

## Planning Applications Committee: 9 March 2017

### Updates to reports

#### **Application: 16/01893/VC**

**Item: 4(a)**

**Page: 21- 46**

#### **Drainage and floor risk:**

The applicant's agent has been unable to provide a Flood Mitigation Plan in time for committee because data from the Environment Agency is awaited. It is recommended that a planning condition be imposed to require the submission and approval of a flood mitigation for the development

#### **Recommendation:**

- Add flood mitigation condition
  - Revision to condition 3) to include approval of treatment of underside of balconies.
- 

#### **Application: 16/01750/F**

**Item: 4(d)**

**Page: 69-80**

#### **Additional representation:**

Additional objections received from two neighbours. One new issue has arisen.

1. The proposed cladding will not be able to be attached without access onto the neighbouring property. Permission to do so will not be granted.

#### **Officer response:**

1. This is a civil matter, and it is unclear if this is correct or not in terms of the physical restrictions of attaching cladding to the building. Planning permission may be granted despite any potentially conflicting civil matters.
- 

#### **Application: 16/01751/L**

**Item: 4(f)**

**Page: 93-106**

#### **Addendum to a current representation:**

An addendum to a previous objection was received in respect of additional drawings having been received and the public consultation process. The objector raised

concerns that the application was not clear in respect of precisely what was proposed.

Following this, the Council requested further scale drawings (plan and elevation drawings) from the applicant to indicate the precise nature of the works. These additional drawings have been added to the online public record and now clearly indicate the works proposed.

The objector questioned if the new drawings ought to be re-consulted upon. The Planning Manager and Conservation & Design Officer concluded that the new drawings submitted were for clarity only and did not fundamentally alter the scope of the proposals. On this basis, re-consultation was not considered necessary.

The objector was advised of this and indicated that she was satisfied with the Officer's response.

---