

APPLICATION REF: 24/1185/FUL

REASON FOR TAKING NO FURTHER ACTION ON APPLICATION:

Applicants have decided to withdraw the application after the following advice:

Plans

The proposed floorplans and 2 site location plans are inconsistent.

The proposed floorplans and elevations state the front elevation has a 6m width and a 7m depth. The 2 site plans conflict with this stating a 7m width and 6m depth, and a 6x6m floorplan.

This prevents an accurate assessment of the proposal in regard to matters such as design and heritage.

In Principle Acceptability

Policy LP28 Part B sets out 3 criteria for proposals for new or extensions to existing social and community infrastructure:

1. It provides for an identified need
2. Is of a high quality and inclusive design providing access for all; and
3. Where practicable is provided in multi-use, flexible and adaptable buildings or co-located with other social infrastructure uses which increase public access

The planning statement refers to the health and fitness industry on a country wide scale stating that in the UK there are over 10 million fitness members with a growth in small private health clubs providing specialist training. The submission does not assess the presence of any existing gyms or small private health clubs on a more local scale. While retrospective, no information on existing number of clients or use of the studio has been provided. As such, the submission fails to adequately demonstrate an identified need.

Flood Risk

A Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted, however this is dated from December 2018 and refers to a previous application for a swimming pool. As such, while it identifies flood risk such as that rear gardens of Shrewsbury Avenue are identified as medium and high risk of surface water flooding, the reports fails to demonstrate appropriate mitigation measures in that it refers to a proposed swimming pool and so is not proposal specific.

As such, the application by reasons of its unsatisfactory flood risk assessment fails to demonstrate that the proposal would not increase flood risk on site and beyond.

Trees

It is noted from site visit that the closest trees are immediately to the rear of the studio and to the side.

2 Arboricultural Method Statements have been submitted. While the report is site specific, it is outdated in that the report is dated 2019 and are reliant on a Tree Survey undertaken in December 2018. Further to this, the report focuses only on the swimming pool and so is not proposal specific and does not assess trees within the vicinity of the proposed studio.

An invoice has been submitted noting that trees works carried out in 2022 were the cutting of a side branch and then cut all over hanging tree around to stop falling on roof. However, there is no updated statement by a suitably qualified arboriculturist to assess the current health of the nearest trees.

Official

The application, by reason of insufficient information and the siting in close proximity to trees to the North and West of the studio, has failed to demonstrate that the trees have not been harmed by the construction of the outbuilding.

DATE OF N.F.A.: 30.09.2024

AGREED BY:

South Area Team Manager:ND.....

Dated:30.09.2024.....