

W

## **PLANNING COMMITTEE 21<sup>st</sup> April 2022**

### **ADDENDUM LIST**

**AGENDA ITEM 3 APP/21/00070 – HOLLINS HEY HOTEL, 191 VICTORIA ROAD, NEW BRIGHTON.**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

##### **AGENDA ITEM 3: APP/21/00070: Hollins Hey Hotel 191 Victoria Road New Brighton**

1. The recommended decision displayed in the agenda report for this item of 'Approve subject to a 106 Agreement' is incorrect, and instead should read as follows:

Recommended Decision: Delegate authority to the Director of Regeneration and Place to issue consent subject to the recommended conditions, and any other conditions that the Director may wish to impose, following:

a) The carrying out of a satisfactory bat emergence survey during the appropriate season which has been subject to consideration by MEAS and either confirms that no bats are present on the site, or that any adverse impacts can be overcome through the use of conditions which do not require substantive changes to the development, and

b) The completion of a Section 106 legal agreement to make provision for a financial contribution of £23,200 to assist the delivery of off-site affordable housing within the locality.

2. At paragraph 2.1 CONSULTATIONS the consultation response of Natural England has now been received and the text under their entry is updated as follows:

Natural England – Natural England have been consulted, as required, on the outcome of the Appropriate Assessment carried out by MEAS. No objections are raised subject to appropriate mitigation being secured which should comprise the provision of an advisory leaflet which explains the sensitivities of the nearby designated sites, promotes the use of nearby Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) and includes a 'responsible user code.' An appropriate planning condition or obligation should be attached to any planning permission to secure these measures.

## AGENDA ITEM 4 APP/21/ 01248 - 22 FARR Hall Drive,

Councillor Andrew Hodson has objecting on grounds that full and proper consultation was not carried out

### Publication of Amendments

The redline of the site plan was amended in response to neighbour's concerns regarding site ownership, anomalies within the drawings and a requirement for the attenuation tank to be located outside RPAs. The amendments are summarised as below.

<b>Plans/Drawings</b>	<b>Difference</b>
B100 C Existing Site & Location Plan (Submitted 23.11.2021)	The redline was amended to be smaller. The blue line is the original red line and the red line is how it has been amended.
B102 AA Proposed Site Plan (Submitted 23.11.2021)	The redline was amended. For ease the attached plan illustrates the difference. The blue line is the original red line and the red line is how it has been amended.
B103 Y Floor Plans & Roof Plan (Submitted 25.10.2021)	This plan addressed the anomaly with the second floor windows and roof lights in the floor plans and roof plan.
B109 K Proposed Site Sections (Submitted 25.10.2021)	The existing ground levels are shown on the site sections in red.
ELL-19017-HH-L-101 A01 Drainage Layout (Submitted 23.03.2022)	The storage tank and new drainage run to a new combined manhole are outside the RPA's of T7 and T10. The storage tank and drainage run are located in the 4 car parking spaces

The following sets out the extent of the changes to the site location plan. The blue line marks the previous extent of the redline line as per the original submission.



The above-mentioned amended plans from the above table were published on the Council's website on 18<sup>th</sup> April 2022 when neighbours advised that they were not visible to the public.

The proposed changes within the recently published amended plans do not materially impact the development to warrant a new re-consultation prior to the determination of the application.

### Woodland Trust

The Woodland Trust submitted the following comments on the proposals on 15<sup>th</sup> April 2022.

*The Trust holds concerns regarding this application due to the potential for impact on a notable oak tree (grid ref: SJ2624381342), registered on the Ancient Tree Inventory, and identified as T7 on the arboricultural impact assessment submitted with the application ... Whilst not a veteran tree, this tree is designated on the Trust's Ancient Tree Inventory as a notable specimen given its maturity and considerable size.*

*Where notable trees are identified, they should be retained and afforded sufficient buffers to allow them to become veteran trees in the future. Although notable trees may not represent the same level of value as ancient/veteran trees, they are likely to become veteran specimens if afforded appropriate space to grow and develop.*

*The Tree report shows the car parking area to be outside the root protection area (RPA) of T7, however, the RPA is shown as uniformly circular and may not take into account the tree's position close to the road. We request that the applicant provides additional information to clarify the likely spread and depth of the roots in relation to the proposed car parking area, submerged storm drainage tank and protective fencing. The applicant should ensure that all forms of development are outside of the tree's RPA.*

The applicant in response to the Woodland Trees comments advised:

*The Woodlands Trust does not object to the proposed development. Also, they acknowledge that the Tree has been incorrectly recorded on the Ancient Tree Inventory.*

*The Woodland Trust identify the Tree as a notable species therefore the RPA's as applied in the Arboricultural Method Statement (19/AMS/WIRR/62 (Rev A) February 2022) are correct.*

*In addition, the Arboricultural Method Statement (19/AMS/WIRR/62 (Rev A) February 2022) outlines the methodology to be implemented in a prescribed manner and sequence, which has been accepted by the Councils Tree Officers.*

The councils tree officer has responded

The tree has a TPO and there is no more protection that can be made other than planning conditions. The Tank has been moved out of the RPA of The Oak T7 in a recent alteration ELL-19017-HH-L-101. The RPA was amended in the updated tree report 19/AMS/WIRR/62 (Rev A). And recommendations in line with BS5837 made with regards to the works in the RPA, namely the no dig parking solution. The tree will not be enclosed by the development. All measures outlined in BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to design, demolition and construction have been proposed to be taken to successfully retain the tree T7. The proposal will need close arboricultural supervision and I believe I did suggest an appropriate condition to that effect.

Arboricultural Site supervision.

The Arboricultural Method Statement 19/AMS/WIRR/62 (Rev A) and plans Drawing 01, ELL-19017-HH-L-101 Rev A01 submitted in support of the application shall be adhered to in full, subject to the pre-arranged tree protection monitoring and site supervision, detailed in (sections 1 and 12 of the method statement), by a suitably qualified tree specialist.

This scheme will be appropriate to the scale and duration of the works and will include details of:

- a. Induction and personnel awareness of arboricultural matters;
- b. Identification of individual responsibilities and key personnel;
- c. Statement of delegated powers;

- d. Timing and methods of site visiting and record keeping, including updates;
- e. Procedures for dealing with variations and incidents.

This tree condition may only be fully discharged on completion of the development subject to satisfactory written evidence of contemporaneous supervision and monitoring of the tree protection during construction by a suitably qualified and pre-appointed tree specialist.

Reason: Required to safeguard and enhance the character and amenity of the site and locality and to avoid any irreversible damage to retained trees pursuant to section 197 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in accordance with policies GR7 of the adopted UDP

#### **AGENDA ITEM 6 APP/21/01952 – 22 Edgehill Road, Moreton**

Due to the amendments to the proposal, para 3.11.2 should now read

The side elevation of the proposed house would retain a distance of approximately 3m from the front side of no 24 (this boundary distance does narrow to the rear of no 24 reducing to the rear of no 24 to approximately 1.5m) and is to the northwest side of this neighbouring property. The proposal will now project approximately 3m forward of no 24. However, given the set back from the building line of no 22 by 1m and the distances between the proposed house and no 24, the impact is not considered to be of such a level that would cause unacceptable harm to neighbouring amenity.