

## **Planning Committee: 7 October 2020**

### **Observations Received Following Preparation of Agenda**

#### **Item 4: W/20/0260 - Orchard House, Old Warwick Road, Lapworth, B94 6LD**

Following the submission of site photographs, WCC Ecological Services have confirmed that their recommendation is the same as for the previous application W/19/1771, i.e. they recommend that notes relating to bats and nesting birds, as protected species, are attached to any approval granted.

#### **Item 7: W/20/1004 - 8 Avon Road, Kenilworth, CV8 1DH**

Kenilworth Town Council confirmed on the 5th of October that they wish to withdraw their objection in light of the changes made to the application, which they consider have overcome their concerns. This application has therefore been withdrawn from this agenda and the decision will be issued under delegated powers.

#### **Item 6: W/20/0668 – Old Beams, Lapworth Street, Lowsonford**

Additional response received from Rowington Parish Council

Rowington Parish Council have circulated a response to Members of the Planning Committee. A summary of these comments is detailed below.

- Consider the Officers Report on application W20/0688 to be potentially misleading, lacking in transparency and wrong on a number of important facts.
- Fail to understand the recommendation to grant when faced with such overwhelming objections.
- Concerned that formal objections from the WDC Principal Conservation Officer and the WCC Landscape Team are omitted from the report
- No published public record of ongoing negotiations between officers and the applicant as referred to in the report.
- Concern that Officers have not assessed the scheme as submitted and considered by Rowington Parish Council and other bodies but rather, have entered into negotiations with the applicant.

- There are references to consultees being satisfied with revised proposals; but there is no published record of these revised opinions, nor an opportunity for statutory consultees to comment on the revised proposals.
- The current gap between the two existing buildings is approximately 20m. The width of the previously approved design is just over 6m. The width of the footprint of the revised design is approximately 11m. This is almost double the previously approved building width. The net effect of this proposal is to destroy a visual gap of approximately 20m and remove *"an open aspect through the site that is an important element of the wider setting of the Listed Building"*
- The Principal Conservation Officer objects to the scheme. It is of concern that there is no mention of this highly relevant and important objection in the Officer's Report.
- The Officer's report does not accurately summarise the comments from WCC Landscape which is a formal objection.

## **Officer Response**

The applicants were advised of the recommendation to refuse the original submission and sought to engage with Officers to seek a scheme that overcame the issues raised. This is normal practice and the Government encourage LPA's to actively engage with applicants.

This resulted in discussions with the agent, Officers and the Conservation Officer whereby a revised scheme was considered to reduce the overall width of the proposed dwelling to increase the visual gap together with the omission of a previously proposed garage to the site frontage.

The scheme as revised reduced a side wing nearest to Old Beams and provided dormer windows set into the roof slope and the dormer on the side facing The Bank House was omitted from the scheme. The result reduces the visual bulk and increases the gap at first floor level.

The elements of increased width are single storey elements only with the main element (the garden room), being set to the very rear of the building.