Late Representations Planning Committee 26 September 2019

Item No. 7	Application	on No FUL/2019/0824		
	Description of Development - Erection of new indoor bowls facility and maintenance store and reconfiguration of car park			
	Site Address - Club House, Gaveston Road			
	Consultation			
		lands Police – no objection. Recommend some best practice anti-crime such as CCTV, lighting and security fencing.		
		report was written, 26 additional objections have been received responding to ional information submitted since the previous meeting. Comments are ed below:		
	(i)	Nothing has changed and Members should refuse it as they said it was unacceptable last time.		
	(ii) (iii)	The reasons for refusal in 1969 are still applicable The sequential assessment is a joke. Why haven't the other 18 sites identified by the residents' group been looked at? There has been no serious attempt to find an alternative site.		
	(iv) (v)	Do Wasps still require the land adjacent to the Ricoh for potential parking? How about land at Brade Drive (where a coffee shop was recently refused planning permission) and at Bannerbrook Lane?		
	(vi)	There are significant highway / pedestrian safety issues with inadequate access and insufficient parking provided		
	(vii)	The police response has been ignored		
	(viii)	A club member is still telling residents that work will commence next year. Has the decision already been made?		
	(ix)	Impact on residents of building itself (loss of light / outlook / noise)		
	(x)	The planting will not make the appearance of the building acceptable. Who will look after it?		
	(xi)	Harm to the character of the area		
	(xii)	Harm to the natural environment		
	(xiii)	Loss of allotments		
	(xiv)	Disruption / harm to health via pollution during construction		
	(XV)	How will the fire service access the site if the gates are locked?		
	(xvi) (xvii)	The forecast maximum use of the site may be wrong The club is not operated in an inclusive manner		
	(XVII) (XVIII)	A traffic management plan will not work as it will deter people from using the		
	(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	car park as they may be delayed getting back out		
	(xix)	The proposed condition preventing simultaneous daytime use of the indoor and outdoor rinks would not be strong enough to prevent problems of intensification of use		
	(xx)	Promoting the sport to people with disabilities will increase the danger on site due to the difficulties of emergency access		

 (xxi) It is unfair that residents cannot speak again at committee and that Members who were not at the previous meeting can vote (xxii) The Indoor Bowls association could run the operation on any site 			
One letter of support has been received as the development would encourage people to play sport and socialise			
Appraisal			
Nearly all of the points above are covered by the main report, however responses to the comments regarding emergency access if gates are locked and the police response are below.			
Condition 14, which relates to access for emergency services, is recommended to include reference to access to the site if the gates are locked when they arrive.			
The police response makes some sensible suggestions regarding lighting, CCTV and fencing. However, as the proposal is on an existing bowls club site, it is not possible to insist on measures which solve any existing deficiencies. Having said that, a condition requiring details of lighting to be submitted is already recommended.			
Comments made by members of the bowls club are not a material planning consideration. Neither is the governance of the club.			
With regard to the three additional sites mentioned by a resident, the Council are in regular contact with Wasps and know that the site adjacent to the Ricoh is not available. The Brade Drive centre has an allocation for 1000 sq m of additional retail space in the Local Plan in order to provide a number of small units to diversify the offer in the centre. The provision of an indoor bowls facility would not comply with that aim. Finally, the site at Bannerbrook is subject to pre-application discussions to be developed and is not available.			
Officers would like to clarify that the 18 sites identified by the resident's groups are not considered sequentially preferable and have not therefore been considered through the assessment process as they cannot be afforded any preference in planning terms than the site put forward by the applicant. It is officers view that the sequential test in planning terms has been satisfied and this is outlined further within the report.			
Additional/Amended Conditions			
14. Prior to use of the building / extension hereby approved, details of the emergency access (including the gate, road markings, surfacing, access when the gates are locked and signage) shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The approved details shall be installed prior to use of the bulding / extension and the gate shall only be used thereafter by emergency service vehicles.			

Item No. 8	Application No FUL/2019/1781
	Description of Development - Erection of two storey rear extensions and loft conversion to create 8 additional HMO rooms
	Site Address - Old Crown 89 Windmill Road
	Recommendation One further objection has been received from the Longford Park Primary School raising the following concerns: The additional occupancy will bring additional traffic and parking problems around the area causing possible hazards to school children. Windmill Road is already very busy and traffic volume and speed is already an issue. There is no clarification on the nature of the intended occupancy of the renovated building.
Item No. 10	Application No FUL/2019/1778
NO. 10	Description of Development - Erection of 36 dwellings and associated infrastructure
	Site Address - Land off Almond Tree Avenue
	Further comments A local resident has written in with further comments in addition to those previously provided, summarised as:
	There has been another accident in the road that resulted in two cars hitting at speed and one then crashing into parked vehicles. The width, curve and number of parked cars combined with speeds that drivers travel create blind spots that often lead to these types of accidents. This road was not built for the amount of traffic at the moment. The added houses will bring more danger not only to parked cars, but to children that have to cross to use the public footpath that takes them to school or to the little bit of space left behind the houses where they can play. The field is prone to flooding and the use of illegal motor bikes across this piece of land will make it a no-go area for the children. A once great open space protected by this Council for the use of all children as a play area and area of natural beauty and wildlife will be gone. Existing houses don't have the luxury of off-road parking and there is a risk of damage to parked vehicles every day. Visitors to the new houses will add to these parking problems, especially to the disabled people in our road.
	Amended Condition
	Condition No.2 (plan numbers) has now been updated following the submission of amended plans tweaking the layout changes referred to in the report. The condition reads: <i>The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved documents: Drg No. SP01N, SP05, SP00A, BT02G, PL01J, PL02H, PL01_1G, PL01_2A, PL01_3A.</i> For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.
	Contributions The Public Rights of Way Officer has confirmed that the contribution request for the re- aligned and widened cycleway will be £43,742.89, which includes relocation of street lighting and vehicle defence structures. This will be secured via a legal agreement.

Item No. 11	Application No HH/2019/2023				
	Description of Development - Erection of two-storey and single storey rear extension, a rear dormer and alteration to front including garage conversion				
	Site Address - 19 Innis Road				
	Consultation				
	Two additional representations have been received which reiterate the initial concerns that the proposed two-storey rear extension would appear oppressive and would affect the outlook and rear amenity of the neighbouring occupiers. One of the residents considers that the proposed extension would result in the loss of light to the neighbouring property and subsequently would increase their carbon footprint as the proposal would contribute towards extra lighting and heating costs. One of the representations indicates that the assessment process and policies do not seem to take into account the damage which would be caused by rebuilds or extensions to individuals and the community in this area.				