

Planning Committee: 9 November 2022
Observations received following the publication of the agenda

Item 5: W/21/1811 – Land at Glasshouse Lane, Kenilworth

Consultation Response

A final response from WCC Highways raising no objection subject to conditions was received on 9 November 2022.

Member questions received and responses provided

1. You imply that the East of Kenilworth Development brief may be relevant to consideration of this item. If so will you be indicating in what ways the proposals diverge from the brief and will there be a visual comparison available (cannot find any proposed presentations for the 9th yet)?

The original masterplan from the Development Brief is included as part of the presentation together with the indicative masterplan from the outline permission together with the proposed site layout to provide a visual comparison.

2. Page 8/9. Mix of property sizes.
 - a. the report states that the mix of sizes departs from that laid down in the Plan but is 'based upon the demands in the local area'. Could you indicate the source of this local data? The Plan was based on local Warwick District needs identified in the SHMA of 55-65% one and two bedroom dwellings compared to the 48% proposed.
 - b. It also states that proposals should be based on the latest SHMA needs (H2 page 67) which have increased I believe to 40% one bed and 35% 2 bed. Has this been taken into account?
 - c. should the fact that the applicant is WDC carry any weight in our planning decision?

A marketing report was undertaken internally by the applicants and the mix generated as a result of this. The agent has advised that the recent dramatic change in availability of mortgages for younger housebuyers has compounded the issue. The agent has advised that more of the smaller product is within the affordable 40%. Vistry have used market data from their existing sites in the area and other developer comps for the sale product. They always instruct a suite of marketing reports to support the land offer. At their site at The Pavilions they have advised that it is the smaller plots which haven't been selling, and the larger 4 and 5 beds which have sold quickly.

WDC being the applicant has no weight within the decision making. The input from WDC as Milverton Homes was the provision of the affordable units based upon their knowledge of demand in the area.

3. Page 17. Can you remind us of what is considered an 'acceptable' level of sustainable emissions for the proposed private housing? Can we expect

that formally submitted Climate Change DPD will be given full weight and that zero carbon standards will be met?

A sustainability statement was submitted in pursuance of the condition attached to the outline permission. This statement outlines the end dwelling carbon emissions and is over and above policy requirements in the Local Plan. The majority of open market plots will be on new building regs, and possibly Future Homes depending on how quickly that's brought in. Milverton Homes requires all their units (50% of the whole site) to be zero emission with no gas.

4. Page 8. The report state that the plans represent an 'efficient use of land'. What is the density per ha proposed?

the gross density is 32 dwellings per hectare and the net is 34 dwellings per hectare.

5. Has the objection raised by WDC Waste management about excessive distance to collection points led to any adjustments in the plans?

The site has been revised through revisions following discussions with highways to address these concerns with provision of bin collection points on private drives where required. Whilst no formal consultation was received due to timescales, Officers are satisfied that the provision of bin collection areas at the end of all private drives overcomes the earlier objection.

Item 6: W/21/1790 – 34 Bridge Street Barford

For the purposes of clarification, members are advised that the main building at the site has an eaves height of 2.4m which isn't proposed to change. It currently has a ridge height of 5m.

The proposals initially indicated an increased ridge height of 7m however during the course of the application, this has been amended to 6.5m.

As a result of the positioning of the proposals, the increased ridge height is not considered to unacceptably impact upon the amenity of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the Conservation Area and street scene.

The pool building is proposed to have an eaves height of 2.4m and a ridge height of 5.3m.

There is significant space on site for off street parking in accordance with the Parking Standards SPG.

Comments received from the Applicant who is no longer able to attend the meeting

We believe that all of the objections have now been met. I have attended a Parish Council meeting and highlighted these changes, the Councillors were supportive and understanding of the changes made, unfortunately due to the

time tabling of meetings they did not have a planning meeting scheduled before this one.

1) The extension roof height is now shown as an elevation lower than the rest of the building, this isn't a change (from the plans submitted September 13th 2022), simply a clarification – apologies to our neighbour for any confusion caused.

2) The timber garage/log store location is now clearly shown on the plan.

3) We have deleted a dormer window from the front of the property and replaced it with a skylight.

4) The proposed wooden cladding has now been removed from our planning application.

We sincerely believe we have fully addressed all the Parish Council's objections. Between us and our neighbour we have been carefully maintaining a tall row of holly trees which now form a hedge: whilst we understand this cannot be used as part of the application, we plan to keep this private screen for the benefit of both properties.

Item 7: W/22/1429 – 40 High View Road

The single-storey rear extension falls within permitted development parameters and therefore will not be addressed within this application.

Item 9: W/22/1022 – 17 Vicarage Road

An error was made in the officer report. The proposed rear extension has not been reduced in height, only stepped away from the shared boundary. The rear extension is still considered not to worsen the impacts on neighbour amenity from what is currently existing.

Concerns over the content and accuracy of Arboricultural Survey.

The accuracy of the report and the positioning of the trees has been checked and verified with the applicant.