

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

PLANNING COMMITTEE (3rd September 2018)

OBSERVATIONS/REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED SINCE COMPLETION OF REPORT

Page 9

**18/00082/FULM - DEMOLITION OF 2NO EXISTING OFFICE BUILDINGS (USE CLASS B1) AND ERECTION OF 3NO. STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION UNITS (USE CLASS B1(C), B2/B8), WITH ANCILLARY OFFICES, ANCILLARY PLANT, SERVICE YARD, ACCESS, PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS, INCLUDING THE REMOVAL OF PART OF WELLINGTON CRESCENT.
LAND AT WELLINGTON CRESCENT, FRADLEY PARK, LICHFIELD.**

Additional Observations

The proposed Unilateral Undertaking Travel Plan Cost for a Framework Travel Plan, which covers a site (e.g. more than one building and more than one business) is £11.900.

Amend Note to Applicant no. 4 to read:

The conditions requiring off-site highway works shall require a Highway Works Agreement with Staffordshire County Council. The applicant is requested to contact Staffordshire County Council in order to secure the Agreement. The link below is to the Highway Works Information Pack including an application form. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form or email to (nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk). The applicant is advised to begin this process well in advance of any works taking place in order to meet any potential timescales.

<https://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/transport/staffshighways/highwayscontrol/HighwaysWorkAgreements.aspx>.

Page 35

**18/00979/FUL - RETENTION OF ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING OUTBUILDING/ANNEX
1 THE GRANGE, UPPER LONGDON, RUGELEY**

Additional Condition

1. Within 3 months of the date of this decision, a detailed landscape and planting scheme shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include hedge/screen planting to the north/north west boundary along Upper Way (behind the boundary wall). The approved landscape and planting scheme shall thereafter be implemented within eight months of the development being brought into use, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

1. In the interests of the visual amenity of the locality and in accordance with the provisions of Core Policy 3 and BE1 of the Local Plan Strategy, the Trees, Landscaping and Development Supplementary Planning Document and guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

Additional Letters of Representation

Two further objections have been made by neighbouring residents. Their comments are summarised as follows:

- Will be overlooked by this horrendous, intrusive property.

- State that they were never notified about the previous application.
- Note there was never a site notice for this development.
- Those allowed to comment previously were told it was a gym not an annex.
- It is not in keeping with neighbouring properties.
- It is too big and overbearing,
- Question how this ever gained planning permission.
- Consider that the enforcement team should not have allowed retrospective permission.
- Question why are planning laws so easily broken.
- The development is too wide.
- The footprint is much larger than approved.
- The roof is wrong.
- It doesn't look like the approved plans.
- They feel overpowered and overlooked by the development.
- Feel it should be rebuilt in accordance with approved plans.

Additional Observations

It is considered that the additional comments made have already mainly been addressed in the main committee report.

The required consultation was and has been carried out in respect of this and the previous application. There was no requirement for a site notice for this form of development.

Whilst the proposed outbuilding has increased in size (floor area) compared to that previously approved, it is considered that this is not significant and does not cause additional harm to the surrounding area or neighbouring amenity. However, in order to reduce the visual impact of the proposal in the streetscene, an additional condition is recommended to include landscape screen planting to the boundary along Upper Way.

Subject to this additional condition, as set out above, the recommendation remains one of approval.

Page 43

RAISING OF ROOF TO FIRST FLOOR SECTION INCLUDING 4NO BEDROOMS AND ENSUITES, SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE TO EXTEND FAMILY ROOM SPION KOP, LICHFIELD ROAD, HOPWAS

Amended Observations

To clarify matters related to impact on residential amenity the applicants' agent has advised that there is approximately 7 meters change in ground levels from the application site/house and that of neighbours' land to the south. Therefore, to explain the relationship to neighbours and the standards set out in the Sustainable Design SPD, I amend the following paragraphs of the main report:

Amend Para 4.2 top read:

"To prevent loss of privacy or overlooking the Sustainable Design SPD states there should be at least 21 metres separation where principal habitable windows face each other. Note 9 in Appendix A of the SPD also states that increased separation distances will be required where there are significant variations in ground level between new and existing development. The guidance advises separation distances should be increased by 2m for every 1m rise in ground level. The properties on Lichfield Road vary in land level and the dwelling is set on the hillside slightly higher than the road level. In this instance the distance would need to be increased by 14m, giving a required distance separation of approximately 35m. The nearest property (Berrybrow) lies some 44m from the existing dwelling, therefore

the distance is in excess of the minimum required, and therefore will not give rise to any overlooking or loss of privacy to the neighbouring properties. Notwithstanding this, the footprint is not coming any closer in terms of its footprint to the existing properties on Lichfield Road.”

Amend Para 4.3 to read:

“The site is also heavily screened by mature trees on the south and west boundaries so this offers screening throughout the year. There are 2no dormer windows proposed on the first floor front elevation, however due to the separation distances, there will not be any undue overbearing impact, as the minimum distance requirement would be 27 metres (13 metres plus 14 metres to account for rise in land levels) for the proposed development and the dwelling has a separation distance of greater than this distance to the closest neighbours; at approximately 44 metres separation.”

LIST OF SPEAKERS

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING

3 September 2018

18/00082/FULM

Mr John Jarman

Objector

Mr Tom Armfield

Applicant's Agent

18/00979/FUL

Mr Darren Jakeman

Supporter

Mr Russell Steven

Applicant

18/00931/FUL

Mr Clive Chapman

Objector

Councillor David Leytham

Ward Councillor

Mr Rob Duncan

Applicant's Agent