Public Document Pack



Law and Governance

Julie Newman
Director of Law and Governance
Council House
Earl Street
Coventry CV1 5RR

5. **Late Representations** (Pages 3 - 10)

To be circulated at the meeting.





Late Representations Planning Committee 20th February 2025

Item No. 6 Planning Ref: PL/2024/0001282/FULM

Site: The New Haven, Dillotford Avenue, Coventry, CV3 5DU

Proposal: Demolition of existing public house. Erection of new apartment block

of 31 x 1 bed apartments with associated carparking and landscaping

REASON FOR REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE

The application has been referred to planning committee due to the number of representations received and due to objections being received from Cllrs; Kelly, Tucker, Sandhu, Bailey and Mosterman.

ADDITIONAL REPRESENTATIONS

A further representation raising objections has been received since the publishing of this report raising concerns in relation to overlooking/amenity issues. These matters are addressed within the published committee report.


UPDATED PLANS LIST


Since the issuing of the report, the site plan referenced in condition 2 on page 24 of the agenda pack and set out on page 35 has a minor discrepancy in that the pedestrian visibility splays have been shown overlapping the adopted highway boundary. The layout plan has duly been updated to correct this error and splays stepped back, for the avoidance of doubt, the required 2m x 2m splays are achieved and no objections are raised by the Highway Authority.

It is therefore proposed to replace listed 'Site Plan - Residential Scheme DWG 01h' with 'Site Plan - Residential Scheme DWG 01l'.

SKETCH PLANS

Since the issuing of the report pack, it has been requested that clearer plans be made available for the existing/proposed layouts and elevations to be made available for clarity to members. These have duly been provided and are included within the late items pack.





Page 5





Page 6













Item No. 7

Planning Ref: PL/2024/0002336/HHA

Site: 21 Nutbrook Avenue Coventry. CV4 9LE

Proposal: Single storey rear extension

REPORT

There is an update to the Equality section of the report. This should read as follows:-

Equality Implications

Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 created the public sector equality duty. Section 149 states:-

- (1) A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to:
 - a. eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
 - b. advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
 - c. foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Officers have taken this into account and given due regard to this statutory duty, and the matters specified in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 in the determination of this application.

The application has set out that the proposal is for specialist accommodation for a person with a disability to enable further independence for them and provide accommodation for a carer. This has been taken into consideration as part of the planning process to try and accommodate the needs of the applicant. However, there are other options available on site for the extension to achieve the desire for independence without causing harm to the nearby ancient woodland

INFORMATION FROM AGENT

Information has been sent by the applicant's agent with letters of support from their MP, friends of the family and health professionals who support the family and family member with a disability. This information had already been received when the application was submitted and was considered as part of the application. The individual letters have not been shared or made public as they relate to the individual's circumstances and nature of the disability. The officer report does state that we have every sympathy with the applicants and understand the need for the extensions however personal circumstances cannot be given significant weight in reaching a decision as already set out by the Planning Inspector at appeal.