



PLANS COMMITTEE

This meeting will be recorded and the sound recording subsequently made available via the Council's website: [charnwood.gov.uk/pages/committees](https://www.charnwood.gov.uk/pages/committees)

Please also note that under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 that other people may film, record, tweet or blog from this meeting. The use of any images or sound recordings is not under the Council's control.

To: Councillors Bentley (Vice-Chair), Campsall, Capleton, Charles, Forrest, Fryer (Chair), Grimley, Lowe, Ranson, Savage, Tassell, Tillotson and Ward
(For attention)

All other members of the Council
(For information)

You are requested to attend the meeting of the Plans Committee to be held in Victoria Room - Town Hall on Thursday, 20th May 2021 at 5.00 pm for the following business.



Chief Executive

Southfields
Loughborough

19th May 2021

EXTRAS REPORT

5. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

2 - 4

The list of planning applications to be considered at the meeting is appended.

Plans Committee –20th May 2021

Additional items received since the report was drafted.

Page 16

Site Address: 1 Chaveney Road. Quorn

Item No. 2

P.A. No. P/21/0129/2

Since the publication of the report, additional information has been received from the occupier of No. 1 Elms Drive and other neighbours in the area commenting on the officer report. Additional information about the history of the application site is also provided.

The additional information mentions that the Council's Conservation and Design Team has not commented on the proposal, despite being a consultee.

Additional material is also put forward which compares the proposed garage with other house extensions and garages in the vicinity at 113 and 115 Meeting Street and which questions the use of proposed materials for the garage and requests members consider requiring the garage to be finished in the same materials as the dwelling house. i.e. stone.

In addition, the safety of the access serving the drive is also questioned and photographs are provided by drone of traffic using the junction of Elms Drive and Chaveney Road which aims to demonstrate traffic has increased significantly over the years since the single garage was erected. The proposal would result in vehicles having to reverse out onto the road and this would be in breach of the highway code. It is alleged that with the new annexe, the capacity for domestic storage would be reduced and that the proposed garage may become used for this instead, resulting in fewer available parking spaces.

The additional information alleges that if hinged doors are proposed to the garages the third parking space would not be able to be used whilst the doors are opened or closed.

The occupiers of No. 1 are also concerned about losses of privacy to the new annex as a result of a new roof light proposed in the flat roofed extension which would give light to the bedroom and through an existing roof light on the rear elevation of the building which would serve the dining area. The writer requests a planning condition that these be obscure glazed.

Full copies of this additional correspondence are available on the planning file.

Officer Response

The Council's Conservation and Design Team were consulted on the application and provided advice to the planning officer, and as an internal consultee within the Planning and Regeneration Service, these comments are often verbal and when in

writing are not published to the website. The officer report provides an assessment of the proposal against the historic significance of the Conservation Area and the nearest 'non-designated' heritage asset of the cottage itself.

In terms of proposed materials, the officer report recommends the imposition of Condition 3 (page 30 of the agenda) to secure exact details of proposed materials but it is considered that the use of render and the indicated stone plinth are generally acceptable for the garage which is detached and distanced from the original cottage and at the edge of the Conservation Area directly adjacent to a modern hipped roof garage at No. 1 Elms Drive which is also render.

Whilst traffic using the junction of Chaveney Road and Elms Drive may have increased over the years this is by no means unique to the development site. Members are reminded that it is not for the applicant to solve all the highway problems of the junction but to ensure that the development provides for its own needs and does not itself result in cumulative highway impacts that could be regarded as 'severe'. The driveway to the garage is an existing one and its use cannot therefore be controlled. There are no parking restrictions within Chaveney Road despite the curvature of the street and it is acknowledged that when cars park within the street additional care and attention is required. However, the local highway authority has no objection to the proposal, is content that sufficient parking spaces are proposed to meet the needs of the development, and officers are content that no significant increase in traffic would arise as a result of the development and that the scheme is considered acceptable in highway safety terms, without the need for an additional turning area. Should neighbours wish to investigate the possibility of a Traffic Regulation Order being made to prevent on-street parking, this should be directed to the Leicestershire County Council as highway authority.

The neighbour at No. 1 is also concerned that the garage may become used for furniture or other domestic storage and this would reduce available car parking. This is entirely speculative but even if this did occur, this would not be a breach of planning control if the use remained ancillary to the residential use of the property overall. It is therefore considered that it would be unreasonable to impose any condition to prevent this from happening. Indeed, many garages are built under permitted development rights and used for both parking and storage. There is also no reason to believe that the proposed garage, built to internal dimensions which meet the Leicestershire Highways Design Guide would be used for anything other than car parking.

With regard to the garage doors, the submitted plans clearly show that up and over or roller shutter doors are proposed and the use of the third car parking space would not be impaired.

With regard to privacy, the outbuilding already contains a rear roof light and can be used for dining purposes without the need for planning permission. The position and nature of the proposed roof light to the flat roofed extension are such that overlooking from the bedroom window within No. 1 Elms Drive would not occur to the proposed bedroom and would be no worse to the dining area than the existing situation, and therefore a condition requiring these windows to be obscure glazed is

not considered to be reasonable or meet the necessary legal tests. The applicant is of course at liberty to apply internal film to the windows if desired in the future.

Recommendation

That the concerns are noted but that the officer recommendation remains unchanged.