

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Wednesday 18th November 2020

- ADDENDUM TO AGENDA -

Item 6.1 – 126 Foxley Lane and 1 Woodcote Drive – 20/01174/FUL

It is noted that the proposed summary box located at the top of the committee report inaccurately stated there were 4 wheelchair accessible car parking spaces. As set out by paragraph 8.53 within the body of the report in fact 6 wheelchair accessible parking spaces are proposed.

Paragraph 8.7 refers to the site being in a PTAL of 3 when it is in fact 1. The calculation of density in the paragraph is correct.

Paragraph 8.24 states "...allows the building to sit comfortably adjacent to this adjoining property within detrimentally impacting the character of the area...". This should state "...allows the building to sit comfortably adjacent to this adjoining property without detrimentally impacting the character of the area..."

Item 6.2 – 89 Hyde Road – 20/00108/FUL

Since the publication of the report, 5 additional representations objecting to the development have been received. All issues raised are already covered in the report other than those noted below:

- No affordable housing [OFFICER COMMENT: Being a minor scheme of under 10 units, there is no policy requirement currently for affordable housing to be provided]
- Comments relating to the development being out of character and landscaping [OFFICER COMMENT: Analysis of the character and design impacts of the development, along with landscaping considerations, setting out why the development is considered acceptable is contained within the officer report, relevant and necessary conditions are imposed]
- CGIs are inadequate [OFFICER COMMENT: CGIs are indicative images and are not approved plans]
- Comments re drainage [OFFICER COMMENT: This is explained further below within the addendum alongside the officer report]
- Construction of the development opposite the site is not complete and the Council has allowed this to happen [OFFICER COMMENT: This is not material to the determination of this application nor within the Council's control]

There are some clarifications and corrections to the officer report which are as follows:

Paragraph 2.5 should say 17th February 2021.

Paragraph 3.8 should say that the surrounding roads only are within an area at high risk from surface water flooding.

Paragraph 4.0 (summary of key reasons) erroneously refers to "...2x 4 bedroom family sized units." This should read "...2 x 2bedroom 4person family sized units".

In relation to paragraph 8.48, it is proposed to have an infiltration tank below the ground level (disabled parking bay) to manage flood risk impact. As per the above point, the paragraph should be updated to state that only the surrounding roads form part of a high risk surface water flood area. Further representations have been made, following the publication of the committee report in regards to two options presented being presented within the SUDs strategy. Option 1 is the Cellular Infiltration tank as referred to under paragraph 8.48. Option 2 refers to discharging any runoff into a public sewer – this option has not been explored and is only referred to within the appendices. For this stage of the process the submitted statement is considered appropriate, in that a suitable sustainable drainage strategy – cellular storage tank - is proposed to deal with surface water runoff and deal with potential flood risk impact. This has been developed as an initial strategy to which officers are satisfied with. A pre-commencement condition requesting the full and final details once further analysis and site investigations have taken place is recommended to be imposed.