

Addendum

LA01/2016/0482/O Outline Planning

Update

Further information was received from the agent which deals with two issues namely the floodplain and infill development.

Floodplain

Under the section entitled Floodplain it states that the adjacent planning permission under B/2009/0447/F doubled the size of the existing building and states that it was not previously developed land. The agent adds that an aerial photo illustrates that the land under the 2009 application is all greenfield and was not previously developed land and states that paragraph 8.24 of the Committee Report is inaccurate in that the original FLD1 policy of PPS15 did not allow for extensions on greenfield land.

The planning history of the site is relevant. Planning permission was granted under B/2004/0210/F for a storage and maintenance shed for agricultural machinery building for Evergreen lawns. At the time of processing that application, flooding was not a constraint identified on the site therefore consideration of flood risk was not deemed necessary. A further application under B/2009/0447/F approved the extension to the existing building, incorporating machinery storage maintenance, training area display area product and maintenance equipment. The extension was considered under FLD1 of the original PPS15 which stated that an exception to the presumption against development included (a) development of previously developed land which is protected by the appropriate minimum standard of flood defence". A review of the application file makes it unclear whether the site was considered "greenfield" rather than previously developed land. Notwithstanding that, a flood risk assessment was submitted and found acceptable by Rivers

Agency. The precedent here is limited given that the proposal was for an extension to an existing shed.

Infill

The agent provided a plan to illustrate how the site can be developed if the dwellings are pulled forward closer to Shore Avenue. The agent quotes CTY8 and states that the policy requires the development to respect existing development pattern and not duplicate it. The agent makes his own analysis of site frontages and states that the site are compatible with existing development. The agent goes on to stress the limited views of the site and the applicants willingness to landscape.

Paragraphs 8.6 to 8.11 of the committee report analyses plot widths, plot size and assessed the proposals under CTY8. Paragraphs 8.12, 8.13 and 8.21 sets out in detail the assessment of integration, character and the position of future dwellings in relation to the flood plain and the need for dwellings to be raised above the predicted flood level.

If the dwelling is set back to overcome the flooding the siting will not respect the existing frontage line of development along the public road. In addition the construction of the dwelling with additional free board will appear prominent and out of character with the area.

If the dwelling is set forward, it would still require a freeboard in excess of 0.5m as per the flood risk assessment which would render the dwelling prominent and dominant and out of character at this roadside location.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the content of this addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.