

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
15 October 2009 at 6:00pm**

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Part A

(open to the public including the media)

Pages

10. Amendment Sheet

68 - 71

See Amendment Sheet attached.

AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee
15th October 2009

AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

LATE AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN INCORPORATED INTO THIS AMENDMENT SHEET AND ARE SHOWN AS EMBOLDENED

7.2 091139 – Shorlands, Coggeshall Road, Dedham

The following consultation response has been received from Dedham Parish Council:-

“The Parish Council Sub-Committee have considered the original application of 3rd September and the amended plans of 25th September 2009. If we have received all the required information at the start of this process we would have ‘called the application in’ for the following reasons:-

UEA13 (a) and (c) we consider that these properties are of an urban design, density, scale and appearance not in keeping with the scale or design of the original property or the surrounding houses in Coggeshall road.

H7 – the proposal fails to meet all three criteria of this policy because:-

- a) They would dominate the estate entrance destroying the open environment that exists. Both properties will be 2 metres higher than the existing property.
- b) The whole junction is surrounded by bungalows therefore the distinctive street scene and character will be destroyed by the proposals.
- c) The proposal adds no distinctiveness, is not harmonious with the surroundings and offers little or no features to reinforce the character of this street scene.

H9 – The proposal fails on both elements and there is nothing of the local vernacular (in a road of mainly bungalows). The scale is too big and dominating the junction and has no place in the setting as presented, further destroying the rural character that exists.

DC1 – The proposal also fails the criteria of element (b).

The Parish Council Planning Sub-Committee also consider that any building location on plot one should be 3 metres minimum back from the current position and any building on plot 2 to be a minimum 5 metres back (in fact attached to the garage would be better) to comply with the building line of the three properties to the north and south of the proposals, and open up the junction to the current levels.

Finally, the size (8.7 metres high according to the applicant's records and higher by 0.3 metres than any existing in that area) and scale is too big for the site. It was considered that two three bed chalet bungalows would be more suited to the location and the data in the Village Design Statement, than those indicated on the plan."

7.3 090902 – 1B Winnock Road, Colchester

Additional response to matters raised in report by agent:-

a) in relation to Urban designers' 5 comments:-

- The area of the site is related to the original plans and site dimensions. Any discrepancy is very minor and unlikely to alter the impact of proposals.
- The Design and Access Statement clearly sets out issues relating to parking and garden areas. In particular, street parking is available in the immediate area and adopted parking standards do not preclude car-free developments.
- The garden sizes are below EDG standards and a number of recent developments at "Knights Field" and elsewhere include examples of where garden areas of 30-40 sq.m. have been accepted. In the central area, a scheme at Northgate Street is provided with neither parking nor private gardens. The suggested communal garden is unacceptable as it would remove all privacy from the properties.
- There will be no encroachment beyond existing site boundary. The design is appropriate to the setting and the suggested oversailing first floor would unacceptably move away from the Victorian theme of the area.
- The majority of the 2 end elevations will be partially shielded by the adjacent properties.

b) in relation to other responses

- Street parking in the locality is not restricted to residents' parking.
- Neither the Council nor ECC appear to have adopted a rigid parking in relation to parking standards and private garden areas in the New Town Ward having regard to other decisions in Winnock Road and Bourne Road.
- The overriding improvement to the street scene in the Conservation Area which will result from this proposal should be encouraged.

7.6 090932 – 31 Creffield Road, Colchester

Additional conditions

“All works must be undertaken strictly in accordance with the methodology statement provide by RWCL dated 24 September 2009 and the submitted Tree Survey , Arboricultural Implication Assessment and Method Statement. A suitably qualified Arboricultural Consultant must be present during all excavation works within the root protection area of the trees to be retained. A written report by the retained consultant must be provided to the local planning authority after the excavation/foundation works are done detailing what, if any, deviation from the original method statement was required. Failure to demonstrate that no adverse affect on the trees will occur would result in a full arboricultural remediation package being required

Reason: To adequately safeguard the continuity afforded by existing trees.”

“The construction of the hereby approved extensions shall be carried out in accordance with the Method Statement for Construction Requirements submitted by the applicant’s agent on 29 September 2009.

Reason: To ensure that the detailing and finishes of the development are undertaken in a manner that this sympathetic to the Conservation Area status of the site.”

7.7 091057 – The Coast Inn, 108 Coast Road, West Mersea

Natural England comment that the development is not directly connected with the management of the Blackwater Estuary SSI/SPA/Ramsar Site & Essex Estuaries SAC for nature conservation. It is their opinion that the proposed development is not likely to have a significant effect on any designated site. If any protected species are known, reported or suspected to be present on the site Natural England should be consulted.

The proposal may affect one or more Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation/County Wildlife Sites identified by the County Wildlife Trust. CBC is advised to consult with them.

In view of this comment members are asked to defer the application in order to carry out this additional consultation. In the event that no adverse comment is received delegated power be given to the Head of Environmental & Protective Services to grant permission subject to conditions as set out in the Committee Report and any additional conditions that may be recommended from the County Wildlife Trust.

Additional Condition

“The existing 5 posts that have been installed that are not situated on the perimeter of the existing car park, together with the rubble deposited on the site, shall be removed within three months of the date of this notice and the ground restored to the satisfaction of the Council.

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity and to protect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.”

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL
PLANNING COMMITTEE
15 October 2009 at 6:00pm**

SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA

Part B

(not open to the public or the media)

Pages

There are no Section B Items