

## PLANNING REVIEW COMMITTEE

**Wednesday 30 October 2013**

**COUNCILLORS PRESENT:** Councillors Baxter (Chair), Fooks (Vice-Chair), Clarkson, Cook, Goddard, Kennedy, Lygo, Sinclair and Wolff.

**OFFICERS PRESENT:** Lois Stock (Democratic and Electoral Services Officer), Michael Morgan (Law and Governance), Murray Hancock (City Development) and Lisa Green (City Development)

### **8. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillor Khan – Councillor Cook substituted, and Councillor Turner – Councillor Clarkson substituted.

### **9. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Clarkson declared a personal interest in agenda item 3 – planning application for 81 Edgeway Road (minute 9 refers) – on the grounds that she had spoken with both objectors and applicants in order to hear as many points of view as possible. She approached this meeting with an open mind.

Councillor Lygo declared a personal interest in agenda item 3 – planning application for 81 Edgeway Road (minute 9 refers) – on the grounds that he was the County Councillor for the area.

### **10. 81 EDGEWAY ROAD**

The Head of City Development submitted a report (previously circulated now appended) which detailed a planning application to demolish the existing bungalow and garages and the erection of 1 x 4-bed dwelling (use class C3).

Murray Hancock (Planning Officer) presented the report to the Committee.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Amanda Jeffries, Mark Arnold and Janet Montgomery spoke against the application, and made the following points:-

- Concern about overlooking and overshadowing;
- This was a radical change from a bungalow to a three storey house;
- Proposal was too big and would impact on neighbour's privacy;
- It would affect the view from neighbouring properties, particularly from the rear of those in Ferry Road, and would be overbearing;
- Proposal was too bulky, too tall and too wide – there was no other house in Edgeway Road or Ferry Road which contained all the features of this one;
- There would be harm to the neighbourhood;
- Proposal should be on a bigger plot.

In accordance with the criteria for public speaking, Garry Tan and Katja Ziegler (Applicants) spoke in favour of it and made the following points:-

- This is an extremely energy efficient home and designed to be so;
- The height is similar to others in the road – it is not the tallest house in the road;
- The applicant had liaised with the planners and amended plans more than once in response to their suggestions;
- The distance between the back of the house and those at the rear exceeds the Council's guidelines;
- The back of the house does not project as far back as one neighbouring property;
- Several properties in Ferry Road have large attic conversions which overlook neighbouring gardens;
- There are double width properties in Edgeway Road already;
- The front elevation is not monolithic – elements are set back.

The following additional information was provided by the Planning Officer in response to questions from Councillors:-

- The existing property was part of the CPZ (controlled parking zone) and therefore eligible for a parking permit, it was expected that the new property would be the same. No comments had been received from the Highways Authority on this matter;
- The proposed garage could take a normal sized car;
- The proposed footprint of the new building is larger than the existing, but the plot is double width and has a larger than average garden;
- The height of the proposed building had been lowered, but it will be difficult to reduce it any further because the roof needed a certain pitch to it (and it was of a prefabricated nature);
- The height of properties in this road varies a great deal, especially on the side of the road where this application site is situated;
- A neighbouring property has solar panels on the roof, and a solar impact survey had been carried out. The impact of this building on the neighbouring solar panels was not sufficient (at less than 10%) to justify refusal;
- The proposed building had a rendered finish and the colour could be conditioned if desired. Buildings in the road came in a variety of colours;
- There was a great variety of building styles in Edgeway Road, particularly on the side of the street where this application site was situated.

Members of the Committee then discussed the application and made the following points during discussion:-

- It was noted that building styles in Edgware Road were very diverse – an eclectic mix;
- Overall, it is a good application;
- Overlooking was marginal and overshadowing debatable;
- The proposal was too bulky and too big for the site;
- There is an issue of "gaps" between the houses, which had not been mentioned but which was significant;
- Overlooking can be an issue in roads in this area, particularly with property extensions;

- Gaps between houses are actually not an issue as this proposal preserves the gaps – and some properties do not have any gaps;
- This is a very large plot, and it could easily take a pair of semi-detached houses;
- It is a desirable development, and energy wise is an exemplar. Because of the nature of what it is, it will be built very quickly so minimising disruption to neighbours;
- There is no overshadowing of properties in Ferry Road;
- The proposed property is the same distance from rear properties as the existing bungalow, and is further away than some of the neighbouring properties;
- The applicants have tried hard to accommodate neighbours' comments;
- This is an urban environment with high density housing, it is wise to make the best use of the plot;
- Happy that this will be a family house.

Having taken all submissions into account, both written and oral, the Committee resolved to APPROVE the application for the reasons set out in the Planning Officer's report, and with conditions itemised below; and that the Head of City Development be authorised to issue the notice of permission.

Conditions:

- (1) Development to begin within the time limit;
- (2) Develop in accordance with approved plans;
- (3) Samples;
- (4) SUDS;
- (5) Pedestrian vision splays;
- (6) Design – no addition to dwelling;
- (7) Shed/cycle parking.

## **11. MINUTES**

Resolved to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 26th June 2013

## **12. DATES OF FUTURE MEETINGS**

Resolved to note the dates of future meetings as follows (subject to any proposal being called in):-

27<sup>th</sup> November 2013  
23<sup>rd</sup> December 2013

**The meeting started at 6.00 pm and ended at 7.00 pm**

This page is intentionally left blank