PLANNING COMMITTEE 6 December 2016

OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED FOLLOWING PREPARATION OF AGENDA

Item 6: W16/0239 – Whitley South

The following comments relate to the specific amendment that is now sought by the applicant. Many more comments were received in relation to the original planning application and these were reported in the original Committee Report.

Baginton Parish Council: Object. The commitment to occupy the full 10,000 sq m should remain in place. This was imposed just 7 months ago and the requested reduction so soon into the project must be viewed with some concern. The provision of infrastructure for this undeveloped Green Belt site should not have come as a surprise. If unforeseen issues are arising this early in the project, the Planning Committee should reconsider the viability and sustainability of the whole project. Further consideration of this development should await the adoption of the new Local Plan.

Bubbenhall Parish Council: Object. If there is not the infrastructure in place for such a development, how can it be even considered for approval? The very special circumstances for allowing this development in the Green Belt related to the urgent requirements of JLR, which were clearly exaggerated given that the permission has still not been issued. The application should be refused to allow further information to be sought on the power supply available to the site. A decision on the scheme should await the outcome of the Local Plan review.

Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council: Object. This reduction in floorspace calls into question the fundamental reasons for granting planning permission. We were told that this application was urgent, but here we are 8 months later discussing amendments. The reasons for the requested reduction do not appear to have a detailed and substantial basis and if they can be vindicated they must cast doubt on the suitability of this site for sustainable development. The development will have a critical impact on traffic and severely reduce the green buffer between Coventry and surrounding villages.

Further information is required on JLRs future plans for the area. Planning permission should be refused pending the outcome of the local plan review.

Cllr Redford: Objects. The fact that JLR are now asking to reduce the 10,000 sq m floorspace figure must be viewed with some concern and puts the Committee's resolution to approve the application in doubt. If the infrastructure is not available, this raises doubts over the suitability of development at this site. This is an important area of Green Belt that separates Coventry from Baginton. There are no special circumstances to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt. The prospect of many more jobs is unproven.

The urgency previously claimed by JLR was clearly exaggerated. Any further decision should be held over until the new Local Plan has been adopted.

Cllr Harrington: The Planning Committee considered carefully the planning application and imposed condition 13 in order to ensure that JLR would commit to occupying the buildings as soon as the facilities were available. This area represented a very small proportion of the total estates and should not be diluted.

Public Response: 19 objections have been received, raising the following concerns:

- a new residential village development would be more appropriate than the JLR proposals;
- contrary to Green Belt policy;
- the previously suggested urgency for JLR is clearly not the case because the site remains undeveloped despite the resolution to grant permission;
- as the site has not been developed, the very special circumstances cited by JLR clearly do not exist;
- the floorspace specified in the condition was increased from 5,000 to 10,000 sq m at the previous Committee to demonstrate JLR's commitment to the scheme – where is this commitment now that the figure has been reduced;
- the 10,000 sq m requirement was modest, being only 20% of the overall development;
- the condition does not impose any timeframe on JLR – they can occupy a second building once the power supply is available;
- the assertions of JLR regarding problems with the power supply are unsubstantiated by any evidence;
- issues to do with securing an adequate power supply are likely to be the fault of the developer, since this is usually down to a lack of investment on their part;
- the Planning Committee should reconsider their previous "minded to approve" decision;
- this is a thinly disguised attempt to get the Gateway project through;
- the development of this site should be considered as part of the Local Plan process;
- the whole scheme should not be approved if the infrastructure is not in place; and
- the promised 10,000 jobs will prove to be spurious.

1 resident has advised that they have no objection but has raised concerns about existing problems with JLR park and ride buses travelling through Baginton village.

1 resident has reiterated their previous comments in support of the application including a request for Section 106 measures to include traffic calming on Leaf Lane, Coventry.

Item 7: W16/1139 – Talisman Square

Amendment to condition

Condition 12 has been amended to include a reference to "higher" education so that university students would comply with the terms of the condition.

Amendment to section 106 contributions

The proposed section 106 contributions have been amended slightly to account for the loss of one unit. The agreed contributions are now as follows:

- a contribution of £64,766 towards the provision or enhancement of public open space;
- a contribution of £28,938.16 towards acute and community healthcare services;
- a contribution of £75 per unit for sustainable welcome packs; and
- provision of signage indicating the routes to Kenilworth Station, the Bus Focal Point and other nearby bus stops and to cycle route 52.

Further consultation response

Two further objections have been received, raising the following concerns:

- a condition should be imposed to require all HGVs to access the site via the Abbey End car park, to ensure that these vehicles do not use surrounding residential streets (as with the condition on Waitrose);
- 3 small retail units are not needed when existing units cannot be filled;
- one larger unit would be better because it would attract a larger retailer;
- it is unrealistic to expect that users of the development will not have cars and therefore the proposals will cause problems on surrounding residential streets;
- an underground car park should be provided;
- there should be a restriction on displays / signs / tables / chairs being placed in front of the retail units because this would only leave a narrow passage down the middle for pedestrians;
- the building is too high and leaves no open space; and
- the design should be improved and should include a fountain or sculpture.

Item 8: W16/1204 – 79 Bedford Street

Amended plans have been submitted which include enlarged bin and cycle stores. This has addressed the fifth and sixth reasons for refusal. Therefore it is now recommended that planning permission is refused for reasons 1-4 as stated in the Committee Report.

Item 11: W/16/1744 – Land Adj. to 19 Pickard St

The two storey rear wing has been removed from the scheme owing to concern regarding conflict with the 45 degree rule from a first floor rear facing window serving 19 Pickard Street. The drawings have been amended accordingly.