

Late Representations

Planning Committee 11 April 2019

Item No. 7	<p>Application No. FUL/2019/0442</p> <p>Description of Development - Change of Use of former public house to 12 Bedroom House in Multiple Occupation (sui generis) and associated extensions/alterations.</p> <p>Site Address - 89 Windmill Road</p> <p>Additional representations</p> <p>Three additional representations made objecting to the scheme on the grounds of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lack of parking, traffic speed in the area and disruption caused during the construction period. - If an 11-bedroom HMO was refused what has changed to make a 12 bed HMO acceptable. - The property will be overcrowded with 12 bed sits, it needs to be 6 or 7 apartments and all self-contained. - The scheme has no benefit to local community. <p>Seven further letters of objection have been received, however these make specific reference to uses and occupancy concerns within the falsified letter. These are non-material planning considerations as they do not form part of the proposal in anyway and cannot be given due consideration in the planning process.</p> <p>One petition has been received with 261 signatures (206 written and 55 on-line) objecting to the scheme on the following grounds:</p> <p><i>We object to a change of use of the former public house at 89 Windmill Road to a 12-bed house in multiple occupation, which is a British English term which refers to a residential property where “common areas” exist and are shared by more than one household. (FUL/2019/0442).</i></p> <p><i>We object to this for many reasons but primarily due to the location of the proposal, which is situated in close proximity to a primary school, namely Longford Park Primary School, which consists of young, vulnerable and impressionable children.</i></p> <p><i>In addition to the above, the proposed HMO is in an area where many elderly residents reside as well as families with young children. A HMO would make residents feel unsafe and would not be welcomed in the area.</i></p>
Item No. 8	<p>Application No. - FUL/2019/0524</p> <p>Description of Development - Erection of single storey rear extension and use of existing dwelling as 3 flats</p> <p>Site Address - 55 Yelverton Road</p> <p>Impact on residential amenity:</p> <p>The report contains an error. The assessment of the neighbouring property No 55 Yelverton Road is actually for the assessment of No 57 Yelverton Road and should read as the following:</p>

'Neighbouring property No 57 Yelverton Road is located west to the application property. Both the neighbouring property and application property have adjoining extensions measuring circa 1.4 metres. Beyond this extension the neighbour's rear extension projects further out and has a similar projection to the proposed. Given the presence of the neighbour's extension, the proposed extension is not considered to cause a detrimental impact upon the amenity of this occupant in regard to loss of light, overshadowing or harmful overlooking.'

Consultation responses:

Following the publication of the report a further representation has been received by a neighbour.

The following comments are material planning considerations:

- Processes- Lack of face to face communication and lack of confirmation when people have objected and how is it known that the objections are registered.
- No mention of the next-door property No 57 Yelverton Road in regard to impact upon neighbouring residential amenity.
- Setting a precedent for flats within the street- The planning officer should have done their research as there have been flats within the street Yelverton Road causing upset regarding excessive noise, disturbance, crime, theft and damage to neighbours. These were sold and converted back to 3-bedroom houses in which there are only 2 houses left with up & down flats on Yelverton Road.
- Parking is an existing problem- the garages to the rear are not used for parking and because some of the properties have extended fencing to the boundary it is difficult to get vehicles to the rear.
- The proposal will not provide high residential quality environment or contribute to creating a sustainable communities. There is already a dwelling and its being destroyed by rented flats being created in between a rows of terrace houses which has been proven to not work.
- The extension does not comply with the SPG in regard to 3.3 metre projection as the extension is proposed to have a 3.5 metre projection.
- It will differ from a family home- A family home doesn't have 3 living rooms, 3 kitchens, 3 bathrooms and multiple occupants down & upstairs. Therefore, family homes are less excessive in regard to noise, only one kitchen less smell, one bathroom less noise, bedrooms are only upstairs so also less noise, etc.
- The proposed extension will have a detrimental impact in regard to loss of light, overshadowing and harmful overlooking.

The following comments are non- material planning considerations:

- Have been told different things about the Committee meeting
- Comments should not be summarised in the Officer Report, as this does not give the full picture.
- The Officer Report is one sided.
- These are 1940's properties not designed for flats or multiple occupation use.
- Rear entrance is privately owned by all residents on Yelverton Road.
- High Quality Design- Over the last years no repairs have been carried out to the property.
- According to Coventry City Council website the council are supposed to be tackling Rogue-Bad landlords and also stopping them from gaining financially at the expense of others - such as neighbours, tenants, residents we believe this to be the case. this will affect the property value of neighbours & residents

	<p>of Yelverton Road while this property will go up, therefore no one will buy residents property apart from possible landlords.</p> <p>Appraisal:</p> <p>Due to lack of resources at this time we are unable to offer face to face meetings to discuss applications. However, if a meeting was requested we would consider arranging this.</p> <p>Once a comment has been made through the Council website, the commenter should receive an email acknowledging the receipt of the comment. Unfortunately, it is not possible to make comments publicly available online due to Data Protection Legislation.</p> <p>The comment in respect of precedent for flats within the street has been raised by a neighbour and not the planning officer. There is no planning history of conversions of dwellings to flats on Yelverton Road. If there are any conversions on Yelverton Road these have been done without planning permission.</p> <p>There are garages to the rear, however how residents choose to use these is personal choice. This proposal does not include a garage but does make provision for 2 rear parking spaces. This has been confirmed as acceptable by the Highways Authority.</p> <p>Many of the comments raised have been covered within the Officer Report. Some of the comments are non-material planning considerations.</p> <p>The proposal is not considered to differ from a family home in that the use is still to remain as residential.</p>
<p>Item No. 10</p>	<p>Application No. - FUL/2019/0266</p> <p>Description of Development - Conversion of dwelling house into 2 flats</p> <p>Site Address - 1 Stanier Avenue</p> <p>Consultation:</p> <p>Following the publication of the report a representation has been received by the Applicant:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has clarified the extent of existing works to the property and that any recent works have now stopped. • People that objected have concerns in relation to this being a "cheap HMO" in the neighbourhood and this is not intended. • The applicant will be living within the ground floor flat. <p>A representation has been received by a neighbour. The following comment is a non-material planning consideration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on house value
<p>Item No. 14</p>	<p>Application No. – TP/2019/0470</p> <p>Description of Development – The application seeks consent to Crown reduce the Sycamore (T1) to the dimensions of 15.0m height and 12.0m spread. The Oak (T2) is proposed to be removed.</p> <p>Site Address – 191 Oldfield Road</p>

A further 10 representations have been received objecting to the felling of the Oak Tree, 9 from local residents and 1 from Cllr Bally Singh.

Cllr Singh has requested his comment be presented in full to the Planning Committee

“I strongly object to the Guphill Oak especially being felled, as I believe that Crawfords must attempt to underpin the structure of the building itself to protect it from subsidence - our duty as a planning authority is to protect local historic habitats especially in largely urban environments in order to ensure bio diversity, a sense of place for residents, and wellbeing for citizens.

I believe the local plan policies ensure protection for green space in urban environments such as in Guphill Lane / Brook / Bridleway. Also, the draft guidance on tree protection to the Local Plan highlights the importance of protecting trees, the benefits of trees to the locality, underpinned by specific protections for veteran trees under the national planning policy framework.

Please ensure this objection is delivered in full to members of the planning committee”.

Further objections have been received raising the following material planning considerations:

- The tree healthy and is protected by means of TPO.
- The tree is home to nesting birds and has biodiversity and ecology value.
- Have alternative options been considered to preserve the tree and support the buildings?
- The tree makes a positive contribution to the natural history of the local area.

Further objections have been received raising the following non-material planning considerations:

- Removal of the tree would be a waste of time and money
- The tree has been on site for 150-180 years

