

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 14th MAY 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

This is information that has been received since the committee report was written. This could include additional comments or representation, new information relating to the site, changes to plans etc.

The text in bold is additional/amended information to that circulated to Members on Tuesday 13th May 2008.

Item 02 – 07/00238/FUL

Walnut Tree Gardens, Lydiard Millicent, Wiltshire

The Parish Council has commented on the revised plans and continues to object to the proposed development. The Parish has, however, withdrawn its objection to the proposed replacement garage for No. 2 Walnut Tree gardens.

A further two letters of objection have been received commenting on the revised plans. The objections raised have been addressed in the main report.

One of the local residents has also submitted three photographs to support his objection to the proposal. These photographs are available on the file.

Recommendation

Delegate to PERMIT subject to conditions and the completion of an Agreement.

The applicant be invited to enter an Agreement in respect of the following matters:

- (i) To ensure that 50% of the residential units to be provided are affordable units and that a flat fee of £26,000 for the odd unit be paid in accordance with the Revised Affordable Housing SPD;**
- (ii) To ensure that the affordable residential units are occupied in perpetuity by people who have a local housing need;**
- (iii) To ensure that a financial contribution is made towards public open space provision.**

Following completion of which the Implementation Team Leader (Development Control and Listed Buildings) be authorised to GRANT Planning Permission.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 14th MAY 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Item 3 – 08.00706.FUL

Wiltshire Golf & Country Club, Vastern, Wootton Bassett

Applicant

Requested that Members be made aware that one of the objectors, who claimed that much of the information supplied in relation to the planning application was based on “falsehoods”, has confirmed “that without corroboration and proof he genuinely does not hold the view that Mr Shah or his company are basing arguments on falsehoods”.

Item 04 – 07/02078/OUT

Windtop, Upper Pavenhill, Purton, SN5 4DQ

Purton Parish Council

No Objection

Development Control Manager

Correction:

Letters have been received from 5 local residents, not 9 as on the agenda.

Satisfactory plans showing turning space have now been received.

Item 05 – 07/03242/OUT

71d Lowden, Chippenham, Wiltshire, SN15 2BS

Chippenham Town Council

Recommends refusal as this is backland development

Development Control Manger

Condition 1 should read:

1. Prior to the commencement of the development hereby permitted, details of the following matters (in respect of which approval is expressly reserved) shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the local planning authority:

- (a) The layout of the development;
- (b) The scale of the development;
- (c) The appearance of the development;
- (d) The landscaping of the site.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 14th MAY 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: The application was made for outline planning permission.

Item 07– 08/00635/S73A

48 Pavenhill, Purton, SN5 4BZ

Agent

The following has been received as clarification of the issues surrounding this application:

No. 48 Pavenhill is one of two properties owned by the applicants. Restrop Lodge (also owned and occupied by the applicant) was bought in October 1998. 48 Pavenhill was bought in October 2000 for three reasons: Restrop Lodge has no real parking and is relatively dangerous for traffic; so the grandmother would have somewhere to stay when she came with some independence whilst acting as a nanny to the children and to put up visiting family and friends; and to have somewhere to run their small business from. Currently the applicants spend a couple of nights a week at 48 Pavenhill as it is a comfortable means of looking after the premises and such will be needed in the future.

Only those rooms identified will be used for commercial purposes.

Part time staff - Mr. Mill's two part time assistants live within two miles of Purton at Priory Vale and three miles at Cricklade. The assistant from the latter location catches a bus. The other is dropped off. Bus routes are available from both and the part time staff will not be given any parking and will be required not to drive their own cars. Sonia Tatara-Mills's two part time secretaries are dropped off and collected by their husbands on journeys to and from work. They live at Wootton Bassett, some 4 miles away. Part time secretaries are not given any parking and required not to drive their own cars.

Please find enclosed a parking plan for two spaces on gravel to be accessed from a dropped kerb at the rear of the property

A photograph has been taken today of some four cars parking at the rear of No. 48. The applicants would like to point out these are nothing to do with their personal or assistants parking.

The only cars likely to be present are those two of the applicants and the occasional client, which is the case at present.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 14th MAY 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Development Control Manager

The recommendation remains as per the prepared report. However, in light of the undertaking (and ability) to provide two off-street parking spaces, it is considered relevant and reasonable to attach one further condition that will require such space to be required.

05 Within one month of the date of this planning permission, full constructional and layout details of two off-street parking spaces to be provided within the boundaries of the site, shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved parking spaces shall be provided within three months of the date of approval of such details, unless otherwise agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to provide off street parking in respect of the proposed development.

Parish Council

No objection in principle, but have concerns with inaccurate information given. Issue 1: where are parking spaces for 3 cars no space on site, so much be on road in which parking is a problem along Restrop View, 2: Part residential, part office, yet no one lives as no one is on the electoral roll, in retrospect are they paying business or domestic tax.

Items 08 and 09 – 08/00581/LBC and 08/00586/FUL

Chequers, Market Place, Box, Corsham, SN13 8NZ

Agent/Architect

Various exchanges of correspondence/drawings to address the issues raised set out in the committee report, including a letter from the agent dated 7.5.2008 which he requested be reported in full to committee (nb this is attached to the website). In summary, the architect's comments/information are as follows:

Underground Garage:

Photographs are submitted which show the proposed position of the opening in relation to the ground levels; these clearly show that it would be lower than the base of the existing wall.

As The Chequers is a house now, only 2 parking spaces are required. The applicant wishes to have some covered parking. This will replace the "original" garage and will not harm its setting.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 14th MAY 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Drainage and Disabled Access:

Further details submitted. The architect has given an assurance that a structural engineer will be employed to provide the detailed design solutions where required (in particular relating to the drain(s) and manhole to the foundations of the building). Revised drawings have been submitted which show a small alteration to the landscaping works to the rear of the site. The architect has also confirm that “the actual width of the disabled path link which is to be hard surfaced will be 900mm and that all remaining areas will be formed to soft contours and turf”.

Garage Conversion:

Architect has submitted revised drawings showing amendments to the joinery in the gable elevation and other windows. The agent advises that his client is unwilling to enter into a legal agreement in respect of the occupation of the residential annexe; and he considers that a condition would be adequate to control the use.

Development Control Manager

Underground Garage:

Recommendation remains unchanged. If members are mindful to approve the applications, revised drawings would be required to show the correct position of the proposed garage opening, and associated alterations to the wall.

Drainage and Disabled Access:

The Drainage Engineer initially recommended refusal. However, subject to a condition to ensure the submission and prior approval of detailed design solutions for drainage, with no increased discharge into the public sewer, the proposals are considered acceptable. Subject to conditions in respect of the landscaping to ensure hard surfacing is reduced, the landscaping/disabled access proposals are now accepted.

Garage Conversion:

The amended scheme is considered acceptable, subject to conditions.

Recommendation

As it is not possible to make a split decision, the recommendation in respect of the proposals remains unchanged; but with the reasons for refusal being amended by:

In respect of 08.00586.FUL – omission of Reasons 1 and 4

In respect of 08.00581.LBC – omission of Reason 1

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Item 12 – 08/00382/FUL

Cepen Park, West Cepen Way, Chippenham, SN15 1PQ

Clarification of policy issues:

The site was allocated in the former (2001) Local Plan (Policy RT2) for roadside facilities – a petrol filling station, restaurant and hotel. All of these facilities have now been provided on this site under these policies. Since the objectives of the policy had been achieved and the site was substantially developed for those purposes the allocation was not carried forward as an allocation into the 2011 plan. Framework boundaries were not changed in the 2011 plan but this site is now part of the built-up area of the town.

Since the site was allocated for development and has now been developed it is not “countryside” in the same way as any unallocated land outside the framework (eg the adjoining golf-course). The key policy issue in this case is whether the land should be retained for further development for the uses for which it was originally allocated. The facilities have now been in place for several years and there has been no evidence of further demand for this type of development on this site. It is considered, therefore, that this alternative form of development is acceptable.
