

EAST AREA COMMITTEE MEETING – 8th July 2009

Pre-Committee Amendment Sheet

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0053/FUL**

Location: **122 Tenison Road**

Target Date: 19.03.2009

To Note: Concern has been expressed, by a near neighbour, that the consultation period for this application has been extended beyond the date of Committee, to the 9th July. This is puzzling, as the computer records show that the re-consultation on this proposal was undertaken on the 16th June and, as it is practice in re-consulting to allow 14 days only for further comment, the period should have expired at the end of the month. That notwithstanding, I am of the opinion that the matter can be considered at Committee and delegated authority given to officers to determine the application, either refusing or approving it, after the 9th July, subject to no new material planning consideration being raised between the Committee and the end of the 9th July. If a new material planning consideration is raised in that period, then the matter can be brought back to the next meeting of the East Area Committee on the 3rd September

Further objection has been received from the residents at 29 and 31 Lyndewode Road. The former provides a photomontage with some of the correspondence.

The points made include concern that although the front dormer has been removed from the plans (which is welcomed), the plans are not considered to have changed much in other respects and the objections raised previously (and rehearsed in the main report) remain.

The proposal is seen as being in conflict with Local Plan 2006 paragraph 3.41, which advises that, "...the extension of existing buildings will be permitted if they do not unreasonably overlook, overshadow or visually dominate neighbouring properties." Particular concern is expressed again about the issue of privacy and the lack of any compromise about the number of new windows, their size, or restrictions about how they open. The three new windows in the existing gable (two at ground floor and one at first floor) would, it is argued, unreasonably overlook the neighbours, and give the neighbours a view of the people using the shower room/lavatory; the original design precluded such openings for obvious reasons. The roof extension will create a large mass that dominates the small garden of 31

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0422/FUL**

Location: **104 Cherry Hinton Road**

Target Date: 15.07.2009

To Note: An additional representation has been received.

Amendments To Text:

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations:

- Tenant of 104a Cherry Hinton Road

The representations can be summarised as follows:

- As a tenant of the flat there is already a significant amount of noise and smell, which emanates from the take-away next door as well as the betting shop on the corner.
- If the proposed unit were to be open during the evenings then it would make the flats an unattractive place to live.
- There is concern that the tenant would find the additional smell from the kitchens a nuisance.

The owners/occupiers of the following addresses have made representations of support:

- Owner of 104a and b Cherry Hinton Road
- Tenant of 104b Cherry Hinton Road

The representations can be summarised as follows:

- Consider that the proposed use is highly acceptable and believe that it provides a much-needed facility within the area.

An additional paragraph should be added after 8.26.

I believe that I have addressed the objectors concerns within my report. The applicant seeks opening hours until 6 pm and as the premises is for a café where the primary purpose is the sale and consumption of food and light refreshments on the premises and where the café's seating is contained within the building I do not believe that there will be a significant noise disturbance. Additionally, comments from Environmental Health Officers recommend that the extraction and ventilation of odours can be dealt with effectively and have recommended a condition, which has been included in this recommendation.

Paragraph 8.5 should be replaced with the following:

The latter part of this policy refers to change of uses from A1 to A2, A3, A4 or A5. While this local centre does have in excess of 60% of units in Class A1 (shops) usage, which this policy strives to sustain, as the property is already classified as a Class A2 use, this part of the policy is not applicable to this application.

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION:

CIRCULATION: First

ITEM: APPLICATION REF: **09/0099/FUL**

Location: **10 Blossom Street**

Target Date: 21.04.2009

To Note: 3 further letters have been received since the report was written.

A letter from Councillor Bradnack is attached.

Two other letters have been received from 12 Blossom Street and 20 Riverside.

The issues raised are:

- the further loss of light that would result from this development proceeding – the closure of the gap affording direct and reflected light ;
- the enclosure, the ‘boxing-in’ and domination of the garden, by the continuation of the existing roof height further along the boundary and the consequent loss of amenity;
- that this is a very tight-knit urban environment, where very large rear extensions are not appropriate - 12 Blossom Street has already had extensions to either side (as well as some impact to the front from 36 Norfolk Terrace;
- the change of use of the existing garage and is an issue for the neighbourhood and conservation area which are already under pressure from multiple occupancy
- concern that the proposed development will put additional pressure on drains – especially a gully drain that is already flooding;
- concern about disruption during development; and
- the materials proposed are inappropriate

Amendments To Text: None

Pre-Committee Amendments to Recommendation: None

DECISION: