

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE 25<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2014**

### **OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PREPARATION OF AGENDA**

#### **Item 7: W/13/1491 – Land at Fiveways, Shrewley**

A further letter of support has been submitted which states the removal of the chicken sheds would be an improvement.

#### **Item 8: W/13/1763 – Land at Holly Walk, Baginton**

##### Further public response

The Trustees of the Lucy Price Sunday School Fund have confirmed that the Nicholls Colton report has addressed their main concerns relating to health and safety of the site and therefore they now support the application.

#### **Item 9: W/14/0011 - 12 West Street, Warwick**

Warwick Town Council: Object. The Town Council are concerned that the proposed use will impact detrimentally on the amenities of residents by reason of noise and disturbance. In particular this concern relates to those residents in the flats above the proposed drinking establishment in the evenings, and if patrons gather outside the premises to smoke or to drink. Residents assert that the applicant has no access to the land at the rear of the premises and that accordingly it will not be possible for refuse to be stored on the land at the rear, and the Town Council ask that the Planning Authority and Environmental Health should establish if the land is available to the applicant before a decision is made regarding the application, for storage on street or in the access passage would be unacceptable.

#### **Item 10: W/14/0040 - 33-35 Abbey End, Kenilworth**

Four further objections received raising the following additional concerns:

- Impact on the already noisy and busy Blundell's alleyway, running from Abbey End, between Hibberd Court and McCarthy & Stone sheltered housing to Southbank Road. A further drinking establishment will change the quiet residential character of the area and increase unsocial behaviour, noise and disturbance for local residents.

- A music licence may be applied for.
- Sufficient similar uses in vicinity.
- Increased use of Abbey End car park with associated noise and disturbance.
- Change of use would remove the premises from potential occupation by a retail use when the economy improves.

### **ITEM 11: W/14/0035 – Land off Vine Lane, Warwick**

A further petition containing 90 signatures has been received from residents within the W3 parking zone:

- There is an existing undersupply of parking in this area which is harmful to highway safety.
- Account is not taken to restrict number of parking permits which can be applied for (up to 3), when new development meet parking standards, so these houses can apply for the same number of permits as existing residents with no off-street parking.
- No development should be allowed which reduces existing off-street provision for existing dwellings.
- Parking standards should take account of area specific car ownership averages per household.
- Over development in any form should be refused.
- Numbers of permits allowed should be limited to number of bedrooms per property, plus one guest permit.
- The maximum number of permits allowed should be 3 plus one guest, regardless of number of bedrooms.

Two further objections received raising the following further concerns:

- The air raid shelter in the rear garden of the application site is incorrectly sited on the proposed plans and will be affected by the development.
- There is a wall on the front boundary to no.1 Vine Court which is not shown on all the proposed drawings, so it is feared this will be removed by the development. This wall affects visibility for cars using the proposed undercroft parking spaces. *The further views of WCC Highways will be reported directly to Committee on this issue.*
- Harm to the safety of children and animals using the driveway of the houses opposite site, arising from overhanging vehicle movements associated with the proposed parking spaces.
- Loss of privacy to houses opposite from first floor living room.
- Development conflicts with BRE 25 degree guideline for daylight and sunlight to windows of the house opposite and at the rear.
- Proposed car ports are out of character with area.

- Loss of surrounding property values
- Increased activity in rear garden due to proposed sole access to dwellings at the rear, impacting directly on amenity and privacy of houses to the rear.
- The development is contrary to DP1, DP2, DP7, DP8, Parking Standards, Distance Separation Standards, NPPF and the Human Rights Act.
- Fire safety and access are a concern to second floor bedrooms, via narrow alleyway
- Accommodation is not suitable for elderly, young families or disabled people.
- No locked entrance or CCTV for undercroft parking, contrary to Parking Standards SPD (section 4.5).
- Parking permits should be removed.
- Construction working hours should be restricted due to proximity of neighbours.
- Boundary with neighbours shown incorrectly and forms not completed correctly.

A collective e-mail responding to the Committee Report has also been received which in summary states:-

- The development is not in character with the surrounding area and does not respect the existing built form;
- It does not comply with the District Councils Separation Distances;
- There is no mention of the bungalow opposite the site;
- The site has been left to degrade on purpose;
- The majority of representations are not available on line to view;
- The drawings are not accurate;
- No individual gardens are shown;
- An Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) has not been carried out;
- No mention of the proposed bedrooms within the roof space;
- A full BRE daylight and sunlight assessment has not been completed;
- The development is overdevelopment;
- No disabled parking spaces are provided;
- Parking spaces not the required width when adjacent to a wall;
- The possibility of redeveloping No.36 Paradise;
- The properties are too small;
- The development is not accessible by disabled people;
- The development provides poor quality homes.

The Archaeologist at Warwickshire County Council has inspected the site particularly with reference to the presence of an air raid shelter and confirms that they have no objections to the development in that respect.

**Item 12: W/14/0080 - 2 Westham Lane, Barford**

WCC Highways have raised no objection subject to additional conditions requiring visibility splays, a surfaced driveway and verge crossing. The following additional conditions are therefore recommended to Committee.

- 13 The access to the site for vehicles shall not be used unless a public highway verge crossing has been laid out and constructed in accordance with the standard specification of the Highway Authority. **REASON:** In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies DP8 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011.
  
- 14 The development shall not be commenced until visibility splays have been provided to the vehicular access to the site with an 'x' distance of 2 metres and 'y' distances of 33 metres to the near edge of the public highway carriageway. No structure, tree or shrub shall be erected, planted or retained within the splays exceeding, or likely to exceed at maturity, a height of 0.6 metres above the level of the public highway carriageway. **REASON:** In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies DP8 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011.
  
- 15 The access to the site for vehicles shall not be used in connection with the development until it has been surfaced with a suitable bound material for a distance of at least 7.5 metres as measured from the near edge of the public highway carriageway in accordance with details to be approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. **REASON:** In the interests of highway safety in accordance with Policies DP8 of the Warwick District Local Plan 1996-2011.

Two further objections have been received, substantively raising the same issues as those already received along with the following additional comments:-

- Residents on the south side of Westham Lane park on the lane as they have no offsite spaces. The applicant's B&B run out of their garage has led to additional parking pressure on this road, and the proposal will add to this.
- It will be difficult for development supplies to be delivered without obstructing the lane and the access to their property.

### **Item 13: W/13/1688 – Land off Mallory Road, Bishop’s Tachbrook**

Three further objections have been received raising the same issues as those listed in the report.

Bishop’s Tachbrook Parish Council have reiterated their objection to the scheme and clarified that in their view the scheme amendments do not address their previous issues and worsen the traffic situation in terms of the number of connections into the road.

### **Item 15: W/13/1699 - 374 Cromwell Lane, Burton Green**

Burton Green Parish Council have made further objections to the amended plans:

Further to the meeting of the Parish Council last night (17th February 2013), it was RESOLVED that the Parish Council OBJECT to the above planning application, including the amended plans.

In addition to the comments already submitted the Parish Council were of the view that the changes were insignificant and that the footprint is identical to the previous design, with the height been the same as previously event with the changes. It was felt that the design did not fit in with the street scene, which are bungalows and that the front elevation and size still overpower the neighbouring bungalows.

The Parish Council also wished to highlight that the recent Housing Needs survey undertaken by WRCC on behalf of Burton Green, highlighted the need for more bungalows in the parish. The Parish were unsure why the property would be changed from a 3 bedroomed to a 2 bedroomed, with then a very large ground floor - and queried whether there was an intention to add additional bedrooms at a later stage.

The garage size was shortened in the plan of 4th December to accommodate the kitchen and now will not take a reasonably sized car. It was felt that the site was being vastly over developed and that the proposed frontage had only been changed by a small cosmetic alteration to one bay. The rear roof lights did not make any difference to the street scene, and the proposals would not be in keeping with the existing street scene.