

Planning Committee: 1 February 2022

Observations received following the publication of the agenda

Item W/21/1443 – Gateway South

Additional representations received

2 objections received raising the following comments: -

- It is noted the Landscape officer still has some reservations about the proposal.
- Therefore, if minded to approve, can it be ensured that the landscaping plan is adhered to in the interests of providing a satisfactory standard of appearance in the interests of visual amenities in the area.

Reference also made to government advice regarding non-licensed sites which are encouraged to have a safeguarding system in place with the LPA insofar as aerodrome safety is concerned [officer note – this is not a material planning consideration]

Item W/21/0263 – Land at Bakers Lane, Knowle

Additional representations received

A total of 4 letters of objection received raising the following comments:

- Traffic build-up can only result in more danger to people in the proximity.
- Site has a chequered history and residents have to live with the consequences.
- Report states no impact to property, but plot has a direct vantage point to garden less than 100m away that runs along tow path.
- The land that is being applied for isn't owned by the applicant as is suggested in the report. Therefore, the parcel of land that is actually owned by the applicant is too small to hold a horse. A fact that has been deliberately omitted from the application to mislead. Please see attached report from the land registry which shows the actual piece of land (WK514228) which is a fundamentally smaller piece of land that what is being shown in the application
- The cumulative impact of all of the applications on this piece of land (pre its subdivisions) has not been considered. This needs to be fully considered before it can be approved by anyone. To date there have been 22 applications submitted for the same site (many of which have been previously passed and have fundamentally altered this piece of green belt, impacting both flora and fauna alike)
- The case officer's report has said there are no properties in the vicinity. But the reality is there are. These properties fall just within the border of Solihull on the north east of the application.
- Urge you to fully consider this application before taking it on face value as this application is not for a set of stables, and even if it was there has

already been more development than should have taken place on this single site.

- If the application is granted then I would urge that you firm up the conditions and restrictions that have been applied making them tighter, based on the fact that the applicant has no intention to use this for housing a single horse. Moreover, there should be a condition applied that there cannot be any overnight stays on this piece of land

Email from Saqib Bhatti MP

Saqib's constituent is dismayed that Warwick District Council (WDC) planning team have finally made a decision on this application and recommended it be approved, with it now going forward to planning committee on Tuesday night on that basis.

Saqib's constituent comments that he believes WDC have failed to address many of the key planning points in the approval and in turn local residents believe they have been badly let down (again) by WDC. They have produced (with legal planning professional support) the attached document that shows the counter arguments to this approval

The main problem Saqib's constituent has with this application is that, while his property is located within SMBC as he is across the canal, he is nearest property to the application. However, the planning officer from WDC has disregarded his property saying there are no properties in the proximity, yet his garden is within 250 meters of the application. He fears that he is being ignored as he does not come under WDC jurisdiction and would like this brought to the attention of the WDC Planning Committee.

Other Documents

A Briefing Note was sent to Members from the Local Residents Group. The briefing note set out the following factors:

- Do not feel Members have full facts.
- Only a small portion of land owned by applicant.
- There have been multiple breaches across the site.
- The planning report did not consider whether the manege constitutes appropriate development in the green belt. It is excessive for the keeping of a single horse and is an unnecessary further visual intrusion on the green belt.
- The planning report failed to properly take account of the impact on neighbouring properties stating that the "nearest property is a significant distance to the south west of the site" which is not the case. In fact, the nearest property is [Name of property was redacted after the meeting at the request of a third party] to the North East of the site, which has a clear view of the proposed site. The privacy of, and views from, this property will be adversely affected by the development.
- The planning document states that "the forestry use utilises buildings to the rear of the site that are used to nurture the saplings to a size where they can then be planted outdoors to grow." The forestry activity using these

buildings and associated polytunnel frames is non-existent (see photos at end of document).

- The planning report states that “the site is accessed from Bakers Lane onto an existing access track leading to the associated paddocks and forestry land to the north of the application site”. This is incorrect. The permission for the access track was for agricultural use only and permission has not been granted for access to paddocks to the north of the application site.
- The planning document is incorrect in stating that there is no history relevant to the parcel of land that is the subject of this application. W/20/1319/AG Notification for prior approval for erection of agricultural building [Withdrawn] was on the site of this application. The application is relevant because it was made around the time the plot of land was sold to the applicant.

Item W/21/1084 – Southfields, Lillington Road, Leamington Spa

Additional representations received

A total of 6 letters of objection received raising the following comments:

- Application fails to address serious parking and highway safety concerns as a result of changing sheltered accommodation into private housing. (Photos submitted have been added to the end of the presentation)
- Proposal will result in harm to amenity of property at No. 59 Almond Avenue (Photos have been added to the end of the presentation)
- Lack of social housing provision.
- Loss of privacy from new dormers.
- Increased noise and disturbance.