

Public Document Pack

5. **Late Representations** (Pages 3 - 4)

Circulated at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Late Representations Planning Committee 22nd February 2024

Item No. 9	Planning Ref:	PL/2023/0002475/HHA
	Site:	26 Glebefarm Grove Coventry. CV3 2NE
	Proposal:	Erection of boundary wall (retrospective).
<p>NEIGHBOUR RESPONSE(S)</p> <p>One further response has been received by a neighbour who has sought further clarification on matters which the officer has raised in the officer's report. Their concerns are outlined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is noted that highways have only objected due to the impact on visibility concerning highways safety and not the need for the neighbouring property having to bump the kerb to access their drive. What is the reason they have not objected to this? • The note concerning the neighbour having the option to widen the drive or increase the length of the dropped kerb for the purposes of vehicular access would be an unreasonable expense for the neighbour. • The respondent has provided historic street view pictures of the previous layout of the properties. They have pointed out that the occupants of no.26 have in the past opened their doors over the neighbour's land and as such have previously assumed a right of access over their land. • The wall serves no purpose other than for the inconvenience of the neighbour, it is also noted that it does not go up to the garage as they would be unable to access the garage should it have been constructed to this point. <p>REPORT</p> <p>The comments which have been raised by the complainant will be discussed below.</p> <p>In terms of the objection from highways, it is noted that the objection made relates to highways safety, the impact on visibility splays would result in an unacceptable impact on such safety. The local highways authority has not considered the need for the neighbour to have to bump up the kerb an expedient reason to object to this application. A reason for refusal has been included which refers specifically to visibility.</p> <p>Concerning the right of access, the officer has viewed the deeds for both the no.25 and no.26 Glebefarm Grove and cannot see any rights of access for either party over the others land. However, any matters concerning right of access or use of the other party's land are considered to be private civil matters and cannot</p>		

	<p>be considered in determining this application. The note concerning the access to the driveway and potential solutions is sympathised with, but again is a civil matter that cannot be considered as part of the application.</p>
--	---