

**WESTERN AREA COMMITTEE – 02/12/2004
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Agenda

Item No.

NUNSWELL HOUSE, HIGHER COOMBE, DONHEAD St. MARY

'I write regarding the above and can advise you that I am a planning consultant acting for Mr and Mrs McQueen, owners of Nunwell House. I can confirm that they have received a copy of your letter dated 25 November 2004 which has been forwarded to me for my attention.

Please be advised that I am aware of the recent history of this site pertaining to the refusal of a retrospective planning application for the unauthorized conversion of an ancillary building within my client's ownership and that I shall be lodging Notice of Appeal against the refusal of planning permission by close of business today. I would be grateful if you would advise Members accordingly at their meeting on Thursday 2 December when considering Enforcement action in this matter.'

Plans list

Item No.

1 S/2004/2013 - SHOP REFURBISHMENT AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDING TO FORM SEVEN DWELLINGS AT THE WALTON BUILDING AND THE LEAPING FROG THE SQUARE MERE

This application has been withdrawn

2 S/2004/2014 - SHOP REFURBISHMENT AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING BUILDING TO FORM SEVEN DWELLINGS AT THE WALTON BUILDING AND THE LEAPING FROG THE SQUARE MERE

This application has been withdrawn

3 S/2004/1901 - ERECTION OF THREE TWO BEDROOM DWELLINGS AND CREATION OF FOUR ONE BED FLATS AND ASSOCIATED PARKING AT OLD SHIP HOTEL CASTLE STREET MERE

Environmental Health

I am concerned regarding the potential for noise and disturbance associated with the use of hotel and car park, however, there is an existing dwelling and much has been done to mitigate noise by way of the layout of the site and the orientation of the dwellings. In the circumstances I do not recommend refusal but recommend that the applicant, who also owns the hotel, be advised that the development and the resulting proximity of dwellings may lead to restrictions of the hours of opening and activities at the hotel.

Highways

I have no objection in principle to this proposal.

5 S/2004/2029 and S/2004/2030 - ERECTION OF 11 DWELLINGS CONVERSION OF EXISTING STORES TO DWELLING AT CASTLE HILL GARAGE CASTLE STREET MERE

**WESTERN AREA COMMITTEE – 02/12/2004
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

HDS Note

Additional condition:

21. Measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway by vehicles leaving the site and must be implemented during the whole of the construction period. No vehicle shall leave the site unless its wheels have been sufficiently cleaned to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway.
In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the locality

Condition no.5 has been amended to the following:-

(5) Before development is commenced, large scale details (not less than 1:10 scale) of the: Chimney stacks, (to confirm height, corbel detailing and materials), Eaves, gables and window sections to all elevations of the dwellings hereby approved, shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority, and the development shall thereafter accord with the approved scheme.

Conservation

I feel that the design approach is acceptable and that the massing and articulation of the new dwellings is a big improvement of the previously submitted scheme.

I note that the design for the 'east building' is very similar to the listed building, particularly at the front. I would suggest that a datestone be inserted above the door facing the road to make it clear it is not original.

I would like to see details of the windows, surrounds, labelmoulds, eaves and chimneys for all elevation before commenting of the detailed design. I would also like to see samples of the slates (natural slate should be used in this sensitive context) and sample panels of the stonework.

Neighbour letters

I am objecting specifically to the 'Demolition of Garage (c1970)' which is attached to Grade 2 listed building.

On the site plan it shows that the entire garage will be removed, including the rear wall of the garage. If this garage is removed it will mean the bank of my house/garden will be completely exposed and privacy would be lost.

As the garage is attached to a listed building and the wall in question is part of the listed building I believe the garage should be left in place

This garage(c1970) was built onto an existing new wall and forms the boundary between the property 'Glendon' and listed building.

Neighbour objection

These latest amendments show some improvements to the siting of the buildings on the front (north side) of the plot and the road layout has been improved. No changes have, however, been made to the design or position of the proposed three storey block at the back (south side) of the development. Although the number of residential units has been reduced by one the provision of car parking spaces does not seem adequate.

I am therefore requesting that my original objections to the proposal for a three storey block on this development set out in my letters of 16th June and 2nd October should stand and be referred to the Planning Committee.

**WESTERN AREA COMMITTEE – 02/12/2004
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Mere Parish Council

As the amendments do not address the objections previously raised, the Parish Council reiterate their previous concerns with a slight amendment on (2) below:

Visual Amenity_ The height of the south building is too high and will be overpowering to neighbouring properties (especially to Union House which is approx. 1.5m lower than the site ground level), causing complete loss of privacy. It will also spoil the visual aspect from the south of Mere. The habitable height should be lowered and there should be no accommodation in the roof.

English Heritage

We have considered the additional/revised information and do not wish to make any representations on this occasion. We recommend that this case should be determined in accordance with government guidance, development plan policies and with the benefit of conservation advice locally.

Highways

I confirm that the amendments provided meet the requirements laid out in my earlier letter. No details of street lighting, road drainage or proposed levels are provided, but these matters can be fully agreed through full detail engineering drawings, which should be submitted for future road adoption purposes.

I have reconsidered the parking level proposed and confirm that 18 spaces for this mixture of 1,2 and 3 bedroom dwellings is acceptable within this town centre location. Cycle parking facilities as per the local plan guidelines should also be provided for each plot.

I therefore recommend that no highway objection be raised.

Neighbour

It would appear that there is no planning condition imposed to ensure that the obscure glazing on the south elevation of this building will be provided prior to the first occupation of these dwellings and that such obscure glazing will be retained and maintained in perpetuity. In the absence of such a condition, it would be impossible to enforce the provision and retention of the obscure glazing as indicated on the revised plans.

We have also been advised by our client that the revised position of the building along the eastern side of the site (Units 5 and 6) shows the rear (east) wall of this building to be erected above the existing boundary wall of the site. This wall is within the ownership of our client and his consent would be required for such works to take place. As such, the scheme as proposed involves the construction of the building on land in the ownership of our client. Our client has not been served with the necessary Notice as required under Article 7 of the Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995. As such, it is our opinion that this application is currently **invalid**. In the circumstances, we would suggest that it would be inappropriate to determine this application until this matter has been properly resolved.

7 S/2004/2143 - ERECTION OF 12 DWELLING HOUSES AND FORMATION OF ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD AND PARKING BAYS AT ALLOTMENT GARDENS CHURCH STREET TISBURY

Neighbours

6 letters of objection on grounds of:

**WESTERN AREA COMMITTEE – 02/12/2004
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

Damage to dwellings (with photographs thereof) by amount of heavy construction traffic on that particular part of the road and development company's behavior on Church St site. Many mishaps have occurred, belief that people are entitled to live in peace, with respect and not put up with "abuse because they are builders" .

Highway safety - In Church St , it is only a matter of time before a serious incident occurs. From the proposed access is a blind corner to the left, with little or no pavement. To the right although a little clearer, already has an entrance/exit a few metres away, from the applicants previous development, and should the street be parked upon heavily traffic chaos ensues road is used by elderly and children to access High Street. . The new development will add another 24 cars at least better and safer access could be achieved from Church Street Close.

Where is the affordable housing". If smaller one or two bedroom flats/houses were put up access could be pedestrianised, more could be built with one or two parking bays for delivery or removal vans. Existing cottages have no off road parking.

Highways

There are no highway objections subject to the following:

1. Further details of the access point to Church Street shall be submitted for further approval to provide a ramped access point. Reason: to improve pedestrian safety at the junction.
2. Additional street lighting shall be provided on the adjacent footpath in accordance with details which shall be submitted for further approval. Reason: in the interests of pedestrian safety and improved links to the town centre.
3. The internal road layout is shown satisfactorily but additional traffic calming may be required to ensure speeds are reduced to 10mph. A splay is now shown at the turning head which will ensure that further development will not be prejudiced.

Please add a note to developer or, preferably, a condition, concerning my 2nd point of my previous letter dated 18th November 2004, regarding the need for evidence that the adjacent retaining wall is satisfactorily constructed.

I further confirm that the conditions contained in your report to Western Area Committee satisfactorily cover the above recommendations.

HDS note:

The following additional conditions are suggested:

18. Construction work, including works to form the access shall take place only between the following hours: -8.00am to 6.30 pm on Mondays to Fridays; 8.00am to 1.00pm on Saturday; and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason; in the interests of the amenities of neighboring dwellings

19. No development (including demolition) shall take place until the siting of the site office & compound has been submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. The site compound shall then be sited as

**WESTERN AREA COMMITTEE – 02/12/2004
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL CORRESPONDENCE**

agreed and hours of working shall be restricted to -8.00am to 6.30 pm on Mondays to Fridays; 8.00am to 1.00pm on Saturday; and not at all on Sundays and Public Holidays.

Reason; in the interests of the amenities of neighboring dwellings

20. No development shall take place until details of the treatment of boundaries of the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Any tree screening, hedges, walls or fences thus approved shall be planted/erected prior to the occupation of the building[s].)

Reason; in the interests of the amenities of neighboring dwellings

21. Measures shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway by Vehicles leaving the site and must be implemented during the whole of the construction period. No vehicle shall leave the site unless its wheels have been sufficiently cleaned to prevent mud being deposited on the public highway.

In the interests of highway safety and the amenities of the locality.

It is also suggested that condition 2 be amended to include 'no alterations nor ' before 'extensions'.

Agent

Amended plans addressing floor levels, road gradients, gable end material, and undertaking to provide S106 Unilateral Agreement.

Copies of S106 Unilateral Undertaking for R2.

WCC Highways

The increase in density from 9 to 12 houses will add to the problems of traffic congestion and ability of infrastructure such as sewerage to cope with additional strains imposed.

Objections listed by the Planning Inspector when she rejected the Appeal still appear to be valid, paragraphs 7,9,10,11 and 12.

Suburban development totally unsympathetic to the conservation area. The proposed access road with Church Street is within 50 metres of the following potential hazards: _

A blind corner at the Crown Public House

Access to 2 private house drives

Access to the Crown Public House Car Park

Access to the road leading to Hinton Hall Car Park (used by large groups of people including young children attending social and religious events and visiting the Playground at the end of the lane.

No 1. Parsonage Mead will have a footpath. The edge of the road will run along the right hand wall of the house and will be constructed 2 metres above the ground floor of the house and within 2 metres of the house wall.