

Public Document Pack

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

To be circulated at the meeting.

This page is intentionally left blank

Late Representations Planning Committee 17th September 2026

Item No.7	Planning Ref: PL/2025/0002239/FULM Site: 3 Bodmin Road Proposal: Residential development of 22 no cluster dwellings and associated parking and amenity space for hospital workers only. NEIGHBOUR RESPONSE(S) Following a re-consultation to inform of amended plans to show additional fire access points, one further letter of objection was received from a local resident who had already objected. The comments re-iterated the points previously made that have already been summarised within the report. CONDITIONS Additional condition to be added: Prior to the occupation of the development hereby approved, an accommodation management plan shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority which sets out how the building and associated car park shall be managed including, tenancy arrangements, maximum length of stays, car parking allocation, staffing and points of contact. Thereafter, the building shall only operate in full accordance with the approved details which shall not be amended in any way. Reason: To ensure that the development is satisfactorily managed, is compatible with nearby uses and does not adversely impact upon the safe and free flow of traffic in the vicinity of the site in accordance with Policies AC1, AC2 and AC3 of the Coventry Local Plan 2017
Item No. 9	Planning Ref: PL/2026/0000901/HHA Site: 169 Butt Lane, Coventry, CV5 9FD Proposal: Use of outbuilding as annexe for family member (retrospective) (re-submission of application reference PL/2025/0002250/HHA) NEIGHBOUR RESPONSE(S) One further neighbour objection has been received following publication of the committee report. The concerns raised by the objector are summarised as follows: Concern that the outbuilding remains capable of independent residential occupation despite the removal of the oven and hob.

	• Concern is raised that, if family occupation ceases, the building could become a separate residential unit. • The retrospective nature of the application, planning history (including the previous refusal) and previous use of the outbuilding are considered relevant to whether the accommodation is genuinely ancillary. • Reference is made to previously submitted evidence regarding commercial/personal training business use. • The objector considers that the building's physical separation, facilities and planning history raise concerns regarding the potential for the creation of an independent unit. • Refusal is requested or, if approved, robust conditions are sought to ensure the accommodation remains ancillary and is not separately occupied, let, sold or used commercially.
--	--