PLANNING COMMITTEE

29 July 2024

SUMMARY OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED SINCE THE PUBLICATION OF THE AGENDA AND ERRATA

Item No. 9/1(a) 23/00932/F Page No. 7

Third Party Representation: ONE additional letter of OBJECTION, with comments summarised as follows:

- Planning Statement continues to refer to dwellings as 1.5 storey, when drawings say 2 storey.
- Site will impact upon 'Transition Boundary' for Conservation Area, through views between 11 Heath Road – no plans of this have been provided.
- The site was previously inaccurately considered by the Conservation Officer as not being visible from the designated heritage asset.
- 11 and 15 Heath Road are not shown on some drawings.
- Section Plan of 11 Heath Road and Plot 3 does not provide indication of view from first floor windows of No.11
- Proposed cladding is inappropriate for site location.
- Plot 3 has increased in footprint since submission.
- Query over position of Air Source Heat Pumps
- Construction impacts on Senters Road
- Senters Road junction with Manor Road is not suitable to cater for proposed traffic, and turning head proposed is not a significant benefit.
- Reference to the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 72 which requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of Conservation Areas.

Assistant Director's Comments:

The comments provided by the third party are noted. The comments raise issues which have been already been considered in depth within the committee report.

Item No. 9/1(b) 23/01446/F Page No. 24

Applicant Supporting Statement (summarised for clarity)

The application is recommended for approval by the Planning Officer.

Consultation/Planning Process:

Consultation has been had with both the Planning Officer and Conservation, the application proposal has been revised from the applicant's original design to a reduced scheme, in terms of height, width and material to a achieve a proposal which has a recommendation for approval from the Planning Officer.

Appearance:

The extension is subservient to the main cottages, uses traditional brick and tiled finishes in accordance with Conservation Officer desired appearance. The extension continues the row of cottages.

Scale:

The scale of the extension is in keeping with the existing cottages, whilst being subservient.

Access:

Access will remain to the property as current, unaffected by the proposed extension, the drawings (Existing and Proposed) throughout have identified the land in ownership of the applicant (edged red). These plans were issued to highways as part of the planning consultation period and have been considered by the Highways Authority (see below responses).

Highways Consultation responses

(Sets out NCC Highways responses and lack of objection which are available online and summarised within the officer's report).

It is noted the Parish Council have commented upon parking/access but this will remain as existing to the dwelling, The highways authority have been consulted as part of the planning process and as above have no issue with the proposed dwelling extension, the proposal is not for an additional property but extension of the existing dwelling to provide the applicant with desired space/reconfigured layout.

Parish Council Comment:

The other matter raised by the Parish Council (in addition to highways – see above) was the roof finish and overall appearance of the cottage, this has been addressed as part of the planning process with review of the proposed extension design (including materials, volume, mass) in consultation with the Conservation Officer, addressing their initial comments with the reduced subservient extension, using materials to match the existing property, this includes the proposal for the roof tile to match the existing cottages.

Elected Member Planning Committee Call-In:

Notes the councillor call in for this application, whilst acknowledging that the matters raised were based upon the original proposed extension.

It is considered that the proposed scheme responds the character with the adjoining property as well as the (non-designated) local heritage area with the revised scheme noting the Conservation Officers comments. The proposal would not impact upon neighbouring amenity, the proposed extension would be a modest residential side extension. The extension would not now exceed 50% of the existing dwellings footprint.

Comments have been raised by neighbours, which as part of the planning process is their right, the planning determination must be determined under planning policy and this application is recommended for approval by the Planning Officer – the application has been subject to amendment from the original scheme and the extension proposed.

Conservation Officer Comment:

As above, the current proposed extension addressed the Conservation Officer initial comments with reduced ridge height for subservience, use of traditional materials, omission of timber cladding, the applicant has considered the views of the authority officers (both Planning and Conservation) for the extension with this reduced scheme which is subservient to the main cottages, continues the cottage row and reflects the local vernacular/material use.

Arboriculturist Consult:

No comment was raised by authority officer.

Ecologist:

An Ecology Consultant was appointed and undertook ecology survey/report including bat surveys and report, identifying need for bat provision which is understood and will be accommodated as part of an approval determination – approval subject to related condition for Bat Mitigation Licence to be obtained to facilitate works.

Historic England:

No comment was raised by Natural England to the proposed extension.

Historic Environment:

Our client understands the potential condition requested in relation to a programme of archaeological mitigatory work in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (2021). para. 205.

Summary:

The proposal has been considered, in consultation with the authority (and their consultees) to provide an extension to the applicants property. The design and scale have been considered/reviewed, ditto the finish, to provide a proposal which is supported and recommended for approval by the Authority on planning policy/grounds which all applicants should be based upon, therefore we trust that the Planning Committee will support this application and the officer recommendation.

Third Party Correspondence (summarised for clarity): THREE public OBJECTIONS:

- Reiterates that the marked boundary to the South is incorrect, intruding into the neighbouring field.
- Reiterates that there is no access for construction works from the neighbouring field to the South and West of the site.
- Development is too big for the plot with poor choice of materials given setting in village.
- Archaeology impact.
- Impact on neighbour amenity.
- Drainage problems in area.
- Impact on rare chalk stream.
- No access to site, nowhere for the delivery of materials or parking during construction – where do the Highway Authority think vehicles will park and how will they access the site area for deliveries without causing damage and disruption, noise and pollution?
- Impact on both Watery Lane and Candlestick Lane in terms of parking, damage as well as safety.
- Cars have parked in the private car park who do not live in the cottages before.

- Potential for vehicles to reverse down Candlestick Lane, stopping and reversing off of the
- B1153 on Gayton Road. A banks man is not permitted to direct traffic on a public
- highway. This road has limited visibility at the Junction on Candlestick Lane and cars do not always adhere to the 30mph limit.
- Frequently commercial vehicles acting on behalf of Anglian Water reverse the full length of Watery Lane and Candlestick Lane) to access the pumping station and damage the surrounding grass verges.

Correction: It is noted that the footing of the agenda from pages 26 – 38 incorrect states the planning references starting with 24/, this should however be 23/01446/F.

Assistant Director's Comments:

The issues raised by third parties are considered to be addressed within the officer's report. In terms of the southern boundary the agent has confirmed plans to be correct; if there is a dispute as to the correct alignment of the boundary then this would be a civil matter. The footprint of the proposed development would not extend beyond the current rear elevation of the host dwelling.

Access to the site across land not within the applicant's ownership or control would again be a civil matter.

The form and character of the proposal, including design, scale and materials as well as neighbour amenity, archaeology, drainage and impact on the nearby chalk stream are addressed within the officer's report. Highways safety, parking and construction are also addressed within the officer's report.

The above correction to the footer of the agenda is noted.

Item No. 9/1(d) 23/00720/F Page No. 49

Third Party Representation: ONE additional letter of OBJECTION. The comments raise additional concerns, requesting an EMF (Electromagnetic Field) Survey given the substation's proximity to neighbouring property due to potential health and noise pollution risks, requested the Fire Service provide additional comments on the substation, and raised concern over future maintenance of the hedgerow as a result of the position of the fire wall and EV charging canopy.

Assistant Director's Comments:

The Neighbours Representation in regard to health and safety and perception of risk from the Electromagnetic Fields (EMFs) are a material planning consideration which has weight in a decision.

Whilst no specific EMF information has been provided in support of this application, the Agents have provided a Hazard Plan & have also previously confirmed that the application meets the 'Blue Book' (APEA -- Association for Petroleum & Explosives Administrations) requirements for the design, construction, modification, maintenance and decommissioning of filling stations. This 'Blue Book' provides information on civil, mechanical, hydraulic and electrical installation issues for the planning, design, construction, commissioning, modification, maintenance and decommissioning of filling stations, together with information aimed to minimise the risks from fire, explosion, to health and to the environment.

The Fire and Rescue Service were previously consulted on the application, including the plans for the substation & substation enclosure. It is not considered necessary to consult the Fire and Rescue Service again.

As noted by the Fire and Rescue Officer during the course of the application, The installation should comply with the IET (Institute of Engineering and Technology) and Guidance for Electric Vehicle Charging Points at fuel-filling stations. The proposal would also need to comply with the relevant Building Regulations & other Health and Safety guidance which further controls fire risk and electrical safety, alongside other issues.

The future maintenance of the conifer hedgerow in regard to practicalities for access is a civil matter.

As a whole, it is your Officer's opinion that the application can be determined based on the information submitted and that no EMF plan is required, due to the controls provided by other legislation alongside the information provided to support this application.