Dear Sir/Madam,

A meeting of the **PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE** will be held in the **Council Chamber, Town Hall, Nuneaton** on Tuesday, 3rd November, 2015 at 5.00 p.m.

**Site Visits will take place prior to the meeting as detailed overleaf**

**Public Consultation on planning applications will commence at 5.00 p.m. (see Agenda Item No. 6 for clarification).**

Please note that meetings may be recorded for future broadcast.

Yours faithfully,

ALAN FRANKS

Managing Director

To: All Members of the Planning Applications Committee

AGENDA

PART I - PUBLIC BUSINESS

Site Visit Information

Members are reminded that a site visit will take place in connection with application number 033452. Members are asked to meet on site at the Freeway Centre, Park Avenue, Nuneaton at 3.30p.m.

Members not having their own transport are asked to meet at the front of the Town Hall at 3.20 p.m. If Members require a lift from Bedworth Civic Hall they are asked to telephone (024) 7637 6325 at least 24 hours before to arrange for an Officer to pick them up at 3.10p.m.

CODE OF CONDUCT- COMMITTEE SITE VISITS

The purpose of a visit to an application site is to clarify and gather information on planning issues relating to the site. It is not to provide a forum for debate and discussion on the merits of the application. Therefore, Committee Site Visits will be conducted subject to the following criteria: -

(a) A site visit is for the purpose of viewing the site and ascertaining facts. They will take place only if authorised by the Committee where the Committee considers it is unable to determine an application on the basis of the Officers’ report to the Committee alone.

(b) Authorised attendance at a site visit shall be limited to members of the Planning Applications Committee and appropriate Officers.

(c) There shall be no discussion of the merits of any application during the site visit. Such discussion will only take place at a meeting of the Committee.

(d) Applicants or their representative shall not be permitted to make representations to members of the Committee during a site visit. They may, however, give any purely factual information which is requested by members through the representative of the Development Control Department and which cannot be ascertained by viewing alone.

(e) At the start of the site visit the Chairman of the Planning Applications Committee or the representative of the Development Control Department will explain and make clear to all those attending the Code’s requirements for the conduct of site visits.
1. **EVACUATION PROCEDURE**

   A fire drill is not expected, so if the alarm sounds please evacuate the building quickly and calmly. Please use the stairs and do not use the lifts. Once out of the building, please gather outside the Yorkshire Bank on the opposite side of the road.

   Exit by the door by which you entered the room or by the fire exits which are clearly indicated by the standard green fire exit signs.

   If you need any assistance in evacuating the building, please make yourself known to a member of staff.

   Please also make sure all your mobile phones are turned off or set to silent.

   Chair to advise the meeting if all or part of the meeting will be recorded for future broadcast.

2. **APOLOGIES** - To receive apologies for absence from the meeting.

3. **MINUTES** - To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 1st September, 2015 (attached). *(Page 5)*

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

   To receive declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests, in accordance with the Members’ Code of Conduct.

   **Note:** Following the adoption of the new Code of Conduct, Members are reminded that they should declare the existence and nature of their personal interests at the commencement of the relevant item (or as soon as the interest becomes apparent). If that interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary or a Deemed Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, the Member must withdraw from the room.

   Where a Member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest but has received a dispensation from Standards Committee, that Member may vote and/or speak on the matter (as the case may be) and must disclose the existence of the dispensation and any restrictions placed on it at the time the interest is declared.

   Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest as defined in the Code of Conduct, the Member may address the meeting as a member of the public as set out in the Code.
Note: Council Procedure Rules require Members with Disclosable Pecuniary Interests to withdraw from the meeting unless a dispensation allows them to remain to vote and/or speak on the business giving rise to the interest.

Where a Member has a Deemed Disclosable Interest, the Council’s Code of Conduct permits public speaking on the item, after which the Member is required by Council Procedure Rules to withdraw from the meeting.

5. DECLARATIONS OF CONTACT
Members are reminded that contacts about any Planning Applications on this agenda must be declared before the application is considered.

6. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ON WHICH THE PUBLIC HAVE INDICATED A DESIRE TO SPEAK. EACH SPEAKER WILL BE ALLOWED 3 MINUTES ONLY TO MAKE THEIR POINTS – the report of the Head of Development Control attached. (Schedule Page No. 10)

7. APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION ON WHICH NO MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC HAS INDICATED A DESIRE TO SPEAK – the report of the Head of Development Control attached. (Schedule Page No. 10)

8. ANY OTHER ITEMS which in the opinion of the Chair of the meeting should be considered as a matter of urgency because of special circumstances (which must be specified).
A meeting of the Planning Applications Committee was held at the Civic Hall, Bedworth on Tuesday, 13\textsuperscript{th} October, 2015.

\textbf{Present}

Councillor W.J. Hancox – Chair


Apologies for absence from the meeting were received from Councillor J. Sheppard.

The Chair welcomed Benn Simm from Warwickshire County Council Highways to the Meeting.

\textbf{PLA25 Mayor Announcements}

The Mayor presented to Councillor A.A Lloyd a special medal from the Malaysian Government the Pingat Jasa Malaysia Medal for his service in the Armed Forces.

\textbf{PLA26 Minutes}

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22\textsuperscript{nd} September, 2015 be confirmed.

\textbf{PLA27 Declarations of Interest}

Councillor J.B. Beaumont : in any relevant item by reason of him being a Member of Warwickshire County Council.

Councillor A.A. Lloyd : in any relevant item by reason of him being the Council's representative on the Hospice Charity and also by reason of him being a Governor of George Eliot Hospital.

Councillor D.C Navarro : in any relevant item by reason of his appointment as a Non-Executive Director of the George Eliot NHS Trust

\textbf{PLA28 Declarations of Contact}

Arden Estate Partnership had been in contact with Members on this committee in relation to application number 033452.
IN PUBLIC SESSION

PLA29 Planning Applications

(Note: Names of the members of the public who spoke are recorded in the Schedule.)

RESOLVED that decisions be made on applications for planning permission as shown in the attached schedule, for the reasons and with the conditions set out in the report and addendum unless stated otherwise.

__________________________________________
Chair
SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION AND RELATED MATTERS REFERRED TO IN MINUTE PLA29 OF THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE ON 13th OCTOBER, 2015

SITE VISITS

033512: 139 Earls Road, Nuneaton
Erection of three new detached dwellings with associated parking; alterations to existing retained buildings and replacement windows to the former nursing home. Affects trees covered by both Tree Preservation Order 8/89 and trees covered under Conservation Area.
Applicant: Mr S Chaudry – Kalma Developments Ltd

No Speakers

DECISION:

Approved subject to a legal agreement and the conditions printed.

033537: 139 Earls Road, Nuneaton
Conservation Area consent for demolition of plant room
Applicant: Mr S Chaudry – Kalma Developments Ltd

No Speakers

DECISION:

Due to the demolition of the plant room already to have taken place prior to committee decision. The committee declined to determine the application and authorised the Planning Officers to remind the applicant of their obligation to wait till the committee has made a decision, in addition, to inform the applicant of their right to appeal against non-determination.

Planning Applications Tuesday 3rd November, 2015
PREVIOUSLY CONSIDERED
033050: Site 61B007 – Former allotments north of The Bull Ring, Nuneaton
Erection of 53 dwellings
Applicant: A R Cartwright Ltd & Canal & River Trust

No Speakers

DECISION:

Approved subject to a legal agreement in respect of highways, affordable housing, play and open space, and the conditions printed

PRIOR APPROVALS
033646: 374 Croft Road, Nuneaton
Prior notification for the change of use from retail (A1) to one dwelling (C3)
Applicant: Mr Gerard Gray

Speakers: Laura Hall
          Gerard Gray

DECISION:

Planning Committee approved the recommendation that prior approval is not required.

033647: 376 Croft Road, Nuneaton
Prior notification for the change of use from retail (A1) to dwelling (C3)
Applicant: Mr Gerard Gray

Speakers: Gerard Gray

DECISION:

Planning Committee approved the recommendation that prior approval is not required.
PLANNING APPLICATIONS
033452: Freeway Centre, Park Avenue, Nuneaton
Erection of 23 self-contained apartments (C3) and 7 shared living bedrooms (C4) (including 1 respite), in 3 blocks, with associated parking, landscaping and garden buildings, all for residents with mental health, physical disabilities/learning difficulties (including demolition of the existing building)
Applicant: Arden Estate Partnerships

Speakers: Councillor S Margrave
Richard Talbot
Nigel Bailey
Will Savage

(NB: Councillor B.J Longden and D.C Navarro declared an other interest by reason of having contact with Mr Richard Talbot due to his involvement in Anker Radio which is also one of the Mayors Charities.)

DECISION:

Deferred to consider information of the amended report that was submitted by Warwickshire County Council Highways. A site visit was also requested to assess the impact of the proposed design on the character and the visual amenities of the area, the loss of the existing building in terms of visual amenity and the impact on highway safety.

033596: Site 114B002 – Garages rear of 61-67 Mavor Drive, Bedworth
Erection of one pair of semi-detached dwelling and 3 terraced dwellings (5 in total) (rear of 61-67 Mavor Drive)
Applicant: Mr Xiao Hu

Speakers: Martyn Higgins
Kenny Smith

DECISION:

Approved subject to legal agreement and the conditions printed.
### Site Visits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>033452/AT</td>
<td>Freeway Centre, Park Avenue, Nuneaton</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Planning Applications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Application No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>033524/WE</td>
<td>Site 28b002 - Church Lane &amp; Weddington Road, Nuneaton</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>033541/WH</td>
<td>82 Bulkington Lane, Nuneaton</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>033127/EX</td>
<td>72 Coventry Road, Exhall</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wards:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AB</th>
<th>Abbey</th>
<th>AR</th>
<th>Arbury</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>Attleborough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Barpool</td>
<td>BE</td>
<td>Bede</td>
<td>BU</td>
<td>Bulkington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>Camp Hill</td>
<td>EX</td>
<td>Exhall</td>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Galley Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Heath</td>
<td>KI</td>
<td>Kingswood</td>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Poplar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>Slough</td>
<td>SN</td>
<td>St Nicolas</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Wembrock</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WE</td>
<td>Weddington</td>
<td>WH</td>
<td>Whitestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SITE VISITS

REFERENCE No. 033452

Site Address: Freeway Centre, Park Avenue, Nuneaton

Description of Development: Erection of 23 self-contained apartments (C3) and 7 shared living bedrooms (C4) (including 1 respite), in 3 blocks, with associated parking, landscaping and garden buildings, all for residents with mental health/physical disabilities/learning difficulties (including demolition of the existing building)

Applicant: Arden Estate Partnerships

Ward: AT

RECOMMENDATION:
Planning Committee is recommended to grant planning permission subject to conditions and a legal agreement as printed.

INTRODUCTION:
The application is for the erection of 23 self-contained apartments (C3) and 7 shared living bedrooms (C4) (including 1 respite), in 3 blocks, with associated parking, landscaping and garden buildings, all for residents with mental health/physical disabilities/learning difficulties. The application also includes the demolition of the existing school building.

The application site is the former Park Avenue School or more recently referred to ‘Freeway Centre’. The surrounding area is predominantly residential, with some industrial in close proximity (Holman Way). There is also a Methodist church in the form of a tabernacle across the highway, along with a wooden garage structure, there is also a Sikh temple and residential care within a small radius. The majority of neighbouring buildings are two storey semi-detached and terraced houses, there are however some bungalows in the area as well as flats (Lister Street/ Gadsby Street).

The Existing school structure is single storey with a steep tiled pitched roof, dating from 1907. The school building has header and cill features around sash style windows as well as chimneys, eaves detailing and stone banding to the front elevation. There is a low brick wall surrounding the font of the site, with iron railings. There is a taller brick wall surrounding the rear of the site. There are two site access’ fronting Park Avenue, which are gated, one either side of the main building as you look at it. There is also pedestrian access here with the recent addition of ramp access to the main entrance doors.
The access to the right hand side leads to the rear of the site, there is a building, set to the middle of the site, which has been adjoined to the main building. There is an open car park/previous playground beyond that, which also has some existing single storey storage type buildings. The access point to the left hand side allows vehicular access to a centrally contained courtyard/car park. There are limited soft landscaped areas, within the site- it is almost entirely hard surfaced. There are some mature trees to the front of the site, although these are contained within the highway and are not on the site itself. There are also some trees to the rear gardens of properties backing on to the site along William Street. There is one cypress tree close to No.24 Park Ave and some planting to the courtyard to the centre of the site.

**RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:**
None

**RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:**
- Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2006:
  - H6 - Planning Obligations;
  - ENV14 - Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents.
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

**CONSULTEES NOTIFIED:**
Seven Trent Water, WCC Highways, NBBC Environmental Health, NBBC Parks & Countryside, WCC Archaeology, WCC Flood Risk Management, NBBC Refuse & Cleansing, NBBC Housing, Nuneaton Society.

**CONSULTATION RESPONSES:**
No objection subject to conditions:
NBBC Environmental Health, WCC Flood Risk, Severn Trent Water, Warwickshire Fire and Rescue, WCC Archaeology, WCC Highways,

Objection from:
Nuneaton Society

No objection from:
NBBC Housing, NBBC Refuse & Cleansing,

No objection subject to s.106 contributions:
NBBC Parks & Countryside

**NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED:**
19-61 (odd) William Street; 2-88 (even), 9-57 (odd), Methodist Church, 59-61, 63-75 (odd) Park Avenue; 115-163 (odd), Gadsby Street; The Lodge, School Walk.
Neighbouring properties were sent letters notifying them of the proposed development on 22\textsuperscript{nd} June and 30\textsuperscript{th} September 2015. A site notice was erected on street furniture on 26\textsuperscript{th} June 2015 and the application was advertised in The Nuneaton News on 6\textsuperscript{th} July 2015.

**NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES:**
There have been 130 letters of objection from 88 addresses as well as 1 letter from Marcus Jones MP & Cllr S Margrave and 24 anonymous. The comments are summarised below;

1) Materials & Design are out of keeping with surrounding character
2) Overlooking and loss of privacy
3) Loss of light
4) Original building should be kept, it is structurally sounds
5) Against NPPF policies
6) Loss of a heritage asset
7) Demolition is unnecessary, building should be adapted and re-used- this is not environmentally sound
8) Landscaping is not suitable mitigation to the intrusive development
9) Proposed design is too dominant, shouldn’t be three storey
10) Layout and density is out of place.
11) Access for emergency vehicles is restrictive in the area
12) Parking is an issue in the area, this will add to that problem
13) Insufficient parking proposed and limited visitor parking
14) Increase in volume of traffic
15) Proposed access would be dangerous
16) Noise and disruption during construction.
17) Damage to properties during construction
18) Dangers during construction, from construction traffic
19) Strain on existing services including sewers.
20) Concern for anti-social behaviour
21) 30 apartments is too many, original proposals were for 16
22) Has not been a socially inclusive process
23) The social inclusion should be extended to the local community, proposed use would be isolated from the community. It is institutionalising rather than inclusive
24) The site is and could be a community asset
25) If current boundary treatment is removed, security will decrease
26) Disruption to bat roosts in proximity of site during construction
27) Light pollution
28) Flooding has been a problem in the area
29) Detrimental impact of the proposed building on the mature trees in proximity to the site.
30) Would set a precedent for three storey development
31) Noise and disturbance from bin storage close to residential properties
32) Turning facilities inadequate within site
33) The loss of WEST which is a valuable community asset
34) Public consultation was just lip service.
35) Request committee do a site visit
36) Insufficient waste storage
37) Large development of Eastboro Way, WCC have stated the need for education facilities in the area, this could be an additional education facility.
38) Amended proposal is still unsuitable for the area, it should complement existing properties
39) The change from buff brick to render and the other changes do not keep with the area, cladding would be very ugly.
40) The changes do not enhance the proposal
41) The changes are just a sweetener to say improvements have been made
42) Change in materials can only be for cost purposes
43) The changes do not address original objections
44) If yellow lines are introduced where will residents park
45) Modifications to the junction may result in slower vehicle speed, with some improved visibility. Visibility to the left is still a key issue and has not been resolved.
46) The modifications proposed to the highway have not been subject to a technical audit.
47) The issues of the visibility to the east still remain
48) Intensification of the access still remains an issue despite junction alterations
49) No indication in reduction of speed or increase in safety for highway users
50) No evidence that visibility splay issues are mitigated
51) The applicant's highway proposal could create as many, or possibly even more, highways safety issues than it is trying to resolve or that are currently there.
52) Department of Transport publication “Manual for Streets” clearly indicates that shared space surfaces, such as the newly proposed table top junction with its shared space principles, can cause problems for individuals with learning disabilities/cognitive difficulties, who may find the environment difficult to interpret and also for those who are blind and visually impaired.

MP Marcus Jones
1) Concerns for the demolition of the existing building
2) Proposed building is out of keeping & incongruous.

Cllr Sam Margrave
1) Loss of heritage asset
2) Design is not appropriate & could set a precedent
3) Lack of community integration with proposal
4) Environmentally unsound to replace a functioning building
5) Highway safety issues
6) Lack of structural analysis
7) Loss of privacy
8) Loss of light and overshadowing.
There has been one letter of support from WCC Extra Care Housing Manager, summarised below;

1) Support for the application due to the need of this type of housing across Warwickshire & Nuneaton and Bedworth.

APPRAISAL:
The key issues to assess in the determination of this application are;

1. Housing need
2. Land designation
3. Loss of a non designated heritage asset
4. Impact on Residential amenity
5. Impact on Visual amenity
6. Highway Safety & Sustainable Transport
7. Flood Risk & Drainage
8. Ecology
9. Loss of community facility
10. Obligations

1. Housing need
WCC Extra Care Housing Lead has supported the application commenting that there is demonstrable need for housing of this type, “in 2014/15 there were 300 customers with Learning Disabilities (LD) living in the community across Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough, with a further 51 customers living in residential care. There are also 134 customers with Physical Disabilities (PD) and/or Sensory Impairment (SI) living in the community across the Borough, and a further 3 customers living in residential care. The Freeway site presents an ideal opportunity for the development of Specialised Housing with Care, which will provide an important and additional contribution to the development of specialist housing accommodation for both the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough and across Warwickshire”. This is a material consideration, one to which Officers attribute significant weight.

This is further supported by the principles of the NPPF which states that a wide choice of high quality homes should be delivered, with opportunities for inclusive and mixed communities (Para. 50).

Overall, it is recognised that the Council does not have a five year supply of deliverable housing land to meet the identified housing need and that this in itself is a matter which weighs significantly in favour of the application.

2. Land designation
Previously developed land, often referred to as ‘Brownfield Land’, is defined within Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF as; “Land which is or was occupied by a permanent structure, including the curtilage of the developed land”. Currently the land has a D1 planning use (Non-residential institution). Paragraph 17 of the NPPF lists the reuse of previously developed land as one of the 12 core planning principles. Paragraph 111 also states that; “decisions should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been
previously developed (brownfield land), provided that it is not of high environmental value”. This land is not considered to have a ‘high’ environment value.

It is also pertinent to mention that this site is within the urban area, and as such it is preferential to site new development within the urban area first before extending beyond the settlement area. Given that the site is Brownfield land, there is a presumption in favour of development here, as there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. The principle of the development in this location is acceptable. These factors therefore weigh significantly in favour of the application.

3. Loss of a non designated heritage asset

Section 12 of the NPPF sets out the government’s principles of conserving and enhancing the historic environments, it defines a heritage asset as including a building, monument, site, place or area of landscape identified as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions and includes assets identified by the Local Planning Authority (including local listing). However, the relevant policy of the Local Plan Env.10 allowing for heritage assets to be locally listed in no longer saved and therefore has no weight. The former Park Avenue school building was previously locally listed, highlighting its importance to the area and the need for its consideration as a non-designated heritage asset to form part of the assessment of this proposal.

Paragraph 135 of the Framework says that the effect of an application on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining the application. In weighing applications that affect directly or indirectly non-designated heritage assets, a balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.

Firstly, the scale of the loss is substantial, in that it would result in the total loss of the non-designated heritage asset. However, it is also pertinent to consider the significance of the heritage asset itself. The level of objection highlights the feeling of the local community about the loss of building and its local importance. This is also added to by the application to English Heritage by local residents, to list the building. English Heritage did an assessment of the building and concluded that compared to other schools of its era and type the former Park Avenue School has little architectural presence and quality. Further to this the school has undergone alterations which detract from its distinction and is therefore not worthy of listing. This assessment holds some weight in determining the significance the non-designated heritage asset has.

The submitted Heritage Assessment states that the building is a highly valued non-designated heritage asset. It argues that the building has some heritage significance that would be lost to the demolition. The report concludes that this loss is not significant enough to warrant statutory protection and therefore refusal of the application, but does warrant preservation by record (a condition). WCC Archaeology has also made similar comments and requires a condition for recoding.
The existing building clearly has local interest which adds to the character of the area, the complete loss of this asset therefore weighs moderately against the application. However, its loss will have only limited impact on the surrounding setting.

An inspector’s decisions that dealt with the loss of non-designated heritage asset forms a material consideration in deterring this application (APP/W3710/A/13/2195900). The inspector here determined that the significant loss of the non-designated heritage asset demonstrably weighed against the application and did warrant refusal of the application, despite the demonstrated need for housing supply. However, since this date, there has been significant slippage in timescales and the timescales going forward remain uncertain. Moreover, there is also an updated SHMAA that has further strengthened the need for housing since the date of this decision.

4. Impact on Residential amenity
The site is entirely surrounded by residential properties, the impact upon these properties must therefore be considered.

No.44 Park Avenue is the property adjacent to the access and block A, the three storey element of the proposal. This neighbouring property has a narrow garden that runs along the access but then widens out to the rear stretching across the rear of its neighbouring properties. No.44 also has a garage separating the access from the house. Block A (three storey) would be approximately 7m from the side boundary of this neighbouring property. There are side facing windows on this elevation, however, they would comply with the guidelines in the Residential Design Guide 2004 (RDG) in terms of overlooking. However, this neighbouring property also has rear and side facing habitable room windows. The separation distance from window to windows would not be achievable here. However, this has been mitigated by introducing angled windows with elements of obscure glazing that allow light to the living areas of the proposed apartments but at the same time protecting the privacy of this neighbouring property by directing the view towards Park Avenue rather than over the amenity space of this neighbour. This neighbour has raised objections to the proposal relating to the impact upon their courtyard to the rear of the property, closest to the house itself. Block A would extend along the boundary from the rear wall of this property by about 5m, this raises some concern for enclosure of this rear amenity space. However, the school build has a side facing gable at this point, which is not dissimilar in height to the proposal, this coupled with the separation distance of the building to the boundary it is not considered that this warrants refusal of the application.

No.24 is the adjacent property to the other side. There is currently an access that runs along this property, this is proposed to be closed. The proposal shows the garden area to abut the rear amenity space of this property, which has no side facing windows. The proposed block A would line the rear boundary of this property by approximately 3.5m, however, again the existing school building has a gable of similar height along here, the difference is
considered to be negligible in terms of enclosure or loss of light. Block B is positioned so that it faces towards the rear garden of this property, however, it is set back from the boundary and the overlooking separation distance suggested in the RDG is complied with. All other distance standards to surrounding residential properties are complied with.

The proposed use of the building for residential care is not thought to add detrimental impact to the residential enjoyment of the surrounding properties by way of noise or disturbance. The proposed use is compatible with the surrounding residential uses. Moreover, the site was once occupied by a school which could have considerable more impact that a residential use.

5. Impact on Visual amenity
The proposal is a clear move away from the traditional character of the area, offering a much more modern approach to design. It is three storey with a flat roof, the materials are a mix of cladding and render and the fenestration is a series of full height glazed windows and panels, some of which are framed. Block A is set to the front of the site continuing the building line along Park Avenue and is the only element of the proposal that will be highly visible in the street scene. It is Officers opinion that the proposal is a move away from other buildings in the area that are a pastiche of their more historic surroundings, which do more to damage the integrity of the character of the area than positively adding to it.

One of the core principles of the NPPF is to secure high quality design. Paragraph 60 makes it clear that planning decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles. However, promoting local distinctiveness is seen as proper.

However, an inspectors decision, on a site opposite the application site (which was refused due to impact upon the character of the area), (APP/W3710/A/07/2033243/NW), stated that there is considerable variety of buildings within the locality, with no special quality or local distinctiveness. The inspector concluded that there was no cohesive architectural character. As this is a material consideration in determining this application, is would be reasonable to suggest that in this instance it would be difficult to proscribe the applicant to a certain architectural style when it has been previously concluded that there is no strong local distinctiveness. It was also noted by the inspector that because a building has noticeable and different form to adjacent development, is not a sound basis for refusing planning permission.

Amended plans were sought from the applicant to try and address concerns raised by local residents. The applicants were asked to show an alternative material to be in line with surrounding development, they were also requested to show a pitched roof and more uniform fenestration to mimic the surroundings. However, having viewed a proposal put forward following this request it was clear that trying to incorporate imitation features whilst maintaining a modern approach, did not aid the overall design of the building. A redbrick building with a pitched roof and uniform fenestration appeared
institutional and did not contribute positively to the surroundings. Officers felt that the modern design was more appropriate and was a contrast to the adjacent development that would then no detract from it. Where brick is proposed to be used, red brick will be conditioned- further to this a condition could be placed on the application to investigate the use of reclaimed brick.

This is supported by the submitted Heritage Assessment that states that the simple modern design would not detract from the surrounding houses and provides contrast as it makes no reference to the architectural style of the surrounding structures, resulting in a minor negative effect of the setting.

6. Highway Safety & Sustainable Transport
A Transport Statement (TS) was submitted with the application, which supports the sustainable location of the proposed development. The TS identifies that there are shops within 400m of the site at the junction of Lister Street and Attleborough Road. Attleborough Road is also a main arterial route with regular bus services. In addition the TS identifies the varying facilities that are within a short distance of the site. As previously mentioned Nuneaton Town Centre and Attleborough District centre are within short walking distance. The TS also identifies there is a good network of footways and cycle route 52 runs past the site leading to the town centre and connecting to Attleborough fields industrial estate (there is external bike racking proposed).

The proposed access and parking arrangements are formed by the use of an existing access to the east of the building leading to a parking area with 11 spaces (one for disabled parking). The access is wide enough for two way traffic movement, and the proposed parking levels are in line with previous parking standards (although these are no longer saved). The TS states that there would be a maximum of 6 staff on site equating a maximum number of 6 people traffic movements during traditional peak hours.

The highways authority original objected to the use of this access as the primary access for the site. The highway authority was not satisfied the access would be safe. Although the applicant argues this is an existing issue, the highway authority is not of the opinion that this access has always been so intensively used.

Following this, the applicant did further highway works including a Road Safety Audit and some junction re-design to overcome the reasons for objection. After consideration of this additional information, the highway authority has removed their objection subject to conditions. The alterations are outside of the application site, there are no changes to the proposed access or the scheme itself only to the highway network outside of the site. The proposals consist of a table top junction and the build out of the footway to create an improved junction arrangement. The Highway Officer commented that the proposed changes to the junction will require vehicles to slow down as they approach the junction. In addition the junction will adopt shared space principles to provide better crossing facilities and environment for
pedestrians and cyclists. Which in turn will change the environment of the carriageway at this location, removing the initial reasons for objection.

Some concern has been raised that the proposal has not be subject to a technical audit. However, this is the same with all planning applications that require works to the highway. Technical details are dealt with by the Highway Authority separately though a s.278 agreement.

NBBC Refuse do not formally object to the application, there are some concerns for on street parking however this is an existing issue that the proposal is not considered to be adding to, as the parking provision is adequate.

7. Flood Risk & Drainage
A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) has been submitted with the application which identifies that currently the site is almost entirely impermeable to surface water and therefore the proposal will increase permeability due to the introduction of the landscaped areas. This will aim to reduce run off from the site and be betterment in terms surface water drainage. Further to this the site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1, which is the least at risk from flood events from fluvial sources. The proposal is to attenuate surface water run off from the site and release it to the network at a controlled rate plus climate change via the use of a Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS).

Warwickshire County Council are the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and have no objection to the application subject to conditions including requiring details of the surface water drainage scheme and the use of SUDS. This is in line with the principles of the NPPF.

8. Ecology
An ecological appraisal was conducted by WCC Ecological Services, the appraisal concludes that there may be potential for nesting bats and/or birds. Therefore, a bat survey was commissioned and submitted with the application. There is no other evidence to suggest the presence of any other protected species. The recommendations following this are bat and bird boxes, which can be conditioned as well as a lighting condition to try and limit external lighting of the new building.

The arboricultural inspection report submitted with the application indicates that there are some mature trees to the front of the site, however, not within it. It concludes that none of the trees within the boundaries of the site would constrain development. However, consideration should be given to those trees growing close to the boundary of the site as shown on the provided plan. Root protection zones for these trees could be conditioned

Overall, in line with the principles of the NPPF, through suitable mitigation there should be a net gain in biodiversity, having moderate weight in favour of the application.
9. Loss of Community Facility
The building is currently used by Warwickshire Education Support Team (WEST) a County Council scheme helping adults with learning difficulties enter training and employment. The County Council intend to re-locate this service elsewhere in the Borough. Previous to WEST being located in Attleborough, it operated from Hurst Road, Bedworth.

The building was used as a school until 1996, since then it was vacant for some years and then used for services as above, as well a day centre for adults with learning difficulties (Freeway Centre). There has been a large amount of object to the proposed demolition of this building, some of this objection has been due to the loss of a community facility. Although the building has been used for facilities in the past, it is not directly accessible to members of the local community on a regular basis. In addition to this, there are a number of other facilities within the Attleborough community that allow for community members to meet etc. the loss of this facility would not lead to the local community being unable to meet and interact. Para. 70 of the NPPF states that decision makers should guard against the loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs. However, it is not felt that the loss of the Freeway Centre & WEST, would be detrimental to the community’s day to day needs and therefore hold little detrimental weight. In addition, WEST is to relocate within the Borough and the proposed new building will continue some of the functions that the Freeway Centre offered.

10. Obligations
NBBC Parks have requested £11,040.11 towards Open Space facilities in the area, the applicant has not raised objection to this.

REASONS FOR APPROVAL:
Having regard to the pattern of existing development in the area, relevant provisions of the development plan, as summarised above, and the consultation responses received, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS:
2. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans contained in the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Description</th>
<th>Plan No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance Survey Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td>9th June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Plan</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>9th June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block Plan</td>
<td>102c</td>
<td>9th June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Ground Floor Plan</td>
<td>200f</td>
<td>3rd September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for Blocks A & B
Proposed First Floor Plan 2015 201f 3rd September
for Blocks A & B
Proposed Second Floor Plan 2015 202f 3rd September
for Blocks A & B
Proposed Ground Floor Plan 2015 210d 3rd September
for Block C
Proposed Elevations 2015 310f 3rd September
for Blocks A & b
Proposed Elevations 2015 312f 3rd September
for Blocks A & B
Proposed Elevations 2015 314e 3rd September
for Block C
Contextual Elevations 2015 320a 1st October
WCC Supported Housing 2015 330 1st October
(Plot 2)3D Visual
WCC Supported Housing 2015 331 1st October
(Plot 2)3D Visual
WCC Supported Housing 2015 332 1st October
(Plot 2)3D Visual
WCC Supported Housing 2015 333 1st October
Junction Options A & B 2015 NK018002 RPS-DR-C-1003 8th September
Swept Path Analysis

3. No development shall commence until a scheme for the provision of adequate water supplies and fire hydrants, necessary for fire fighting purposes at the site, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not be occupied until provision has been made in accordance with the approved details.

4. No development shall commence until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council and the said scheme shall be carried out within 12 months of the commencement of the development and subsequently maintained in the following manner:-

Any tree or plant (including any replacement) which, within a period of five years from the implementation of the scheme, dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season.
with another of a similar size and species unless the Council consents in writing to any variation.

5. No development shall commence until full details and samples of materials proposed to be used in the external parts of any building, including details of those re-claimed from the demolition of the original building, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

6. No development shall commence on site until a satisfactory photographic record of the building has first been obtained in accordance with a brief to be first agreed in writing by the Borough Planning Authority in consultation with the Warwickshire County Council Archaeological Information and Advice (AI&A) team. The record so obtained shall be submitted to, and approved by, the AI&A team prior to development works commencing.

7. No development shall commence until full details of the boundary treatments, including new walls and fences, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The building shall not be occupied until the boundary treatments have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

8. No development shall commence until the details of Bat & Bird boxes to be provided at the site have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not be occupied until the boxes have been provided in accordance with the approved details.

9. No development shall commence until details of the external lights and lighting columns have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. No light or lighting column shall be installed other than in accordance with the approved details.

10. No development shall commence until measures for the protection of the trees surrounding the site (as identified in the arboricultural report submitted on the 9th June 2015) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. No construction work shall be carried out unless the agreed measures to protect the trees have been provided and are maintained during the course of construction.

11. Prior to the commencement of development a method statement for the installation of hard surfacing and foundations for vehicle parking areas, footpath construction and refuse storage areas and screening in the vicinity of trees surrounding the site (as identified in the arboricultural report submitted on the 9th June 2015, shall be submitted to and approved by the local planning authority in writing. Subsequently all work shall be carried out in accordance with the agreed statement.
12. No groundworks, remediation, demolition or built construction will be undertaken until a Construction Management Plan which should contain a Construction Phasing Plan, Demolition Management Plan and HGV routing Plan is submitted and approved by both the Council and Highway Authority.

13. Prior to commencement of either groundworks, remediation or built construction a detailed access arrangement drawing shall be submitted and approved by both the Planning and Highway Authorities in general accordance with Junction Option B identified on drawing NK018002-RPS-DR-C-1003. The development shall not be occupied until the junction works and access arrangement have been implemented in accordance with those approved details, under a Section 278 Agreement under the Highway Act 1980.

14. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on sustainable drainage principles and an assessment of the hydrological and hydrogeological context of the development, has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the LLFA. The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall:

- Demonstrate that the surface water drainage system(s) are designed in accordance with CIRIA C697 and C687 or the National SuDS Standards, should the later be in force when the detailed design of the surface water drainage system is undertaken.

- Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to and including the 100 year plus 30% (allowance for climate change) critical rain storm to the 1 in 2 year pre-development brownfield runoff rate less 20% betterment.

- Demonstrate the provisions of surface water run-off attenuation storage in accordance with the requirements specified in ‘Science Report SC030219 Rainfall Management for Developments’.

- Demonstrate detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details of any attenuation system, and outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods.

- Confirm how the on-site surface water drainage systems will be adopted and maintained in perpetuity to ensure long term operation at the designed parameters.

15. No development shall commence until details for the disposal of foul sewage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. No
dwelling shall be occupied until the drainage works in accordance with the approved details have been carried out.

16. Block B shall not be occupied until details of a 2m high solid, non-translucent screen measure from the finished level of the staircase turning platform shown on elevation K (Drg:312f) have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The screen once provided must be subsequently retained in perpetuity.

17. The building shall not be occupied until the cycle stands as shown on the hereby approved plan 200d, have been provided on site in accordance with that plan. The cycle stands should be retained in perpetuity at the site, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

18. The site shall not be occupied other than for the purpose of Specialised Housing with Care suitable for persons with Mental Health and/or Physical Disability Sensory Impairment and/or Learning Disabilities and/or Autism, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

19. No out building or greenhouse as shown on plan 200d shall be erected at the site, prior to details of the dimension of the building being submitted to and approved in writing by the Council.

20. The internal finished floor levels shall be set no lower than 150mm above the external ground levels, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

21. The surface water discharge from the site should be limited to the 1 in 2 year pre-development brownfield runoff rate less 20% betterment.

22. The development hereby approved shall not be implemented until a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Council.

23. The approved remediation works shall be completed on site, in accordance with a quality assurance scheme, agreed as part of the contaminated land assessment.

24. If during implementation of this development, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and a specific contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the additional remediation works are carried out. The agreed strategy shall be implemented in full prior to completion of the development hereby approved.

25. On completion of the agreed remediation works, a closure report and certificate of compliance, endorsed by the interested party/parties shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
26. No development shall commence until details of Sustainable Welcome Packs (including public transport information) has been submitted and approved in writing by the Council. The approved packs shall be provided to each dwelling prior to the first occupation of any dwelling.
REFERENCE No. 033524

Site Address: Site 28b002 - Church Lane & Weddington Road, Nuneaton

Description of Development: Erection of 160 dwellings with associated landscaping (phase 2) (Approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of already approved outline application ref 030775)

Applicant: Davidsons Developments Limited

Ward: WE

RECOMMENDATION:
Planning Committee is recommended to grant planning permission, subject to the conditions printed.

INTRODUCTION:
Erection of 160 dwellings with associated landscaping (phase 2) (Approval of reserved matters relating to appearance, landscaping, layout and scale of already approved outline application ref 030775) at site 28b002 - Church Lane & Weddington Road, Nuneaton.

This is a Reserved Matters application for residential development of 160 residential dwellings, of which 120 will be open market and 40 will be affordable and public open space including the retention and creation of foot and cycle paths, creation of areas of play and associated landscaping.

The matters being considered at this stage are appearance, landscaping, layout and scale. All other material considerations were evaluated and approved at Outline stage, including access.

The site is to the south-west of Weddington Road. It currently consists of open agricultural fields which are designated as Area of Restraint and Countryside in the Local Plan. The land is fairly level, there are a number of hedgerows which divide the site and some of these contain trees. To the north-west is Weddington Green Track (Sustrans Route 52) which then links into the public footpath which runs across the southern part of the site. To the south of the site is Church Lane which consists of a mixture of properties including bungalows and two storey properties. St James Church is to the south and is a Listed Building.
The 13 week target date for dealing with this application expired on 14th October 2015, however an extension of time has been signed until after this Committee.

BACKGROUND:
This application is being reported to Committee at the request of Councillor Kondakor.

The following matters are being considered at this stage, reserved from the Outline permission 030775:

- **Layout** – the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces are provided within the development and their relationship to buildings and spaces outside the development;
- **Scale** – the height, width and length of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings;
- **Appearance** – the aspects of a building or place within the development which determine the visual impression it makes, including the external built form of the development, its architecture, materials, decoration, lighting, colour and texture; and
- **Landscaping** – treatment of private and public space to enhance or protect the site’s amenity through hard and soft measures, for example, through planting of trees or hedges or screening by fences and walls.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:

- 032326 – Approval of reserved matters for 121 dwellings (Phase 1) Approved 18th December 2013
- 032259 - Application for variation of conditions 13 and 22 of planning permission ref 030775 to show minor amendments to the proposed roundabout – Approved 12th November 2013
- 030775 - Residential development for up to 326 dwellings including a GP surgery and associated areas of open space and landscaping (outline including access) – Allowed following Appeal 20th February 2012

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:

- Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2006:
  - H3 - Affordable Housing;
  - H5 - Housing Capable of Adaption;
  - H6 - Planning Obligations;
  - R8 Green Track Network;
  - ENV2 - Area of Restraint;
  - ENV3 - Rural and Urban Countryside; and
  - ENV14 - Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents.
- Affordable Housing SPD 2007.
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).

CONSULTEES NOTIFIED:

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:
No objection subject to conditions:
NBBC Environmental Health, Warwickshire Fire & Rescue, Severn Trent Water, NBBC Parks

No objection from:

No response from:
NBBC Refuse & Cleansing, Open Space Society, Highways Agency, Friends of the Earth, Warwickshire Wildlife Trust, CPRE, Ramblers Association

NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED:
Marcus Jones MP, 19 Awarua Crescent 4 Beaumont Road, 2, 12, 16, 26 Bramdene Avenue, 1, 10 Brookdale Road, 3 Caldecote Close, 32, 40 Carisbrook Road, 1 Carlson Terrace 10, 12, 57, 82, 113 Castle Road, 73 Chancery Lane, 12 Charlecote Walk, St. James Church, 1, 3, 5-25, 27, 29, 31-59, 49A, 49B, 61, 63, 65, 67-70, 73, 74, 75-83, 85-87, 89, 91, 93, 95, 97, 99, 101-103, 105, 107, 109 Church Lane, 14 Countess Road, 1-4 Cresswell Close 6, 8 Derwent Way, 1A, 5, 18, 19 Elmfield Road, 11 Ennerdale Crescent, 34 Falmouth Close, 9, 31 Fox Avenue, 18 Fritcheley Close, 74 Gallants Farm Road, 31 Everard Court Garrett Street, 46, 53, 66 Glenfield Avenue, 15 Langdale Drive, 20 Leicester Road, 82 Mancetter Road, 24 Niton Road, 9 Nursery Gardens, 34 Oakdene Crescent, 19 Old Hinckley Road, 26 Oriel House Windsor Road, 197 Pallett Drive, 22 Peake Avenue, Freedom House, Pot Lane, 4, 27 Queensway, 16, 36 Romsey Avenue, 23, 54 Ryde Avenue, 7, 19, 22 Scott Avenue, 66, 67 Shanklin Drive, 16 Shawe Avenue, 41A Smith Street, 87 Somers Road, 40 Southfield Close, 49 St. Nicolas Park Drive, 15 Swinburne Close, 1-4, 8-11 Swinerton Heritage, 2, 3, 7, 9-11 The Coppice, 4 Tintagel Way, Lingfield Farm, Tuttle Hill, 6, 17-18, 21 Ventnor Street, Lower Farm, 21 Grove Fields, 129, 193, 219, 220, 242, 244, 248, 270, 281, 299, 300, 303, 305, 307, 309, 310, 310A, 311, 312A, 312, 313-320, 322, 324, 326, 401, 403, 405, 407, 409, 411, 451, 453, 455, 457, 459 Weddington Road, 10, 28, 44, 54 Winchester Avenue, 34 Whitehall Close, 97 Windermere Avenue
Neighbouring properties were sent letters notifying them of the proposed development on 24th July 2015. A site notice was erected on street furniture on 14th August 2015 and the application was advertised in The Nuneaton News on 17th August 2015.

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES:
There have been 5 letters of objection from 5 addresses. The comments are summarised below;

1. Road safety
2. Air quality impact.
3. Insufficient police, doctors, schools to cope with the new development.
4. Premature to Borough Plan
5. Will not listen to our objections
6. Fails to take account of surface water flooding
7. Encroaches on bridle way and Asset of Community Value.
8. Affordable bungalow needs to be built early

APPRAISAL:
The key issues to assess in the determination of this application are;

1. Principle
2. Flooding
3. Affordable Housing
4. Impact on Asset of Community Value and Church
5. Layout and Residential Amenity
6. Doctors surgery
7. Conclusion

1. Principle
This application is for approval of reserved matters for 160 dwellings on land to the rear of Church Lane and Weddington Lane. Members will recall dealing with the outline planning application in 2011, the decision was allowed in February 2012 following an appeal. This granted approval for the principle of residential development of up to 326 dwellings including a GP surgery and associated open space and landscaping. Together with the first phase (121 dwellings), this development will provide 281 dwellings in total.

This application is now for the second phase of a 2 phase development of the reserved matters relating to appearance which deals with the external built form of the development, materials and texture, landscaping which deals with both hard and soft landscaping on the site, layout which deals with the way in which buildings routes and open spaces are provided within the site and scale which deals with the dimensions of each building in relation to its surroundings. Only these details can now be considered at this stage as all other issues such as traffic and flooding were considered during the outline application and were considered to be acceptable.
2. Flooding

Flood Zone mapping produced by the Environment Agency shows the majority of the land for built development to lie within Flood Zone 1, the zone at the lowest risk of flooding. There is a very small section of the proposed development, located to the south of the site close to the church, which is situated within flood zone 2. As a consequence a minimum floor level has been apportioned to these plots to raise the plots out of flood zone 2 and into flood zone 1 to remove the future risk of flooding, this is the area where the proposed bungalows are positioned.

To ensure no loss of floodplain, it has been agreed by the Environment Agency that the development will provide floodplain compensation to the south of the site for the land removed from Flood Zone 2. This area will ensure that whatever volume of flood plain storage is removed as a result of the land raising on the southern boundary will be re-instated. By undertaking this minor land re-profiling, it can be ensured that all built development is located within Flood Zone 1 and as such a sequentially preferable location for development.

A flood strategy for storm drainage at the site has been developed to meet national and local policy. In accordance with the conditions of the original outline permission the attenuation pond has already been provided prior to the occupation of any dwelling.

Originally, WCC Flooding objected to the proposal, however following a revised layout they have withdrawn their objections. The proposal will provide valuable flooding alleviation across the local and wider catchment area, including the River Anker, and as such the development will result in positive environmental benefits to the existing urban extent of Nuneaton. To ensure that the existing culvert under the Church is not compromised a condition is proposed to require details of this culvert to ensure it is effective.

3. Affordable Housing

Overall 120 dwellings of the 160 dwellings are to be open market houses with 52 x 3 bedroom houses, 52 x 4 bedroom houses and 16 x 5 bedroom houses and the remaining 40 are to be affordable split into 36 x 2 bedroom properties including 4 x 3 bedroom houses. Of these 6 are shared ownership and 34 are rented.

There are three areas of affordable housing, one (ten dwellings) located within the centre of the close to the open space creating a mews area. The second area of affordable housing is situated adjacent to the Church where 19 dwellings are proposed, of these 17 are proposed to be bungalows. The third area is around the rear of the Oakland nursery where 11 dwellings are proposed.

The design of the affordable housing is to the same high standard as the first phase of the scheme, to the lay person they will be indistinguishable. Therefore, the affordable housing has been subdivided into 6 areas throughout the whole scheme.
The Housing Strategy Manager comments support for the application. Again they comment that there is a desperate need for affordable housing. The mixture of houses and bungalows will provide a much needed provision. There is a high demand for 2 bed family homes currently and therefore this mix would significantly contribute to meeting current Housing Need. They are particularly pleased to see the delivery of 17 affordable bungalows on site. They also confirm that the layout of the affordables in this phase is acceptable in that it compliments the others across Phase 1.

4. Impact on the Asset of Community Value and Church
In 2014 the Borough Council approved an Asset of Community Value which follows the line of the bridleway which dissects the site from north to south. As part of the proposal the layout retains this bridleway and provides an enhanced cycle provision to both the Weddington Walk, Weddington Road and the bridleway to and from Weddington Walk/to the Church to be improved/widened in accordance with original outline planning conditions.

There are concerns that insufficient space has been provided between the dwellings and the bridleway, however the plans indicate enhanced provision of a 3 metre wide footpath and bridleway along the original path. The Asset of Community Value is not materially affected by the proposal.

5. Layout and Residential Amenity
The layout has a clear hierarchy of street types, allowing for vehicles, pedestrians and cycle users to easily navigate through the site as well as ensuring vehicles follow appropriate speeds through the site and in residential areas. It has been designed to reduce traffic speed to 25 mph through the use of traffic calming.

In terms of the overall design a variety of different house types and sizes are proposed, however the focus of the development is designed to be used as family homes. The scale of the dwellings is considered to be in keeping with the neighbouring properties as well as the location of the site and surrounding facilities; as such the proposed development is considered acceptable in terms of scale.

In general across the site distance standards between plots are complied with, through there are a couple of locations where distance standards are tight and do result in slight shortfalls, however these locations also provide an open aspect beyond the affected window and it is not considered that these are so significant to warrant a recommendation of refusal. However, the angles and positions of these properties reduce the impact of any shortfall. It is considered that these distances are acceptable in the interests of achieving a good overall design in this part of the site. The distance standards from proposed properties are met and exceeded in most cases.

The majority of the housing scheme is semi detached and detached offering a mix of off street parking by way of driveways and garages. The properties have been designed so that parking will not dominate the frontages.
In relation to the public open space, a tarmac footpath following a continuous connective route through the open space allows a link from Weddington Road through to Church Lane and Weddington Walk in accordance with the principles of the original outline planning permission. The parks department initially had some concerns about the positions of some of the properties adjacent to the walk. The applicant has amended the scheme to reflect some of these concerns and to ensure that a gap remains it is proposed that permitted development right be removed from these properties.

6. Doctors surgery
   There is an obligation in the original planning agreement requiring the transfer of 1.2 hectares of land following the occupation of 141 dwellings. At this stage the trigger point has not been reached but the land has been retained in phase 1 of the scheme.

7. Conclusion
   Overall, the scheme includes all the requirements of the original outline planning permission and provides a high quality development. There is no need for a legal agreement as this is already in place with the outline application and all of the conditions as set out on the outline application will still apply to the site. The recommendation is one of approval subject to the conditions as set out on the agenda.

**REASONS FOR APPROVAL:**
That the details and plans contained in the following schedule 1 shall be approved in accordance with condition 1 and condition 17 of outline planning permission reference 030775 allowed on 20th February 2012, relating to layout, scale, appearance, landscaping and levels

Having regard to the pattern of existing development in the area, relevant provisions of the development plan, as summarised above, and the consultation responses received, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience.

**SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS:**
1. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans contained in the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Description</th>
<th>Plan No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Location Plan – Phase 2</td>
<td>Rev A</td>
<td>23rd July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Planning Layout</td>
<td>1064-220 Rev B</td>
<td>13th October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Soft Landscaping</td>
<td>GL0123 – 07B-09B</td>
<td>5th October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase 2 Open Space</td>
<td>GL0123 - 10B-12B</td>
<td>5th October 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravel Path, Cycle path</td>
<td>GL0123 – 13-15</td>
<td>5th October 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule 2
1. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no building, extension or structure, and no wall, fence or other means of enclosure shall be erected on Plots 177-188, 225-242 of Phase 2, other than those expressly authorised by this permission.

2. No development shall commence until full details of the culvert under St. James Church including headwall, grate and construction have been submitted and approved in writing by the Council. The culvert improvements shall be implemented in accordance with the approved details.
REFERENCE No. 033541

Site Address: 82 Bulkington Lane, Nuneaton

Description of Development: Two storey extension to rear, single storey extension to front and side, increase height of existing dormer to side

Applicant: Mr S Simon

Ward: WH

RECOMMENDATION:
Planning Committee is recommended to refuse planning permission, for the reasons as printed.

INTRODUCTION:
The proposed alterations include a two storey extension to rear, single storey extension to front and side, increase height of existing dormer to side. As well as additional parking area to the front with access on to Bulkington Lane. The proposal creates additional consulting rooms as well as rooms for minor surgeries. The application form states this is to lead to an increase of two members of staff.

The existing Whitestone Surgery is located on the junction of Bulkington Lane and Whitestone Road. It is a former residential property, set within a predominantly residential area. The existing property is dormer bungalow in style, with a very tall steep pitched roof. There is an existing access and hard standing off Bulkington Lane that would have served as a driveway to the original property. There is also a hard standing and access to the rear of the property, creating a parking area, in what would have been the garden. There is an open green area to the front of the property, which is in the ownership of WCC.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
TP/0213/95: Alterations to form entrance lobby - Approved 1995
TP/0658/94: Change of use to doctors - Approved Committee 1995

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:
- Saved Policies of the Local Plan 2006:
  - ENV14 - Supplementary Planning Guidance / Supplementary Planning Documents.
CONSULTEES NOTIFIED:
Severn Trent Water, WCC Highways,

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

Objection from:  
WCC Highways

No response from:  
Severn Trent Water

NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED:  
77, 79, 80, 84 Bulkington Lane; 97 & 114 Whitestone Road.

Neighbouring properties were sent letters notifying them of the proposed development on 4th August 2015.

NEIGHBOUR RESPONSES:
There have been 10 letters of objection from 10 addresses as well as 1 Anonymous. The comments are summarised below;

1) Increased activity.
2) Increased traffic issues at Bulkington Lane/ Whitestone Road junction.
3) Overlooking and loss of privacy.
4) Loss of light to garden
5) Increase in on-street parking, which is already an issue.
6) Out of place in residential area, too intensive/big for the site.
7) Proposed parking not sufficient
8) Parking to front would remove the green area and cause visibility issues at junction, parking area is not suitable.
9) Design overbearing and out of character
10) Access of to Bulkington Lane is not safe
11) Large signage to side of property

APPRAISAL:  
1. Residential Amenity
2. Visual Amenity
3. Highway Safety

1. Impact on Residential Amenity
There are a number of residential properties that surround the site. No.114 Whitestone Road is to the rear of the property, with the two storey proposed extension projecting towards it. There are no primary side facing windows to
the side of this property and the extension projects towards the front, which is not useable amenity space, as there is a driveway here. In addition, the proposed extension would still be a significant distance from the boundary with this property and would not create loss of light or overshadowing. There are windows proposed facing this boundary, less than 7m away. However, as mentioned, this is not overlooking amenity space. Therefore, it would not create any significant loss of privacy. No.80 Bulkington Lane and 97 Whitestone Road face the application site. However, these properties are across the highway and are an acceptable distance away to protect residential amenity from the proposed extensions. The property most likely to be impacted upon by the proposed extensions is No.84. The proposal creates almost 9m of two storey development along the boundary, the RDG recommends 3m. In addition, the drawing shows a 60 degree line from the adjacent window, however, as this is a two storey development and so it should be a 45 degree line, the proposal would significantly infringe this. Creating a sense of enclosure to both the garden and rear facing windows. There are no side facing windows proposed that would create overlooking to this property. In addition the proposal is to the north and so should not create a detrimental loss of light. However, the impact upon this property is severe and would warrant refusal of the application.

2. Impact on Visual Amenity
Currently the property is fairly inconspicuous, and remains to look like a residential property that fits with the surrounding residential context. However, the proposed extensions almost double the size of the property to the rear, creating a large gable feature to Whitestone Road. Although there are such gable features in the area, it is not in keeping with the design and scale of the property. Further to this, the proposed fenestration in the extension is not in keeping with the proportions of the original. It is felt that the proposed extension would therefore appear incongruous and overbearing in the street scene and would be over intensive development for the plot.

In addition to this, the proposed extensions take up a large proportion of the existing parking area, meaning that the proposal includes parking to the front of the property. However, this is on the green area to the front of the property, on land belonging to WCC. Many of the objections raise issues with existing parking problems with the level of comings and goings from the property. It is felt that the alterations will add to this and would create an over intensive use on the site, that would have detrimental impact upon the visual amenity of the surrounding area by way of its layout created by the proposed parking to the front, as well as the safety issues discussed below.

3. Impact on Highway Safety
The Highway Authority has objected to the application for a number of reasons. The Highway Authority consider 15 spaces would need to be provided and only 9 are proposed. Of the 9 proposed the Highway Authority feel 5 may not be suitable as they are proposed on land belonging to them which permission for may not be granted. In addition, if they were to be
constructed on public land they must be for public use and not solely for the
use of the surgery, further reducing the provision at the surgery. Further to
this, if the access off Bulkington Lane were to be used, it would have to be
widened towards the junction, which would not be considered safe, further
more the telegraph pole would have to be re-located. Last, the remaining
space on the existing car parking do not have manoeuvring room and can not
turn within the site, having to do so within the highway, this is not acceptable.
Therefore, there would be a detrimental impact on the highway which would
warrant refusal of the application.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL:
1 (i) Policy ENV14 of the Nuneaton & Bedworth Borough Local Plan 2006
states:-
The design and materials of all development should be of a high standard in
keeping with the scale and character of the locality. All development should
comply with Supplementary Planning Guidance and/or Supplementary
Planning Documents produced by the Borough and County Council, where
detailed guidance is considered necessary.

(ii) The proposal is contrary to this policy in that the two storey extension to
the rear is close to the rear boundary of No.84 Bulkington Lane. Creating an
overbearing sense of enclosure to the rear amenity space and rear facing
habitable room window, to the detriment of residential amenities currently
enjoyed by this property. (Contrary to paragraph 9.6 of the Residential Design
Guide).

2. Paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) states
... Developments should be located and designed where practical to;

- Create safe and secure layout which minimise conflicts between traffic and
cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate
establishing home zones.

(iii) The proposal is contrary to this policy in that the layout does not allow for
safe access, manoeuvring and egress within the site boundaries. The
proposal by way of its size and layout is over intensive limiting the availability
of off-street parking, to the detriment of highway safety, the free flow of traffic
and visual amenity of the area. (Contrary to paragraph 35 of the NPPF)
REFERENCE No. 033127

Site Address: 72 Coventry Road, Exhall

Description of Development: Erection of 8 assisted living units (Outline with access being considered)

Applicant: Mr Allen

Ward: EX

RECOMMENDATION:
Planning Committee is recommended to grant planning permission subject to conditions as printed.

INTRODUCTION:
The application is for the erection of 8 assisted living units (Outline with access being considered) at 72 Coventry Road, Exhall.

Currently the site is vacant land. Previously there was a post office and one residential unit on the site, which has subsequently been demolished and the land cleared. The site fronts Coventry Road, with a two storey residential property to the northern boundary. This property was once attached to 72 Coventry Road, but this is now a detached property. To the south of the site, are some retail units with flats above, on the return, fronting school lane are more residential flats, these are Council owned. The development around this junction is all three storeys. At the rear of the site, to the west is John Haynes Court, which is a Council owned residential home for the elderly, this is accessed via School Lane. The access here is also used as an access to a Council garage court, parking area for the retail units fronting Coventry Road and parking for residents/visitors of John Haynes Court. At present the applicant also has a right of way over this access to get to the site, albeit this right of way was originally for the post office and one dwelling. There is also an existing dropped kerb to Coventry Road, with an access wide enough for one car- it would have once served the driveway of the residential unit.

The application is for the erection of 8 assisted living units in one building, with parking for 12 vehicles. The site is proposed to be used via the John Haynes access, with a right of way established with NBBC Land & Property.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY:
- TP/0156/89: Change of use from retail (A1) to office (A2)- Approval 1989
- TP/0059/99: Change of use to resource centre, to include rear ground floor extension for disabled WC- Approval 1999
BACKGROUND
The application is being reported to Committee at the request of Cllr. Sara Doherty.

The following matter is to be considered at this stage:

Access – accessibility to and within the site for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding access network.

The following matters are reserved to be considered at a future stage and do not form part of the application:

Layout – the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces are provided within the development and their relationship to buildings and spaces outside the development.

Scale – the height, width and length of each building proposed in relation to its surroundings.

Appearance – The aspects of a building or place which determine the visual impression in makes, including the external built form of the development.

Landscaping – Treatment of private and public space to enhance or protect the site’s amenity through hard and soft measures, for example, through planting of trees or hedges or screening by fences or walls.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICIES:
- National Policy Planning Framework (NPPF)
- National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)

CONSULTEES NOTIFIED:
WCC Highways, NBBC Housing, NBBC Refuse, Severn Trent Water, NBBC Parks & Country Side, NBBC Environmental Health, NBBC Land & Property

CONSULTATION RESPONSES:

No objection from:
NBBC Housing, NBBC Parks & Countryside,

No objection subject to conditions:
NBBC Land & Property, NBBC Environmental Health, STW

Objections from:
WCC Highways, NBBC Refuse & Cleansing,

NEIGHBOURS NOTIFIED:
Flat 1,2,3,7,8 & 9; 58-60, Co-Op, 58-64 (even), 66, 66a, 74, 77, 76a,b & c, Coventry Road; 1-29 (odd) School Lane; 1-31 (Inc.) John Haynes Court, School Lane.
Neighbouring properties were sent letters notifying them of the proposed development on the 16\textsuperscript{th} December 2014 and John Haynes Court 1\textsuperscript{st} October 2015.

**NEIGHBOURS RESPONSES:**

**Objections**
There have been three letters of objection from two addresses and one petition with 36 signatures, raising the following points:
1. Damaged caused to property when shop was demolished
2. Side facing bedroom window will be affected
3. Noise and disturbance from parking
4. Loss of light to rear
5. Existing parking problem
6. Problem with existing access for refuse collection and emergency vehicles
7. Increase of traffic using access
8. Access is already a hazard

**APPRAISAL:**
The key issues to assess in the determination of this application are:
1. The Principle of Development
2. Residential Amenity
3. Visual Amenity
4. Highway Safety & Access

1. **Principle of Development**
The site sits within a context of mixed uses. There are a number of residential properties surrounding the site, there are however some retail units adjacent to the site as well as opposite. There are also some industrial uses opposite the site. Therefore, in principle, a residential use on the site is acceptable in relation to the surrounding context. Further to this, the NPPF encourages the re-use of land that has been previously developed. This site would be considered as a brownfield site, that the Council would encourage re-development of. The land is not of high environmental value, there is very little vegetation of the site, which is in a very urban context. In addition this, the proposal is to provide Specialised Housing, there is a demand for this type of housing in the Borough, that this development could go some way to providing.

Moreover, at the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Therefore, unless any other material considerations suggest otherwise, this application should be approved.

2. **Residential Amenity**
There are a number of residential units that surround the site. John Haynes Court is a residential home for the elderly, to the rear of the site. However, the building is separated from the site by amenity space, parking and a garage court. Therefore, the back of the site is 50m from the facing part of this building, with intervening development. Part of John Haynes court is closer to the site than this at 25m away, however, this is not directly in line with the rear of the site and so is less likely to be
impacted upon. An objection has been received from the Manager of John Haynes Court, as well as a petition from residents and visitors which is mostly raising issues of parking issues that exist as the site, as well as the use of the narrow access. However, the proposed building is to provide its own parking area to meet the needs of the building. Moreover, the use of the access for this type of residential care is considered to be minimal and the movements created negligible in terms of the impact it could have on the residential amenity of these residents.

There are some flats at first and second floor above the retail units on Coventry Road. These have windows that face out to the front and rear, however, there are no side facing windows. It is not thought that a residential use at this site would unduly affect the residential amenity of these flats, as long as the layout and design of the building takes in to account the rear facing windows of this property, which is Officers opinion is achievable based on the indicative drawings provided. There are also some flats to the south of the site, that are Council owned, to the rear of these flats, facing the site is some shared amenity space and parking, there are also habitable room widows facing out across this towards the site. However, this is not a direct view, and the building is unlikely to extend in front of these windows.

The property most likely to be impacted upon is No. 74, which was once attached to the building that occupied the site. This property has side facing habitable room windows that are original and primary windows. There are side facing windows at first and ground floor and one ground floor rear facing window adjacent to the site. There are some indicative plans which show the building could take in to account the windows on this property and meet the guidelines in the Residential Design Guide (RDG).

NBBC Environmental Heath have had input in to the indicative layout since there were some initial concerns over air quality. Environmental Health have requested a noise survey be carried out to determine glazing specifications for windows and a scheme of noise attenuation to be submitted including rapid and trickle ventilation, these details can all be conditioned before development commences. This would ensure residential amenity of occupants would meet British standards.

3. Visual Amenity
The property is likely to have to be L shaped as shown on the indicative plan, and most likely a mix of two & three storey. The surrounding development is a mix of two storey and three storey, although there are some single storey development around the site too. In this instance it is thought that a two and three storey mix would be in keeping with the surrounding area and development fronting Coventry Road, with some development in depth which would be in keeping with the pattern of development in the area. The NPPF requires that all developments should be of good design, therefore, any reserved matters will deal with the visual amenity. However, it is Officers opinion that an acceptable development could be achieved on the site.

4. Highway Safety
There has been a significant amount of pre-application discussions with the applicant about the development of this site. The applicant has been told that in principle the
application would be acceptable subject to issues relating to access and the acceptability of the use of NBBC owned land for access.

Discussions with NBBC Housing Manager’s and Land Manager has resulted in the application for assisted living units. This is as the parking requirements and the movements associated with this use are considered less than if the land were to be developed for private housing. The Land Manger stated that the applicant would have to extend their rights of way over this land, by giving NBBC a sum of money, however, he was not in disagreement with this. This falls outside of the remit of planning, and is a separate issue for the applicant to address. Further to this, NBBC Housing Manager was happy that the level of parking would not impact upon the amenity or parking of the residents in John Haynes Court, and that the application for assisted living was welcomed and overcame previous concerns for parking when the pre-application discussion was surrounding private housing. Therefore, from a land owner perspective NBBC has no issue with the use of the access and parking.

WCC Highways have objected to the application. This is on the basis that, the existing access is not wide enough for two way traffic movement, making access and egress difficult. Further to this WCC feel that the visibility splays can not be achieved when looking right from the access. WCC also feel that the parking provision is too low and below guidance. WCC consider that on street parking is already an issue and that the proposal could exacerbate this. If the application is refused on this basis, it maybe that the site would be rendered un-developable. There is no other point of access available and no opportunity for the access to be widened due to the constraints of the site. The site has been vacant for several years, and is a prominent location on a main road, NBBC planning officers would like to encourage development here.

However, this should not be at the expense of Highway safety. Having said that, Officers feel that some pragmatism should be applied to the assessment of the site. It is agreed that the access is only 3.5m wide for a length of 25m, however, it is not agreed that the associated movements with the proposed development would add ‘significantly’ to the amount of movement created along here. The access is already used by John Haynes Court, access to the garage and for parking for the shops and flats surrounding the site. This proposed assisted living block with 8 rooms, will not add to this to a detriment that would warrant refusal. This is similar to the objection based on visibility splays, this is an existing issue on access already used access. In addition to this, the applicant has agreement with the adjacent land owner replacing the boundary treatment to the west with railings to aid visibility, this could be conditioned, prior to commencement of development. As before, the proposed development is not considered to be any different to the traffic already using this access. The final objection is on parking levels, however, NBBC no longer has an adopted parking document. Aside from that, the previous parking document required 1 space per 4 residents (therefore two in this case) and one space per 4 staff, therefore this site would be able to cater for at least 36 staff at any one time. Therefore, actually parking standards would have been complied with.

NBBC Refuse & Cleansing have objected to the application, on the basis that they already have issues with this access and they feel additional parking may exacerbate this.
REASON FOR APPROVAL:
Having regard to the pattern of existing development in the area, relevant provisions of the development plan, as summarised above, and the consultation responses received, it is considered that subject to compliance with the conditions attached to this permission, the proposed development would be in accordance with the development plan, would not materially harm the character or appearance of the area or the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers and would be acceptable in terms of traffic safety and convenience.

SCHEDULE OF CONDITIONS:

4. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved plans contained in the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan Description</th>
<th>Plan No.</th>
<th>Date Received</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ordnance Survey</td>
<td></td>
<td>18th December 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey Drawing</td>
<td>P/N</td>
<td>10th September 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. No development shall commence until a noise attenuation scheme to meet the standards for internal and external noise levels defined in table 4 and section 7.7.3.2 of BS8233:2014 (Including glazing and ventilation details) has first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. No dwelling shall be occupied other than in accordance with the approved details.

6. The site shall not be occupied other than for the purpose of Specialised Housing with Care suitable for persons with Mental Health and/or Physical Disability Sensory Impairment and/or Learning Disabilities and/or Autism. Unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

7. The development hereby approved shall not be implemented until a contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy, has been submitted to, and agreed in writing by the Council.

8. The approved remediation works shall be completed on site, in accordance with a quality assurance scheme, agreed as part of the contaminated land assessment.

9. If during implementation of this development, contamination is encountered which has not previously been identified, the additional contamination shall be fully assessed and a specific contaminated land assessment and associated remedial strategy shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the additional remediation works are carried out. The agreed strategy shall be implemented in full prior to completion of the development hereby approved.

10. On completion of the agreed remediation works, a closure report and certificate of compliance, endorsed by the interested party/parties shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
11. No development shall commence until a landscaping scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council and the said scheme shall be carried out within 12 months of the commencement of the development and subsequently maintained in the following manner:-

Any tree or plant (including any replacement) which, within a period of five years from the implementation of the scheme, dies, is removed or becomes seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the next planting season with another of a similar size and species unless the Council consents in writing to any variation.

12. No development shall commence until full details and samples of materials proposed to be used in the external parts of any building, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not be carried out other than in accordance with the approved details.

13. No development shall commence until full details of the boundary treatments, including new walls and fences, have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The building shall not be occupied until the boundary treatments have been carried out in accordance with the approved details.

14. No development shall commence until details of a boundary treatment to the west boundary of the access and along the frontage of No.29 School Lane, Exhall have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. The development shall not commence until the boundary treatment has been provided in line with the approved details.

15. No development shall commence until details for the disposal of foul sewage have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Council. No dwelling shall be occupied until the drainage works in accordance with the approved details have been carried out.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A1</strong> (shops)</td>
<td><strong>A2</strong>, or up to 150m² <strong>A3</strong> subject to Prior Approval, or up to 200m² <strong>D2</strong> subject to Prior Approval and only if the premises was in A1 use on 5th December 2013. A <strong>mixed use</strong> comprising an A1 or A2 use and up to 2 flats may also be permitted subject to meeting certain conditions. <strong>C3</strong> if the cumulative floorspace of the building is under 150m² and subject to Prior Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A2</strong> (professional and financial services) when premises have a display window at ground level, but excluding betting offices or pay day loan shops</td>
<td><strong>A1</strong>, or up to 150m² <strong>A3</strong> subject to Prior Approval, or up to 200m² <strong>D2</strong> subject to Prior Approval and only if the premises was in A2 use on 5th December 2013. A <strong>mixed use</strong> comprising an A1 or A2 use and up to 2 flats may also be permitted subject to meeting certain conditions. <strong>C3</strong> if the cumulative floorspace of the building is under 150m² and subject to Prior Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A3</strong> (restaurants and cafes)</td>
<td><strong>A1 or A2</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4</strong> (drinking establishments)</td>
<td><strong>A1 or A2 or A3</strong> except buildings that may be defined as ”community assets”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5</strong> (hot food takeaways)</td>
<td><strong>A1 or A2 or A3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B1</strong> (business)</td>
<td>Up to 500m² <strong>B8</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong> (general industrial)</td>
<td><strong>B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B2</strong> (general industrial)</td>
<td>Up to 500m² <strong>B8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B8</strong> (storage and distribution)</td>
<td>Up to 500m² <strong>B1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C3</strong> (dwellinghouses)</td>
<td><strong>C4</strong> (houses in multiple occupation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C4</strong> (houses in multiple occupation)</td>
<td><strong>C3</strong> (dwellinghouses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sui Generis</strong> (casinos and amusement arcades/centres)</td>
<td><strong>D2</strong>, or only if existing building is under 150m² <strong>A3</strong> or subject to Prior Approval. <strong>C3</strong> if the cumulative floorspace of the building is under 150m² and subject to Prior Approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sui Generis</strong> (betting offices and pay day loan shops)</td>
<td><strong>A1 or A2</strong>. <strong>C3</strong> if the cumulative floorspace of the building is under 150m² and subject to Prior Approval. A <strong>mixed use</strong> comprising a betting office or a pay day loan shop, or an A1 or A2 use and up to 2 flats may also be permitted subject to meeting certain conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sui Generis</strong> (agricultural buildings)</td>
<td><strong>A1, A2, A3, B1, B8, C1, C3, D2</strong>, all subject to meeting relevant criteria and Prior Approval. See notes below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 2015