

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
COMMITTEE 18th MARCH 2009

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 17th March 2009.

Item 1 – 08/00826/FUL

Whitehall Garden Centre, Corsham Road, Lacock, Chippenham, Wiltshire

Development Control Manager

A Unilateral Undertaking has been received which secures the four identified items (alteration of management system regulating the traffic lights; potential waiting/parking restrictions on Corsham Road; alterations to junction of Notton Land and Corsham Road: and imposition of a speed limit on Notton Lane). The Recommendation is therefore amended to:

Planning Permission be GRANTED subject to conditions set out on pages 29 to 32 of the report

Lacock Parish Council raises no objections.

Objections

7 additional letters of objection received. These reiterate objections reported but also raise the following matters:

- **Proposed lagoons in field to south of Harris Lane will impact on flooding in area and public access to this area has implications for Harris Lane which is a private right of way. (Officers note: whilst lagoons and a nature reserve are shown on the plans these do not form part of the application, being outside the red line application site).**
- **Surface water run-off from Whitehall Garden Centre may pollute surrounding area.**
- **Access and egress is still inadequate and a danger to pedestrians.**
- **Pedestrian facilities are inadequate and dangerous.**
- **Pedestrian access through the site is inadequate (there is only one pedestrian exit from the building and no route from that exit to Corsham Road).**
- **Service roads within the site should be moved away from houses.**
- **Noise assessment is flawed.**
- **Holiday tours run from the site and customers leave their cars on site for duration of trip and activity cause disturbance to nearby residents in the early hours.**

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
COMMITTEE 18th MARCH 2009

Items 2 and 3 – 08/02809/FUL and 08/02810/LBC

Latimer Manor, West Kington, Wiltshire SN14 7JQ

Nettleton Parish Council

No objections to the new access. Opposed the proposal (6:1 against) to alter the existing access. Specifically, they were opposed to bringing the boundary close to the road, but did not object to the principle of closing off the access.

Local Resident

The applicant has shown him a sketch plan for the entrance and a gate, as suggested by the case officer; he would be willing to withdraw his objection if this amendment is agreed upon.

Local Resident

The applicant has shown him a sketch plan for the entrance and a gate, as suggested by the case officer; he would wish to change his previous letter of support to one of objection in response to such an amendment.

Applicant

A further 10 emails and 1 letter. In summary:

- He has not declined to amend the new access in that he agrees to alter the size and design of the gates.
- Considers that the person who previously objected to the scheme has no right of approval over the design and de facto this means he has withdrawn his objection
- Questions why it is considered so essential to retain the position of the historic gate pier, particularly in the light of English Heritage's and County Highways' comments; he wishes to have a lawn behind the repositioned wall.
- Considers his proposal retains the pier and entrance, as requested by English Heritage in their comments on the previous application; and that they have no objections to the current proposal because they do not believe it harms the character, appearance or setting of the listed building (this was confirmed to him in a telephone conversation with EH).
- Asks the case officer to confirm that altering the old entrance is not contrary to policies HE1, HE2 & HE4 of NWLP 2011, Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990 or PPG15, and to record that fact in the late observations.
- The overwhelming majority of villagers support the proposal.
- Considers that the case officer's suggestion would form an awkward and ugly "dogleg"; and some of the wall was repositioned approximately 8 years ago.
- Encloses extracts of the plan "as proposed" and "as suggested by Conservation Officer", and also a photograph of the suggested gates. Advises that the letter can be taken as his legally binding undertaking to install the gates whether or not it is a condition of any approval.

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
COMMITTEE 18th MARCH 2009

Development Control Manager

The proposed gate has been added to form part of the application documents. No further revised plans have been submitted. The extracts to the plan referred to above, together with a historic plan of the access have been added to the presentation material.

The wording of Local Plan Policy HE1 includes the following:

“When permitting development in Conservation Areas, the established historic streets, building lines and frontages, burgage plots and boundaries, the plan form of buildings, and other historic physical and landscape features will be conserved and incorporated into the proposal where appropriate.”

The boundary to Latimer Farm has remained virtually unaltered at least since the C19, and it is considered essential for this to be reflected in any alterations, and in particular retention of a south gate pier and pair of vehicular gates. The plan “as suggested by Conservation Officer” was prepared by the applicant’s agent following a meeting. The applicant and his agent have been advised that there are no objections in principle in softening the line of the wall to the north of the new gates and gate pier, but your officer has been advised that they do not wish to amend the application. The proposal to bring the boundary forward of the historic line, including incorporation of the highway verge, and the blocking of the gates on the garden side, are still considered to compromise the Grade II* curtilage listed building, the setting of the Grade II* listed building and the character of the conservation area.

Recommendation remains unchanged.

Item 4 – 08/02792/REM

Glen-Pac (Southern) Ltd, The Forty, Cricklade, Wiltshire

Development Control Manager

There are two errors in the report relating to windows on the rear elevation of the plots 4 and 6. In the 3rd paragraph under the heading ‘Impact on Residential Amenity’ on Page 40 the second sentence should read ‘.....only windows serving **non-habitable** rooms are now proposed in the rear elevation.....’

The first sentence of the seventh paragraph under the ‘Impact on Residential Amenity’ heading should read ‘Plot 6 has been amended to the effect that there are **no** windows serving habitable rooms in the rear elevation.....’

For clarification **all** windows proposed in the rear elevations of Plots 1-6 (inclusive) serve non-habitable rooms i.e. landings and bathrooms.

The following informative should be added:

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
COMMITTEE 18th MARCH 2009

Attention is drawn to the conditions imposed on the "outline" permission (Local Planning Authority Reference 06/00025/OUT) granted on 24 March 2006 which should be read together with this approval. Any outstanding requirement of the conditions to submit details for approval by the local planning authority should be particularly noted.

"In relation to concerns raised over drainage, the officer wished to highlight that the proposed scheme represents a potential opportunity to reduce surface water runoff from the site.

At present 85% of the application site is covered with hardstanding (52%) and buildings (33%).

The proposed development would result in dwellings comprising only 29% with the remainder comprising garden, gravelled drives, block pavers and only 7 metres of tarmac.

Consequently, the gardens, pavers and gravelled areas provide significantly more permeable surfaces on the application site than currently existing and as a result there can be no increase in surface water run-off from this site."

Officer recommendation unchanged.