

PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 OCTOBER 2018

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PREPARATION OF AGENDA

Item 8: W/18/1276 – 2 Satchwell Place

Public Responses: 1 Support – drug use is high within the area and the tenant should be able to protect herself; the fence is not inappropriate and has tidied up the area; the fence is necessary for privacy; the Council should bear the costs if they wish to replace it.

Item 9: W/18/1284 – 52A Queen Street

The agent has submitted a further note which makes the following points in support of the application:

- it is not correct that no marketing board was displayed – a photo is provided showing one in position when the property was visited on 30 July –this has been in position throughout the marketing period and remains in place now;
- the marketing has been comprehensive and meets the requirements of the Local Plan;
- marketing has been ongoing for four years;
- the cost of the fit out was not the only reason that the prospective tenant pulled out – there were also issues with a lack of parking, lack of footfall, lack of people driving past, insufficient space and poor outlook;
- refurbishing the property to make it more attractive to potential tenants would be too costly given the amount that has already been spent over the extended vacancy period, and given there is no likelihood of success;
- the Committee Report is biased because it does not put forward the applicant's arguments in favour of the proposal;
- retail is changing, with local retail centres diminishing in size as more people shop on-line;
- units like the application property are no longer desirable – there is no demand for any retail or service facility in this location;
- the Policy does not indicate what should happen in this scenario – leaving the unit vacant in perpetuity is not an acceptable solution;
- the NPPF states that where policy is silent then planning permission should be granted for sustainable development; and
- the proposals are sustainable, making best use of an existing building and enhancing the conservation area.

CAF Response: CAF considers that this building makes a positive contribution to the Conservation Area and would welcome its retention and a viable use being found for it.

Item 10: W/18/1435 – Land South of Gallows Hill, Warwick

Update to content of report

At page 10 of the report, reference is made to an appeal against W/17/2275. This was in fact the earlier application W/17/0699.

Update to S106 Requests

The Warwickshire Police request is **£33,243** not £27,487 as stated in the report.

Update to Conditions

- Conditions amended to be prior to commencement of dwellings to allow works to spine road and access to commence together with minor wording alterations.
- Removal of phasing condition as not required.
- Variation of masterplan condition to be in accordance with details submitted.
- Variation of design code condition to be in accordance with details submitted.

Item 14: W/18/1602 – Land Adjacent to 2 Mill Road:

1 Public Response: Support, there is little architectural merit in the character of Mill Road as it stands and recent development has destroyed its character. There is a widespread tradition in Leamington of these mews roads being revitalised. The proposed development is very well designed which respects this tradition.

Item 16: W/17/2398- New Village Hall, Red Lane, Burton Green

Both Cllr George Illingworth and Cllr Michael Coker, have written to all members of the Committee and have expressed their support for the application.

The Environmental Health Officer has recommended a further condition requiring that all windows and doors to be kept shut to contain noise after 11.00 pm.

Item 15: W/18/1729 – 35 Greville Smith Avenue

Further consultation response:

Whitnash Town Council: No objection.