

**PLANNING COMMITTEE: 4 MARCH 2020**  
**OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PREPARATION OF AGENDA**

**Item 5 – W/19/1887 – 12 Coventry Road, Baginton**

2 additional comments received from individuals who have responded previously since the officer's report has been published, reiterating their objections, plus the following:

- Officer's report does not pick up the proposed dwelling is in front of Sheriffs
- Dimensions or ground levels not addressed
- No limit set on maximum height of proposed dwelling
- Far taller than existing bungalow on plot
- Roof lights overlook neighbouring properties

An email exchange with one of the objectors confirmed very special circumstances did not need to be put forward as the site is not in the Green Belt.

**Item 6 - W/19/1977 Ranibagh, Mill Lane, Little Shrewley**

Proposed condition 9 (removal of permitted development rights for roof alterations) will also include the removal of rights to install windows at the first floor on the rear elevation of both proposed dwellings in order to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties against overlooking and loss of privacy.

**Item 7 - W/19/2006 Unit 1, Moss Street, Leamington**

The agent has requested that the following information is presented to Councillors:

*a) The proposal would allow potential mixed occupation of the whole accommodation for both students and professional persons employed locally.*

*b) This should provide an opportunity for high quality accommodation for a wider range of the local community*

*c) Each tenancy agreement would relate to the requirements set out in the Management and Green Travel Plan.*

*d) At night there is only 8% occupancy of the Court Street and Packington Street car parks.*

*e) There are eleven letters of support*

*f) A Legal Agreement can be entered into to restrict occupiers applying for residents parking permits which will address concerns regarding on street parking issues*

*g) The question of compliance with condition 12 of planning application reference 13/2154 can be addressed by a further application and the use of the proposed*

*electric vehicle charging point for the general public would meet the aims of the Councils long term energy strategy for the District.*

In response to the above comments, Officers wish to confirm that a legal agreement has not been provided in support of the application to restrict the right of occupiers from obtaining parking permits.

Comments received after the report had been published:

10 Objections: the traffic surveys do not comply with WDC's requirements and fail to provide the necessary evidence to support the applicant's case. Aside from ignoring the requirements as to when they should be conducted and whether demand around the clock should also be assessed as this site is within the town centre and close to the station, the applicant also includes spaces south of the canal eg in Charlotte St, at least 500m distant. This flies in the face of the statement at App A of the Parking SPD stating that consideration should only be given to 'Any area of a street which lies within 200m walking distance (approximately a 2 minute walk) of the site.

The applicant fails to consider that there are 8 places of worship within two minutes' walk of the site which haven't been taken into consideration as part of the parking surveys provided. Their communities are widespread so attendees come in cars, and because there is little or no on-site parking, they have to find spaces in streets nearby. The presence of so many places of worship with well-used community facilities in this small and densely populated neighbourhood between the river and canal creates unrecognised additional demand for on-street parking.

Few dwellings here have on-site parking and Conservation Area status now precludes the conversion of front gardens into off-street parking, so most residents have no option but to park on the road.

There are additional smaller developments increasing on-street parking demands on these same side streets north of Radford Rd - namely 2 spaces for 5 Russell Terrace (W/18/1744); 2 for Former Stables (Corner of Farley Street/Plymouth Place - W/18/2108); and a shortfall of 3 at 1 New St (W/15/1558). This is not to mention other nearby developments such as at 29-33 High St and 3 George St, where unilateral undertakings denying access to resident parking permits do not, of themselves, prevent the use of cars by occupants and their visitors: they merely lead to such drivers parking wherever they can and displacing other residents.

The extension to L6 parking zone took out of contention a significant section of unrestricted parking which previous Planning Inspectors had identified as available to accommodate the Moss St shortfall. This is unrecognised by the applicant and understated in the case officer's report. Moreover residents access to other freely accessible off-street parking has been/is being reduced because the managements of Baxter Court (backing on to the new Moss Street blocks), Ashlawn House in Forfield Place, and Warneford Mews on Radford Rd have now debarred anyone but their own tenants from parking on their parking lots on pain of clamping and fines; the installation of a traffic island outside 7 Radford

Rd has removed 2 further spaces; and paid-for spaces at nearby Packington Place car park are due to reduce in number as a result of the Council's decision to regenerate a derelict building there (W/18/1929).

WCC Highways fail to recognise recent accidents on which highlight parking stress and safety hazards.

For the last 12 months bins have been constantly stored illegally on the pavement thereby obstructing pedestrians. There was room for them on site against the railway arches but the commitment was never honoured. There is every chance that the outcome will be the same with respect to overseeing parking, particularly since on-street parking would anyway be beyond their control.

The application has the look of hotel accommodation or an Airbnb, mixing up the two categories of tenure, students and short-lets, is not a good idea for either categories. The combination of demand for student and airbnb will continue to crowd out family dwellings.

The various supporters' comments do not live near the development.

## **Item 09 – W/20/0121 - 129 Warwick New Road, Leamington Spa**

### Comments received after the report was published

Additional **13** comments of objection including an objection from Cllr Oliver Jacques (Warwick, All Saints and Woodloes) received making the following points:

- The development destroys the historical characteristics of the area due to its unsympathetic nature
- It is out of character and harms the amenity of neighbours as a result there is overshadowing, visual impact and loss of amenity
- Development is of overbearing design and is in breach of local council's policies thus undermining Council's planning policies
- Rules and regulations have been completely overlooked and granting this application will set negative precedent for future unlawful development
- Development is not in compliance to building regulations in height or depth and undermines the council's planning authority and its values
- Results in loss of daylight, sunlight and creates unneighbourly overbearing impact
- The development was pre-meditated and intentional from the beginning to gain retrospective approval for its unlawful extension
- Negative and intrusive impact on the neighbouring properties which does not preserve neighbourly relation
- Extension is overbearing as it has been built on an already raised platform, and greatly impacts the natural light and privacy previously enjoyed at 127 and 131

- The development is imposing and overlooks both sides which constitutes a serious invasion of privacy and impacts both neighbours resulting in the diminution of the enjoyment of their living areas and outside spaces.
- Development will increase the householders' carbon footprint by default
- Value of property decrease as a result of the extension

Objection made by Cllr Oliver Jacques (Warwick, All Saints and Woodloes)

- The length and height of the extension breaches the 45-degree line in relation to the rear living room and kitchen at 127. This appears to significantly impact upon the amount of light and warmth entering the properties and breaches the Council's policy BE3
- Commented on previous application not in compliance with the limitations of permitted development
- Possible impact on precedent set if the application was to be granted

Further **11** comments of support received making the following comments:

- Extension will enhance the property and help to bring lovely but dated properties in line with modern family housing requirements with sympathetic addition
- In keeping of the neighbourhood and the applicant has followed the advice of planning officer
- The development is not obtrusive and is in keeping of the existing building. Decision should be based on previous judgement of lawful development
- The extension is complimentary to the property and similar extension has been carried out on streetscene
- The extension is not visible from the front of the property and looks in line with the style of the house.
- The extension is not overbearing nor does it limit amount of light to neighbours. The extension is permitted development.