

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
16 February 2012 at 6:00pm**

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**Part A**

(open to the public including the media)

**Pages**

**. Amendment Sheet**

**88 - 91**

See Amendment Sheet attached.



# AMENDMENT SHEET

Planning Committee  
16 February 2012

## AMENDMENTS OF CONDITIONS AND REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

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

7.1 112480 – 14 Honywood Road, Colchester

**Correction** – FOUR letters of objection have been received, not three as originally reported. The fourth letter does not raise any new points.

During the re-consultation period following the submission of amended drawings, two representations have been received.

The first, from 17 Honywood Road, covered the points previously made, and also added:

“You suggested that Mr. Anthony submit revised plans – and indeed went so far as to send Mr. Anthony suggested plans that would apparently meet with your approval! Is it really the job of a senior planning officer to draw up plans for a developer in the knowledge that local residents have objected to previous proposals?”

**To answer the question posed, yes it is the job of a senior or any other Planning Officer to give advice, including drawing up possible alternatives in response to points raised by objectors in order to hopefully arrive at a satisfactory solution.**

The second point raised related to attempts to reduce/remove the fencing and vegetation on the boundary.

*Officer's comments – This issue has already been noted and is dealt with by proposed conditions 09 and 11.*

The second, from 4 Ireton Road, which is the only neighbouring property affected by the proposed extension, thanked your Officer for visiting their property and explaining proposed ideas for amendments, adding ‘We appreciate your efforts to make the plans acceptable to us, and do accept the improvements offered.’

The letter posed the question, however, about the proposed height and material of the wall on the boundary, and also voiced concern about possible noise due to proposed windows out on to the patio.

*Officer's comments – This issue has already been noted and is dealt with by proposed conditions 09 and 11.*

### 7.3 111725 – 13 Park Road, Colchester

The reference to the CSCI (Commission for Social Care Inspection) at paragraph 1.5 should be amended to the CQC (Care Quality Commission). The CQC was formed as an amalgamation of the CSCI and the Health Care Commission.

Further comments have been received from Councillor Lewis as follow:

*'At the planning meeting held recently this application was deferred for further information, the accommodation was discussed at length, the report states three members of staff and six residents, in the existing accommodation, with six bedrooms, one bathroom with toilet, and one toilet. I assume the staff mentioned are care workers, as the unit would require additional office, and house keeping staff to carry out the day to day running of this care home, I accept some of this information is not a planning consideration, however I would like to point out the application for an additional bedroom with en suite facility, adds to the already insufficient shared facilities available for male and female residents and staff in this Care Home.*

*Planning Application. 091154. dated 12th: June 2008. The report describes this unit as for people with learning difficulties a Residential Institution, going on to say The premises will provide employment for eight persons, working shifts, with no more than three employees in any shift.*

*This means if a resident is escorted to the bus stop to take advantages of community facilities, that will leave two staff members, to look after the proposed seven residents, the office and the house keeping, a shift take over takes more than a few minutes and could mean six cars on site, reports have to be considered etc.'*

**Officer's comments – the issue of parking standards has already been discussed in the report.**

Comments from our Environmental Control section have been forwarded in relation to existing noise complaints:

'I spoke to x at the beginning of December who said in the summer the noise problems are with radio/music which can be heard when windows are open. The noises some of the residents make also disturb x. I explained that this type of noise was very difficult for us to deal with because we are unable to serve a noise notice on this. However we can deal with the radio/music.

I have also spoken to another neighbour who is disturbed by the use of the washing machine. x mentioned that it is on all the time and there is no break from the noise.

Neither neighbour mentioned they have an agreement with the home.'

#### 7.4 112266 – Kingsford Business Park, Layer Road, Colchester

Environmental Control comment as follows:-

"Environmental Control have no formal conditions to add to this application. However, the D2 use could be applied only whilst the applicant is on site.

This will prevent other D2 usage from using the building in the future and possibly causing a nuisance to nearby residents."

The Highway Authority raise no objection to the proposal and comment as follows:-

"Having regard to the fact that the current use allows for normal office facilities, the access could see a variety of trips on a daily basis. This would include employees, customers, business clients and service vehicles for materials such as stationery and hygiene equipment. In this regard the proposed use of the unit being limited to 26 times per year and a low level of private vehicles will mean that the conflict with existing highway users at the access point will be lessened."

Additional observations by Mr Harrison who will be running the courses:-

1. The hide will be the same size and appearance as a garden shed, coloured dark green.
2. The orientation of the hide will optimise light availability for photography but facing away from neighbours. A number of bird feeders positioned in front of the proposed position are already attracting a larger number of woodland birds.
3. This is an educational and conservation based use, involved a maximum of 20 full day and 6 half day sessions, limited to a maximum of 4 students, mainly in the 40-50 year age bracket.

4. The maximum number of car park spaces required is 5 and may well be less as a result of car sharing, use of alternative transport or course places that are not filled.
5. The use will generate revenue for EWT and is aimed at spreading awareness in nature conservation.

The applicant has responded to matters raised in the representations and his comments are viewable on-line.

7.5 112321 – Papillon House, Balkerne Gardens, Colchester

Application withdrawn by agent

7.6 112430 – 16 Rosetta Close, Wivenhoe

**Amended Condition 05**

**Prior to the works commencing in relation to the development hereby approved details of the new window within the front (north east) elevation serving the master bedroom shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning authority. The details shall include the obscuration level of the glazing (equivalent to scale 4 or 5 of the Pilkington Texture Glass scale of obscuration) and the method by which the window shall be fixed shut. The window shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and shall be retained as such at all times thereafter.**

**Reason: as before**

**COLCHESTER BOROUGH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE  
16 February 2012 at 6:00pm**

**SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA**

**Part B**

(not open to the public or the media)

**Pages**

**There are no Section B Items**