

ITEM 2.2 – 19/504059/FULL – Wentworth House, Wentworth Drive

From Cllr Tim Gibson

Q1: I note in the report that we did notify residents and post our usual planning notice but are you tell me how wide our notification went in terms of proximity to the site.

OFFICER RESPONSE:

All residents directly adjoining the site were written to, as is standard for our public notification. For example, no. 87 Kenilworth Court have been notified but not no. 85 Kenilworth Court.

The blue squares in the image below show the properties that were written to and the red triangles indicate those that have responded.

The site notice was posted on the nearest lamp post to the bins on Kenilworth Court.



ITEM 2.3 – 19/506038/REM – Land fronting Painters Forstal Road

From Cllr David Simmons

Q1. With reference to page 84 of the officer's report, what is the site area and what are the approximate dimensions of the site?

OFFICER RESPONSE:

The site area is approximately 0.4 hectares, and measures 66 metres by 84 metres at its widest points. The site location plan shown on page 84 of the report is erroneous; it is only the front half of the site which is in question here. We will table an amended site location plan, and this has already been sent out to Members via Democratic Services

Q2. With reference to point 2.01 this is a reserved matters application for access, appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. Does that include the location within the site?

OFFICER RESPONSE:

The siting of the building within the site is part of this application

Q3. With reference to point 6.02 Positioning the building. Why would moving the hall to the middle of the plot require a complete redesign of the building?

OFFICER RESPONSE:

I have consulted the applicant in this matter, and I understand that moving the position of the proposed hall to the middle of the site is likely to require a re-design of the building as it has been designed to face away from Pawley Farm to protect the occupants' residential amenity. Having a nearly blank wall facing Pawley Farm from the middle of the site would not be conducive to good design; any redesign might necessitate re-orientating the layout so fenestration would then face Pawley Farm; this would lead to a substantial erosion of residential amenity to the occupants of Pawley Farm. The move would also result in the loss of useable outdoor recreational space; would make the building more prominent within the street scene, and would have budget implications

Q4. As 3 above. Other points. Why would solar gain be reduced by moving the location as suggested in 3. above?

OFFICER RESPONSE:

I have discussed this matter with the applicant, and I understand that solar gain works in the same way you would expect for solar panels with respect to orientation. The ideal orientation for solar gain is south to south-southwest, this provides the maximum exposure throughout the year to direct sunlight. The building has been orientated to be as close to this as possible to ensure that any benefits from solar gain can be maximised to aid efficient and sustainable design whilst still relating to the site. Simply moving the building more centrally within the site would retain its orientation and solar gain, but compromise its relationship to the site. Rotating the building to face the street frontage could go some way to address how the building relates to the site, however, as stated in response to question 3, it would create bad design for the site as a whole. Therefore the building would have to be redesigned to re-orientate spaces (internal and external), glazing and entrance to ensure that the wholistic approach to the design of the building and site can also provide the benefits of solar gain along with the required elements of good design with regard to external spaces and how the building addresses the entrance and street.

Q5. Please can you confirm that in this situation "detriment of residential amenity is a material planning consideration?"

OFFICER RESPONSE:

'Detriment of residential amenity' would be a material planning consideration. Officers have taken this matter into consideration, and have concluded that residential amenity would not be unacceptably eroded for the following reasons:

- The building would be orientated to face in the opposite direction from the immediate neighbour
- There are only two windows shown on the elevation facing the neighbouring boundary; one would serve a toilet, would be fairly small, and some distance from the neighbouring property; the other, serving the kitchen is required by Condition 1 to be fixed and obscure glazed
- The drawings show a planted buffer zone on the north-eastern boundary between the site and Pawley Farm
- The building would be single storey and low (less than 4m to ridge height)

From Cllr David Simmons

With regard to further mitigation point 6 (page 79). PFCA have responded by saying that they are content to preclude planting trees in the buffer zone and limiting the height of the hedge, (to say 2 meters), to prevent overshadowing of the neighbour's property and garden. I think this should be included in condition (3) relating to landscaping? It is worth pointing out that the land at Pawley farm is approximately 1 m below the application site.

OFFICER RESPONSE:

Officers have considered the idea of precluding trees within the buffer zone, but are of the opinion that to do so would not decrease any effect on the residential amenity of the residents at Pawley Farm. This matter and our conclusions are discussed in paragraph 7.03 of the report.

The applicant has agreed to not have any Malus trees within the buffer, as requested. The change in levels is noted in paragraph 1.01 in the report, but my observation on site was that the change in levels was approximately half a metre, rather than a metre.

ITEM 2.4 – 19/500768/FULL – Owens Court Farm, Owens Court Road

From Cllr Tim Gibson

Q1: Hi can you tell me whether the Environmental Health Manager has been chased for a response and if so could we have details of the response received.

OFFICER RESPONSE:

I discussed the matter with Steve Wilcock this morning, who has advised that his team would raise no objection and would ask for no conditions to be appended to any approval, should Members be minded to approve.