

**WEST/CENTRAL AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 1<sup>st</sup> MARCH 2012**

**AMEND/DE-BRIEF NOTE**

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 11/1482/FUL

Location: **1 Hoadly Road**

Target Date: **31 January 2012**

To Note:

Following the publication of the Committee Report, a further letter of representation has been received from 3 Hoadly Road. This is attached to the Amendment Sheet as Appendix 1 for your information. I have the following comments to make about the points raised in this letter:

*Lack of site visit to 3 Hoadly Road*

Attempts were made to visit 3 Hoadly Road, but the offer was not accepted.

*Comparisons with 17 Hoadly Road*

Each application is decided on its own merits, but the existing extensions to neighbouring houses are relevant to the assessment of this application because they are part of the character of the area. The extension at 17 Hoadly Road has not been built in accordance with the approved plans. Planning permission was granted for a two-storey extension, and a single storey extension abutting the common boundary with the adjoining neighbour, 15 Hoadly Road. The single storey extension that has been built does not abut the common boundary, but is not so materially different as to warrant further investigation.

Comparisons have been made with the extensions to 17 Hoadly Road as, although they are not identical to the extensions proposed at 1 Hoadly Road, they are similar in scale and design, and their existence supports the conclusion that the proposed extensions would not be out of character with the area. It also demonstrates that an extension of this scale may be, on balance, acceptable in terms of its impact on the adjoining neighbour.

*Amendment to the window at first floor level*

To overcome the concerns raised about the large window at first floor level, and the potential to overlook 3 Hoadly Road, the window has been reduced in size. The amended plans are attached to the Amendment Sheet as Appendix 2.

I recommend that condition 3 is removed, as, in my opinion, reducing the size of the

window will mean that there is no potential for any direct overlooking of 3 Hoadly Road.

The following Appendices are attached:

- Appendix 1 – Further representation from 3 Hoadly Road
- Appendix 2 – Amended plans
- Appendix 3 – Comparison of existing and proposed floorplans
- Appendix 4 – Birds eye view of the site and photograph
- Appendix 5 – Shadow analysis (prepared by the City Council)

Amendments To Text:

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:

**DECISION:**

---

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: 11/1585/FUL

Location: **Rear of 82 – 94 Richmond Road**

Target Date: **22 February 2012**

To Note:

**Recent Appeal Decision 11/0921/FUL**

The previously refused planning application on this site has been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. I have attached a copy to the amendment sheet.

Paragraph 9 sets out the key conclusions of the Inspector. In the round, the Inspector concluded the height, mass and angular design would be too intrusive in its context, particularly when viewed from number 78 Richmond Road. The Inspector concluded that a transition in height to the north of the site may be more appropriate.

*Officer Comments*

I remain of the view that the application proposal addresses the previous reason for refusal and does not conflict with the recent appeal decision. The overall visual impact upon number 78 is in my view much improved. This is because of the reduced overall height and the reduction in scale of the proposed roofs. I have attached photomontages to the amendment sheet of the previously refused scheme and of the application proposal. The comparison plan attached also illustrates the revised massing of the proposed roofs, which I consider acceptable.

### **Additional boundary planting**

The Inspector raised doubts as to whether any trees planted along the boundary with number 78 would survive and flourish (paragraph 10 of the appeal decision). In response, the applicants arboricultural consultant has confirmed the boundary can adequately accommodate further tree planting.

#### *Officer Comments*

I am satisfied the applicant has suitably addressed this issue. Further technical tree pit details have been submitted and are attached to the amendment sheet.

### **Amended Plans**

Following the original submission, amended plans have been received responding to consultee comments. The following minor changes are proposed.

- Removal of rumble strips.
- Further details on waste bin provision.
- Obscure glass to the second floor balcony of plot 1.

### **Additional Plans**

The applicant has responded to concerns regarding the access to the site for a fire tender. I have attached a tracking plan showing a sweep path analysis which is satisfactory.

### **Attachments**

- 11/0921/FUL 82 Richmond Road Appeal Decision
- Letter response from applicants agent
- Watercolour sketch of application proposal
- Photomontage of previously refused application (dismissed at appeal 11/0921/FUL)
- Comparison plan showing the footprint and elevation of the application proposal in relation to the refused scheme.
- Sweep Path Analysis
- Technical Note on the access arrangements
- Tree planting technical details

Amendments To Text: None.

### **Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation:**

Removal of proposed **condition 15**: Rumble strips. These have now been omitted from the scheme.

**DECISION:**

---