

## PLANNING APPLICATIONS COMMITTEE

### ADDENDUM 13<sup>th</sup> June 2023

#### Item

1. Update to Section 11 (Planning Obligations) of the report to confirm that the applicant has agreed to meet the financial contributions which have been requested, as set out on pages 44-51 of the report.

The cost of the Real Time Information (RTI) displays has been queried; however, it has been confirmed that the cost provided within the County's Infrastructure Team's consultation response is an estimate of the RTI display cost rather than a precise figure. The precise RTI display cost would be negotiated through the S106 process with input from the County Council.

Update to Page 18 of the report relating to neighbour responses. A further three neighbour representations have been received following the publication of the agenda. Two of the representations are neutral in nature and one is an objection to the application. The representations raise the following summarised matters:-

1. One representation has queried where Drawing Numbers 18158-08 and 18158-08-02 (referred to within recommended conditions 35 and 36) are located on the website. Drawing number 18158-08 (Bramcote Close / Long Street Junction Tracking and Improvements) is provided within the submitted Transport Note. Drawing Number 18158-08-02 has been superseded by Drawing Number 18158-08-2-B (Wolvey Road / Long Street Junction Improvements) which is a standalone drawing.

2. A neutral letter of representation has been received relating to the ecological impacts of the scheme, noting the importance of ecological mitigation, to include the provision of bird, bee and bat boxes/bricks, hedgehog highways, as well as the requirements to secure biodiversity net gain measures more generally. A request has been made that Swift boxes (and other bird boxes suitable for smaller birds) are provided across the scheme. Further details have also been provided in relation to best practice and RSPB guidance.

3. A letter of objection has been received raising highway safety concerns specifically relating to the adequacy of Bramcote Close and Long Street to accommodate the additional traffic generated by the development. Concerns have also been raised relating to the existing arrangement at Bramcote Close and that refuse lorries are required to reverse along the highway at present.

Recommendation: No change to the original recommendation.

Amend consultation responses section to include NBBC Sport Development, WCC Infrastructure, NHS and George Eliot Hospital from 'comments from' to

'no objection subject to conditions/securing financial contributions from' section.

Add NBBC Tree Officer in to consultees notified.

Add Open Space Society in to 'no response from'

**2. AMEND Condition 6 to read:**

6. No development shall commence until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site, based on the sustainable drainage principles set out within the approved surface water drainage strategy (ref: CRBW-BSP-ZZ-XX-RP-C-0001- P04\_FRA\_&\_Drainage\_Strategy, revision P06, dated 18th May 2023) 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:

1. Limit the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to and including the 1 in 100 year (plus an allowance for climate change) critical rain storm to the QBar Greenfield runoff rate of 4.38l/s/ha for the site in line with the proposed strategy.

2. Provide drawings / plans illustrating the proposed sustainable surface water drainage scheme. The strategy agreed to date may be treated as a minimum and further source control SuDS should be considered during the detailed design stages as part of a 'SuDS management train' approach to provide additional benefits and resilience within the design.

3. Provide detail drawings including cross sections, of proposed features such as detention basins, swales, and outfall structures.

These should be feature-specific demonstrating that such the surface water drainage system(s) are designed in accordance with 'The SuDS Manual', CIRIA Report C753.

4. Provide detailed, network level calculations demonstrating the performance of the proposed system. This should include:

a. Suitable representation of the proposed drainage scheme, details of design criteria used (incl. consideration of a surcharged outfall), and justification of such criteria where relevant.

b. Simulation of the network for a range of durations and return periods including the 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year and 1 in 100 year plus 40% climate change events

c. Results should demonstrate the performance of the drainage scheme including attenuation storage, flows in line with agreed discharge rates, potential flood volumes and network status. Results should be provided as a summary for each return period.

d. Evidence should be supported by a suitably labelled plan/schematic (including contributing areas) to allow suitable cross checking of calculations and the proposals.

5. Provide plans such as external levels plans, supporting the exceedance and overland flow routing provided to date. Such overland flow routing should:

- a. Demonstrate how runoff will be directed through the development without exposing properties to flood risk.
- b. Consider property finished floor levels and thresholds in relation to exceedance flows.

The LLFA recommend FFLs are set to a minimum of 150mm above surrounding ground levels.

- c. Recognise that exceedance can occur during any storm event due to a number of factors therefore exceedance management should not rely on calculations demonstrating no flooding.

AMEND Condition 9 to read:

9. No phase of development shall commence until full details of the construction of the roads serving that phase including footways, private drives and means of accessing individual plots, drainage (including the outfalls) and levels of the car parking and manoeuvring areas as shown on the approved plan have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority in consultation with the Highway Authority. The relevant phase shall not be occupied until the areas for that phase have been laid out and substantially constructed. Such areas shall be permanently retained for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles.

AMEND Neighbour Responses to read:

There have been 11 objections from 9 addresses plus 1 objection with no address provided. The comments are summarised below:

1. Increased traffic and congestion.
2. Loss of wildlife habitats.
3. Loss of trees and hedgerows.
4. Would destroy the character of Bulkington village.
5. Another encroachment into an area that separates Bedworth, Coventry and Bulkington.
6. Increased traffic, light and noise pollution.
7. Increased pressures on already overstretched services in the village such as Doctors, Dentist, schools and the emergency services.
8. Coventry Road is a very busy through road. Whilst the development is being undertaken what impact will this have when plant and building material are being brought to the site?
9. Impact in traffic flows.
10. Impact on pedestrian and vehicle safety.
11. Proposed cycleways are inadequate.
12. Increased vibration from vehicles using the access road.
13. Loss of privacy.
14. Insufficient parking.
15. Adverse visual impact on the landscape.
16. Affordable housing not adequately dispersed through the site.
17. Concerns with anti-social behaviour.
18. Concerns with how the ditches will be maintained.
19. Increased flooding.
20. Development is out of character with existing properties.

- 21.Loss of light.
- 22.Loss of views.
- 23.Loss of agricultural land.
- 24.It has become noticeably harder however to cross Bedworth Rd in the mornings.
- 25.What plans are there to help pedestrians, who are trying to walk more to help the environment, cross the busy roads in Bulkington that have seen a huge increase in traffic since the start of the housing developments allowed?

AMEND Neighbour Responses to read:

There have been 11 objections from 9 addresses plus 2 objections with no address provided. The comments are summarised below:

- 1.Increased traffic and congestion.
- 2.Loss of wildlife habitats.
- 3.Loss of trees and hedgerows.
- 4.Would destroy the character of Bulkington village.
- 5.Another encroachment into an area that separates Bedworth, Coventry and Bulkington.
- 6.Increased traffic, light and noise pollution.
- 7.Increased pressures on already overstretched services in the village such as Doctors, Dentist, schools and the emergency services.
- 8.Coventry Road is a very busy through road. Whilst the development is being undertaken what impact will this have when plant and building material are being brought to the site?
- 9.Impact on traffic flows.
- 10.Impact on pedestrian and vehicle safety.
- 11.Proposed cycleways are inadequate.
- 12.Increased vibration from vehicles using the access road.
- 13.Loss of privacy.
- 14.Insufficient parking.
- 15.Adverse visual impact on the landscape.
- 16.Affordable housing not adequately dispersed through the site.
- 17.Concerns with anti-social behaviour.
- 18.Concerns with how the ditches will be maintained.
- 19.Increased flooding.
- 20.Development is out of character with existing properties.
- 21.Loss of light.
- 22.Loss of views.
- 23.Loss of agricultural land.
- 24.It has become noticeably harder however to cross Bedworth Rd in the mornings.
- 25.What plans are there to help pedestrians, who are trying to walk more to help the environment, cross the busy roads in Bulkington that have seen a huge increase in traffic since the start of the housing developments allowed?
26. Loss of green fields.
27. Impact on air quality
28. Bulkington does not need anymore development. Its character is being destroyed.