



ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO PLANNING COMMITTEE

14th July 2020

AGENDA ITEM 9

20/00094/FUL - Land South of 69 Torquay Road, Chelmsford

Clarification of additional illustrative content:

Illustrative content from the ward councillor and correspondence from the applicant's agent have been included as part of Item 9. The absence of clear headings and the inclusion of the ward councillors' slides as a separate appendix in contrast to attaching the agent's slides at the end of the officer report is confusing. For clarification, both the ward councillors' slides and the agent's slides should have been included as appendices.

Comment on agent's submission:

The agent has written to all members of the planning committee (13 July) including their illustrative slides already within the agenda pack. The agent's correspondence and additional slides refer multiple times to the term 'open vista' and 'imaginary open vista'. Cllr Lee did not mention an 'open vista' in his report to the committee on June 9th, neither did Cllr Lee mention any other road or cul de sac on this development in Springfield.

Agent's slide 3 relates to a neighbouring site (No 72) where a planning application submitted in 2018 was withdrawn. A withdrawn planning application has no relevance to the application being considered by the planning committee. This slide refers to that neighbour objecting to the current planning application. It is understood that the applicant for the 2018 planning application no longer lives at no 72, and did not comment upon the current proposal. No letter of representation was received in respect of the current planning application from the current occupiers of no 72.

Agent's slides 4, 5,6,7,8 and 9 relate to locations beyond Torquay Road – Lynton Drive, Totnes Walk, Sidmouth Road, Rushleydale and Redruth Close. The committee was not told by Cllr Lee that the original estate designers did not want to ensure all ends of cul-de-sacs were open vistas. Housetypes, layouts, building positions in these slides are all different to Torquay Road, they are not directly relevant to the consideration of the current application.

Agent's slide 10 refers to the committee being told that the street scene must not be allowed to change. Cllr Lee did not state in his report that the street scene must not be allowed to change. The slide highlights no. 67. The plan of the original development indicates a single garage at the side of the house where a garage exists now.

Agent's slide 11 refers to an original 1960 covenants. Cllr Lee in his report referred to an extra clause on no 69 stating .. nor shall any additional building or buildings be erected thereon - . As previously stated by planning officers in the presentation to the committee on June 9th, covenants have no bearing upon the planning merits of this proposal.

AGENDA ITEM 10

20/00251/FUL - 90 Brook Lane, Galleywood, Chelmsford

Point of Clarification:

There are two side windows to the neighbour's property (Number 88 Brook Lane). The kitchen window at ground floor level and a bathroom window at first floor level. Members may be under the impression from the previous presentation that the windows sit in line with one another. The bathroom window is set further to the rear of the house than the kitchen window. Members will have seen this during the site visit on 13th July. The position of the first floor bathroom window does not change Officer's view that the bathroom window is a non-habitable room and therefore offered less protection than the ground floor kitchen window.

Officers comments towards the following items:

AGENDA ITEM 6 – 19/01917/FUL – 10 - 12 & 14 Hanbury Road

AGENDA ITEM 7 – 19/01916/FUL – 10 - 12 Hanbury Road

AGENDA ITEM 8 – 19/01692/FUL – 14 Hanbury Road

Additional comments have been received from neighbours following the site visit. These have been copied to all members. The points raised are addressed below:

Noise:

The references to single and double skin walls are misleading, as they are entirely different methods of construction with similar insulation properties. The proposal is for a '150mm brick wall with metal cladding' which has slightly better noise insulation properties than the previously specified '70mm outer brick layer and 100mm concrete block inner layer'.

See comments from PHPS:

It is noted that the residents' acoustic consultant has now stated that the way the noise level has been calculated is incorrect. Nothing has changed in the HA Acoustic report in relation to way the predicted levels have been calculated throughout the life of the application, and I am satisfied with the methodology used.

The two different indicative types of wall construction seem to make no difference to the overall predicted noise levels at nearby receivers as they have similar sound reduction index values.

The construction of the wall of the unit will, in fact, have a relatively small impact on the total sound received at the residential properties from the proposed use (the roof provides less sound protection than the walls with respect to sound generated within this unit). The higher level sound source from the proposed operation, predicted to be experienced at the receiver, is actually shown to be the noise created by activities in the external yard area. That is, a predicted level of 43dB(A) from the external activities at the receiver, and a predicted level of 36dB(A) from the activities taking place within Unit 10-12 at the receiver. When all sources are combined this still gives a cumulative noise level at the receiver of 44dB(A).

I have reviewed the latest report from the objectors' noise consultant, and whilst I note the differences of opinion in relation to the way sound sources have been measured, and the likely impact calculated, I remain of the view that the proposed use should be able to operate with no significant noise impact on residents.

Heights:

The photo montage was not intended to be an accurate representation, but a visual impression of the structure. Members will have seen for themselves the difference in ground levels at the back of the site. The proposed rear extension which would be 5m deep would leave a gap of 1.5m to the garden boundaries. From existing ground level within the site, the top of the fence at the end of no 64 sits at approx. 3.1m. The underside of the eaves of the proposed rear extension, from ground level would be approx. 4.3m. When viewed from the garden of the neighbour the extension eaves would sit approx. 1.2m higher than the fence. This will be relatively higher further west as ground levels in the rear gardens are lower.

Roof Material:

The new materials on the roof of the rear building were clear to see at the site visit. These are proposed on the rear extension too. Condition 4 of item 7 requires details of the roof material to the extension to be submitted and approved by officers prior to use. A further condition can be added to require the roof of no.10-12 to be treated with a non-reflective finish.