

ADDENDUM REPORT

Planning Committee



Item Number: 6.2

Site: 76 Looseleigh Lane, PL6 5HH

Planning Application Number: 20/00425/FUL

Applicant: Mrs Edwards

Pages: 13-20

1: Clarification on wording

In paragraph 10 it states that the transparent balustrading will not block out unacceptable levels of sunlight. This should read as 'translucent' balustrading as the 1.1 metre balustrading on the south and east facing elevations will be frosted as clarified by the agent on the 14/09/2020. The case officer makes clear that this does not alter the judgement for this aspect of the scheme.

2: Updated plans

A minor drawing error on the revised proposed plans (titled: P1012-02 REV B) relating to the western privacy screen, was spotted on the south-east facing elevation. A final proposed plan (titled: P1012-02 REV C) was received on the 14/09/2020 correcting this error. The final drawing which is viewable online now corresponds with previous negotiations and does not alter the judgement for this aspect of the scheme.

3: Revised letter of representation count

The original consultation period ran from the 7th May, 2020 to the 28th May, 2020. Two letters of objection were received during this period. Following this period the case officer entered into negotiations with the applicant and a second consultation period ran for 14 days from the 26th August, 2020 to the 9th September, 2020. Three letters of objection were received during this period. In summary, the comments are listed as follows:

- the application would set a precedent for the area
- an approval would be inconsistent with a previous position taken by the council
- light pollution
- loss of light
- loss of privacy
- loss of outlook
- noise disturbance
- any screening on the eastern boundary would further contribute to loss of light and outlook

In terms of consistency and setting a precedent in the area, each application is considered on its own merits. The recommendations are consistent with those made on no. 78 due to similar identified amenity issues however they differ from recommendations made for no. 82 as the latter does not have similar amenity issues. All other points made have been addressed in the officer's report, therefore having taken into account the above representations and material planning considerations the officer confirms that their recommendation remains unchanged.