



## Planning Committee

Date: 31/1/19

Report of Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation

### SUPPLEMENTARY PAPER

Since preparation of the agenda, the following information has been received. Officer comments are provided in response along with any amendments to the recommendation.

Item Number: 1 Site Address: Reedswood Way	
Supplemental Information	Officer Comments
An amended proposed site layout has been provided (revision C) this plan includes electric charging point layout details which are supported by Pollution Control Officers.  The Coal Authority confirms they have no objection.	Condition 2 is updated to include the amended plan and electric vehicle charging specification.  Condition 10 is amended to omit reference to electric charging points.  To note.
	<b>Recommendation:</b> Amend to: Planning Committee resolve to Delegate to the Head of Planning, Engineering & Transportation to grant permission subject to conditions and subject to amendment and finalising of conditions.
Item Number:2 Site Address: Eclipse Works	
Supplemental Information	Officer Comments
Eclipse Works is recorded on the historic environment records and not a locally listed building as specified in the report although the Council will be pursuing listing of this building on the Council's local list. However, Eclipse Works is a non designated heritage asset.	Noted.

<p>The occupier of 152 Parker Stree has sought advice as to how to retain the boundary wall adjacent their property. They have also raised concerns about retaining it at a suitable height.</p> <p>The Wildlife Trust have advised the submitted report found no evidence of bats during the building inspection. However, from the photos and description provided a number of buildings, do contain features suitable for roosting bats. As per BCT Bat surveys for professional Ecologists Good Practice Guidelines, any buildings found to contain suitable roosting features for bats should be subject to dusk and dawn surveys. This is due to the potential for bat species such as common pipistrelle that can roost underneath roofing tiles (For example) and may not be discovered during internal or external inspections. The Wildlife Trust would require the level of potential for each building to be stated within the report and the appropriate number dusk and dawn surveys to be undertaken on each building.</p>	<p>Noted. The objectors original comments have been addressed in the committee report and planning condition 5a addresses the issue of all boundary treatments, including the wall adjacent 152 Parker Street.</p> <p>Noted. Amend the recommendation to allow for the applicant to undertake further dusk and dawn bat surveys.</p>
	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> Amended to Delegate to the Head of Planning, Engineering and Transportation to Grant Planning Permission Subject to Conditions and a S106 Agreement to secure provision for urban open space and landscape management plan and subject to overcoming the outstanding objections raised by the Coal Authority and awaiting formal comments from Western Power and subject to further dusk and dawn bat surveys being undertaken.</p>

Item Number: 3 Site Address: Three Crowns PH, Walsall	
<b>Supplemental Information</b> The applicant's agent has asked that the application be withdrawn from the agenda to provide more information in regard to the ecological impacts of the development.	<b>Officer Comments</b> The Chair of the Planning Committee has agreed to defer the application from this agenda.
	<b>Recommendation: Deferred.</b>
Item Number: 4 Site Address: 12 ORWELL ROAD,WALSALL,WS1 2PJ	
<b>Supplemental Information</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<p>The reason for bringing to planning committee is incorrect on the report and has been changed to: Significant community interest.</p> <p>A member of the community via a local ward councilor has raised the following points;</p> <p>Original bungalow built on a hill</p> <p>Ground levels had not been established by planning</p> <p>Why has there not been a 21 day consultation</p> <p>Explain what a discharge is</p> <p>It may be enforcement as they have been built</p> <p>Resident provided further comments following receipt of the notification of committee consideration of a planning application;</p>	<p>To note</p> <p>Noted. Planning committee are being asked to determine the application before them and the drawings illustrate land levels</p> <p>Noted. Planning committee are being asked to determine the application before them and the drawings illustrate land levels</p> <p>The Council has previously carried out a 21 day consultation, there is no legal requirement to carryout a further 21 day consultation period before bringing to planning committee</p> <p>The Councillor and member of the community haven't confirmed what they mean by 'discharge'</p> <p>Whilst the houses have been built, the current application is to regularise the planning situation</p>

24/1/19 letter found in letter box on Sunday 27/1/19	The Council cannot take responsibility for the delivery of the post or when a resident checks their letter box.
Why hasn't there been 21 days consultation	The Council has previously carried out a 21 day consultation, there is no legal requirement to carryout a further 21 day consultation period before bringing to planning committee
7 <sup>th</sup> October 2015 sent objections to the proposal	Any objections previously received will have formed part of the overall planning assessment
17 <sup>th</sup> November 2015 provided an addendum to the earlier letter following receipt of the proposed street scene	Any objections previously received will have formed part of the overall planning assessment
Engaged Patrick Cluxton to provide a letter dated 11 <sup>th</sup> December 2015 and no response to from this letter, no meeting and no explanation.	No meeting was requested. The consultation letters issued by the Council confirm; <i>It is not possible to acknowledge receipt or respond to your comments directly, however should you make comments on the application, I will inform you of the decision when it is made.</i>
The letter raises 25 points. 6 of these points relate to possible enforcement action, 5 are statements about the case, 3 relate to the previous application, complaining about the decision. Objections in relation to the current application; ground levels, heights, relationship to neighbouring houses, overbearing impact to neighbours at the rear, materials and request for PD removal.	<p>The current application is to regularise the planning situation and enforcement matters are not determining issues of this application.</p> <p>Complaints about the previous case are not material to the determination of this application.</p> <p>The objections are addressed in the committee report; seperation distances between houses are considered sufficient and accord with the Councils guidance.</p> <p>Removal of permitted development rights were considered although in this instance, there is insufficient evidence of potential harm on neighbours amenity to justify their removal in this instance.</p>
The application has evolved over 3 years, with 29 documents listed on the website, new to me, with the dates they came into existence	There are many documents on the Council's website for this planning application. The Council has endeavoured to secure accurate drawings reflecting what has been built. Some of the discrepancies were minor, such as details of windows, which would not warrant reconsultation, some greater discrepancies, which would have been consulted on. As confirmed by the objector, they had previously been consulted on several occasions. The outstanding issue is the front boundary and the impact to highway safety. The applicant has not provided updated documents, so, in this instance, it can be resolved through an appropriate planning condition as set out in the committee report and this is why the case is now being brought

	forward.
	<b>Recommendation: Grant Planning permission subject to conditions, as set out</b>
<b>Item Number: 6</b>	<b>Site Address: 42 Slaney Road, Walsall</b>
<b>Supplemental Information</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
A late objection has been received from the Police.	Given the lateness of the objection, which hasn't given the applicant the opportunity to review and consider, the Chair of Planning has agreed to defer the application from this agenda
	<b>Recommendation: Deferred.</b>