Denise Stone

From: planning@hinckley-bosworth.gov.uk
Posted At: 14 July 2009 18:22
Conversation: ConsulteeAccess for Planning - Application Comments (09/00411/FUL)
Posted To: Planning Application Comments

Subject: ConsulteeAccess for Planning - Application Comments (09/00411/FUL)

ConsulteeAccess for Planning - Application Comments (09/00411/FUL)

"C J Peat" has used the ConsulteeAccess for Planning website to submit their comments on a Planning Application. You have received this message because you are the Case Officer for this application or because this is a designated mailbox for ConsulteeAccess comments submissions.

Comments were submitted at 14/07/2009 18:21:41 from IP 192.168.0.3.

Application Summary

Application Number:
09/00411/FUL

Address:
Carlton Grange
Congerstone Lane
Carlton
Nuneaton
Leicestershire
CV13 0BU

Proposal:
EXTENSION AND ALTERATION TO EXISTING DWELLING, NEW SWIMMING POOL AND ENCLOSURE, REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING OUTHOUSES WITH NEW GARAGES AND WORKSHOP WITH GUEST ANNEXE OVER AND NEW ENTRANCE GATEWAY TO DRIVEWAY

Case Officer:
Louise Forman

Customer Details

Name:
C J Peat

Address:
7 Main Street
Carlton
Nuneaton
Warks

Postcode:
CV13 0BZ

Email:
CARLTONPC@TISCALI.CO.UK

Phone Number:
01455-290934

Comments

Submission Type:

Comments:

A. Carlton Parish Council (the PC) objects to this application on the grounds that:

(a) the proposed 'Summer Room' is out of keeping with the existing dwelling by virtue of its flat roof, elaborate cornice, over-sized window and door openings and tiny window panes. This might be remedied by re-siting this room as a link between the main house and outbuildings, making a pitched roof with eaves to match the main house, reducing the size of the door and window openings, and simplifying the fenestrations.

(b) the proposed access gates are too close to the highway boundary on a dangerous bend where vehicles regularly exceed the 30 mph speed limit. This could be remedied by setting the gates at least 4.25m back from the highway boundary so that a vehicle standing in front of the closed gates would be clear of the highway.

(c) Ground level is not correctly represented in existing and proposed elevations D. The change in ground level is shown in existing elevation C, but not in proposed elevation C. This has distorted both proposed and existing elevations D, and makes it look as though the plinth course will be lower in elevation D. This anomaly is clearly shown between the main house and the summer room in proposed elevation D.

B. The notes on the drawings repeatedly state that windows and fenestration are to match the existing style, but this is not the case. The PC suggests that there should be a presumption in favour of the window size and fenestration shown in existing elevations A and B, and that the fenestrations in the outbuildings should be simpler than those in the main house to signify their subsidiary status. The PC also suggests that the first floor windows in proposed elevation D would look better if placed symmetrically within each gable, and that the balcony in proposed elevation C would look better if centred above the ground floor window. The PC recommends that details of all fenestrations be submitted for approval before execution.

C. New and existing elevations C suggest that the site is to be levelled before the new outbuildings are built. Is this the case? The PC recommends that all construction levels be checked and agreed on site before development commences.

D. These comments refer only to the application submitted on 4th June and the PC wishes to be informed of any later amendments.

ConsulteeAccess for Planning. (c) CAPS Solutions Ltd.