

## Planning Committee: 30 March 2022

### Observations received following the publication of the agenda

#### Item 4: W/21/0527 – Four Brothers Farm, Five Ways Road, Shrewley

##### Update to Planning Conditions

Condition 3 to be updated to read "Development in Accordance with the recommendations set out within submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal"

Condition 4 to be updated to be "No works above slab level until..."

Condition 6 to be updated to "No works above slab level until..."

#### Item 5: W/21/0802 – Land North of Bakers Lane

Additional public responses received:

##### 2 Objections:

- Sheer devastation of work already carried out is wrong and the site looks nothing like the Green Belt.
- No consultation was made for ecological surveys, the effect on wildlife and endangered plants.
- Area prone to flooding and works will increase the problem.
- Concerns about loss of hedgerow.
- The bridge is also considerably worn and would not withstand more traffic.
- Concerns regarding the number of barges and cars seeking to park at this facility. Who will police and govern?
- There is one barge constantly moored with a car and a static caravan - are they paying mooring fees to waterways?
- If granted, this proposal will simply reward bad behaviour.

As a point of clarification, Officers wish to confirm that the maximum number of moorings at the site is 20. This is the same as the maximum number of moorings under the previous application.

A query was raised regarding an alternative access to the site. Officers have confirmed with the applicant that this is part of the forestry operations only and will not be used in any capacity in connection with the moorings. It is currently provided with a locked gate at the access onto Bakers Lane and this will continue. A condition is also proposed below to ensure that only the proposed access is used in association with the moorings.

It is recommended that an additional condition is included as follows:

There shall be no vehicular access to the site, other than that which is shown on the approved drawings. **Reason:** Alternative vehicular access to the site could

have a detrimental impact on highway safety and would be contrary to policy TR1 of the Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029.

It is recommended that Condition 4 is updated to the following:

No further development nor use of the site shall be carried out until details of the arrangements for the **removal of any temporary structures associated with the development and** retention and restitution of the top soil over the area of spoil deposit, including details of surface water drainage works have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. **No further development nor use of the site shall be carried out until the development has been carried out in full accordance with such approved details.**

### **Item 6: W/21/1084 – Southfields, Lillington Road, Leamington Spa**

#### Additional Public Responses:

- Loss of privacy as a result of new dormer windows overlooking gardens and facing directly at neighbouring properties windows. At least one window contravenes the Residential Design Guide.
- Adequacy of parking provision is strongly disputed. Assumption is proposal does not constitute a change of use. Not been able to challenge this assumption.
- 35 spaces is not adequate for a potential 119 people if fully occupied.
- Will result in vehicles overflowing onto surrounding roads.
- Access to public transport is limited in this location.
- Will result in hazardous highway conditions on the busy surrounding roads.
- Existing site resulted in minimal noise. Increase in vehicles will generate additional noise, light pollution and disturbance.
- Car parking spaces near to neighbours gardens will also create noise and disturbance day and night in a formerly quiet garden area.
- Entrance and Exit is hazardous with poor visibility, especially with car parked on street.
- Concerns regarding felling of healthy trees to accommodate parking.
- Note that a preliminary ecological appraisal was requested prior to determination. Urge that this is done and any recommendations acted upon before approval granted.
- No affordable homes provided.
- Contravenes Local Plan, Residential Design Guide, Parking Standards and Affordable Housing SPD's.
- Paragraph on provision of 'personal care' is semantics. Southfields provided sheltered accommodation to elderly residents some of whom were far from self-sufficient even though self-contained. The fact that all rooms had emergency pull cables with 24/7 monitoring, that external doors were fitted with codes and voice coms and attended to in person by the Warden when in distress indicates a level of 'personal care' and sheltered protection.
- Dormers are out of character with the area.
- Will have negative impact on my family as privacy will be lost into our bedrooms and dressing area, including that of my young daughter (photos attached to presentation)

- The proposals are in direct breach of the councils own regulations regarding proximity, set out in Policy BE3 of the local plan.
- I ask that you vote in accordance with the council's own guidelines regarding proximity, which were created for the very purpose of protecting its constituents in situations like this, to reject the plans in their current form.

#### Update to Planning Conditions

Condition 9 makes reference to water efficiency based upon an occupation rate of 2.4 people. As the flats are one bedroom only, this is to be reduced to 2 people.