

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 25th June 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 24th June 2008.

Item 03 - 08/00522/FUL

Pound Mead, Corsham

WCC Education

Confirmation has been received that the requested £80k is required for a number of infrastructure related projects at Corsham Primary School - for example the provision of additional office/staff space as a result of the changing staffing profile of the school, and the replacement of temporary mobile accommodation with permanent.

WCC have again made it clear that they regard the £80k as a "discounted" figure and is specific to the particular financial circumstances of the applicant. It is offered on the basis that other parties such as NWDC itself, will give a comparable "discount" from their expected contributions (eg. for public open space etc). The full contribution that would ordinarily be expected is £332,494.

Senior Regeneration Officer

Confirmation has also been received from the Senior Regeneration officer with regard to the requested financial contribution towards public open space (POS). Whilst a development of this size would normally have POS provided on site to cater for the residents needs, there is other open space within easy reach of the site. A financial contribution would therefore be an option and would be calculated on the number and nature of the proposed market dwellings only. This gives a figure of £184,000.

The open space in Corsham is, at the moment, managed by the Town Council. The TC have confirmed that improvements are required, although there were no specific measures planned at that time of asking. The Senior Regeneration officer has confirmed the difficulty in expecting the TC to have plans drawn up in the hope that contributions were going to materialise.

Development Control Manager

A further report prepared by Hydrok has been received in respect of stability of the slope to Oathills and Hither Spring. This confirms that the stability of the bank will be secured through development and the existing garden walls will not be adversely affected. The report also confirms that an additional retaining wall of 1.0m-1.2m in height will be constructed adjacent to those properties at Oathills.

In the event of the DC Committee resolving to grant planning permission, it is suggested that the following additional condition be imposed :

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 25th June 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

16. The stability of the bank along the northern boundary of the site shall be secured in accordance with the conclusions and recommendations contained within the Hydrock reports, dated 30th November 2007 and 12th June 2008 respectively, and in accordance with large scale elevational and constructional details of the new retaining wall, which shall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development. Development shall be carried out in accordance with those details approved.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of securing a retaining structure of appropriate appearance.

Item 04 - 08/00916/FUL

Timikel House, Crudwell, Malmesbury, Wiltshire, SN16 9EY

Local Residents

Letters of objection received from 6 local addresses raising similar concerns to those detailed in the report:

- Claims that the site flooded in excess of the 200mm stated by the applicants
 - The additional house will put further pressure on local drainage system
 - Will result in overdevelopment of the site, lack of privacy, increased traffic/inadequate parking, loss of light to adjoining property, loss of mature hedgeline, adverse impact on streetscene/environment
-

Item 06 - 08/01015/FUL

The Hidden Barn, Ashton Keynes

Agent

A letter has been received from the agent together with revised plans. Below is a summary of the key points raised:

- With regard to the previous appeal decision referred to in the report, this was for a barn that had previously been extended and therefore is not relevant. This proposal involves one extension to a dwelling, which has never been extended and has been designed to resemble the scale and footprint of a building which once stood on the site.
- Policy BD6 permits extension to rural buildings providing the extension is not 'extensive' – the policy does not define the extent of 'extensive'. The policy aims to protect the openness of the countryside and protect the character of the host building. The proposed extension cannot be seen from the surrounding area and the size in relation to the overall size and scale of the existing building as a whole is not 'extensive' it equates to a 28% increase in floor area of the total building.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 25th June 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- The revised plans show that the height of the ridge has been reduced which has a significant affect on the overall scale and appearance of the extension. The revised roof line is split in two levels, part of the roof will be 4.7 metres high (the same as the existing roof ridge) and the remaining part will step lower at 4.2 metres high. This represents a reduction in height of 1.2 metres and 0.7 metres. The extension will therefore be subservient to the host dwelling and means that no part of the proposed extension will be visible from the spine road. The length of the proposed extension is 15.4 metres not 15.5 metres as referred to in the report.
- Alterations have also been made to the garden room, which involved replacing the glazed element with stone walls to reflect the character of the main building.
- Whilst not a planning issue, it is confirmed that the existing Bio Digester system is more than sufficient to support the proposed extension.

Local Resident

A letter has been received from a local resident in support of the application. Below is a summary of the key points raised:

- It is appropriate that the space of the old chicken shed should be used, it is merely restoring a space previously occupied by a building.
- The proposal will not be visible to public view.
- Applicants need a larger house and are the sort of people that should be encouraged to stay in the village.

Case Officer

The revised plans with the reduced roof line are an improvement on the original drawings, however, the amendments are not considered to overcome the recommendation for refusal. It is considered that an extension of this size and scale would be detrimental to the character of the original converted barn.

It is stated by the agent that the extension represents a 28% increase in the floor area of the total building, however, this relates to the total footprint of the three adjoining dwellings and therefore it is considered that 28% is a considerable increase to this range of barn conversions, similar to an additional unit.

Please note revised Informative:

1. This decision relates to documents/plans submitted with the application, listed below.

Plan References

01, 02, 03 and 06 received by the local planning authority on the 23rd April 2008 and revised plans 04A and 05A received by the local planning authority on the 23rd June 2008.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL COMMITTEE 25th June 2008

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Local Resident

An email has been forwarded from a neighbour who has stated that she is more accepting of the lower roofline, which is more sympathetic to the surroundings.

Development Control Manager

Other matters raised in the email relate to: planting of some trees, being party to meetings with the building surveying team to seek assurance that the drainage is adequate and a contractual agreement regarding Resident Association contribution – these would be private arrangements between the two parties and not matters that can be controlled through the planning process.