

Planning Applications Committee: 8th November 2012

Updates to reports for consideration.

Application No: 12/01759/F 126/128 Waterloo Road Page: 99

Further representations: Two further letters of objection has been received making the following comments:

- A complaint about the application process specifically that the plan submitted is inaccurate and that part of the land within the red line is owned by the council, meaning that the applicant has no legal access/egress. The application should not be determined until the boundaries and access has been accurately and legally indicated.
- An email from Cllr Brociek-Coulton stating that she and 'Cllr Barker can't be at the Planning Committee tomorrow but we would really strongly ask that the Planning Committee look at the 126-126 Waterloo Road application for a site visit. To see the way it will effect the surrounding area, and at the moment with planning permission for six cars to park there, there is a danger as the cars back onto the small piece of road that is used by many people from Jolly Gardeners Court. A site visit is really needed to explain the way this happens. We both hope that the Committee will take this into consideration.'

Response:

- The issue of land ownership is not a material planning consideration. In terms of process, the applicant and Council Property Services department were made aware this by the Planning Service. The applicant subsequently withdrew their original application and resubmitted it with evidence that they had notified the landowner. The issue of land ownership / right of access is a separate process between the applicant and the landowner. Also see para 11 in the report.
- A site visit is not considered necessary. The issue of impact on the area is addressed in paras 28 and 29-32. The parking/highway safety concern has been addressed in paras 36-43. The presentation will also have numerous photos to help members form a view of the merits of the proposal.

**Application No. 12/01155/F Chalk Hill Works, 21 Rosary Road
Page 65**

Withdrawn representations: One letter withdrawing the objection to the scheme on the grounds that the plans now take on board the recommendations in the bat consultants report. It also commends the applicant on his commitment to biodiversity (see paragraph 7 and 62/63).

Response: To be noted.

Minor Amendments to Layout: The applicant has submitted minor amendments to the layout of the square (removing the turning-head nibs) and updated the hard landscaping for the roads and shared surfaces (See paragraphs 64-67).

Response: These amendments are welcomed and represent the applicants willingness to continue to improve the scheme.

Marion Road/St Leonards Road Playspace: It should be noted that this play area is about to be refurbished. (See paragraph 33)

Response: To be noted.

Application No: 11/01074/F Site of former 18 Penn Grove
Page: 81

Further representations: One letter has been received from Mr Derham who has previously commented on the application. His comments are as follows:

- Cannot see any changes from the previous plans
- Support the site being developed provided it does not block light from properties on Waterloo Park Close, which the current plans do.
- Development should be kept to two storey to reduce loss of light, overlooking and to be in keeping with surroundings

Response:

- No new issues have been raised.

Application No: 12/01348/F 102 Prince of Wales Road
Page: 39

Further representations: One letter has been received from Birketts LLP on behalf of Alan Boswell Insurance Brokers Limited, the owners of 100 Prince of Wales Road who has previously commented on the application. Their comments are as follows:

- Objections still stand; however happy to see that Class A4 has been withdrawn from this application
- Should this application be approved we suggest that it is imperative that conditions be imposed. Approval of Class A3 will be detrimental to neighbouring residents and businesses. Conditions should be imposed restricting opening hours, prevention of litter, adequate sound protection, prevention of odour escape and adequate ventilation. For

example opening hours should be restricted to 11am – 10pm on week nights and 11am to 11pm on Friday and Saturday. A condition should be imposed to enforce sound protection measures to be implemented along with a condition pertaining to restrict hours further if the premises is allowed to play music given the impact this would have on neighbouring residents and businesses. Conditions should prevent any extraction systems from adversely affecting neighbouring buildings.

Response:

- No new issues have been raised. Paragraphs 20-25 of the report address most of the issues along with the conditions listed in the report.