

**Planning Committee 14<sup>th</sup> January 2025**

**SUMMARY OF LATE COMMENTS/REPORT UPDATE**

The aim of this report is to seek to avoid the need for lengthy verbal updates that Planning Officers have sometimes needed to provide in the past at the Planning Committee. In consultation with the Chair, it has been decided that on the evening before committee a summary of all the late comments/representations received so far will be emailed to the Committee Members by the Governance Team.

It is possible that verbal updates will still be required at the meeting as sometimes comments are received at the last minute or Officers may wish to amend their recommendations: however Officers will seek to keep verbal updates to a minimum.

At the meeting Officers will only refer briefly to any key points of the case in the summary that has been emailed, as well as providing the usual verbal update for any additional last minute items.

If Members have any queries about the comments or the application itself please feel free to contact the relevant case officer given beneath the title of each summary below.

**PARISH:** Killamarsh

**APPLICATION:** 24/00303/FLH

**CASE OFFICER:** Ken Huckle

**1. SOURCE OF COMMENTS:** Email from Cllr Baker

**DATE RECEIVED:** 13.01.25

**SUMMARY:**

I substituted for Cllr. Mark foster at the last planning committee where the item on 41 Rose Way Killamarsh was deferred because of concerns over the submitted drawings.

Is the drawing – d/18/03 Rev J - the one being considered for approval at the planning committee tomorrow?

If so, I would like to point out that I have concerns that the drawing does not show the true 'as-built' situation of the building.

On page 13 of the committee report there is a photograph of the northern elevation.

The gap shown over the over the windows and up to the eaves on the northern elevation on both the approved drawing and the as-built appear to be the same, yet the actual gap on the photo is considerably more. On the photo the gap appears to be about 4 blockwork courses or some 900mm.

It seems to me that the actual eaves height could be getting on for 600mm higher than that which was approved. The other elevations also do not appear to reflect the true position.

Therefore, the ridge height is probably significantly higher than shown, but one cannot rely on the submitted as-built drawing to know by how much.

Consequently, the table on page 13 of the report appears to understate the variance between what was built and what was approved.

Could this situation be checked on site please and the actual height of the building be verified, please, particularly bearing mind that the nearest neighbour has objected?

Regards, Cllr Neil Baker

**OFFICER COMMENTS:**

The questions raised by Cllr Baker are addressed in turn below:

1. The plans that show the “as built” situation are revision J
2. In reviewing the comments made, measurements have been taken from the two banks of roof lights to the eaves and ridge, as well as the ground floor windows, and these have been compared to the photographs shown. Officers have been to site and double checked the eaves and ridge heights, it is considered that these measurements are correct.
3. The eaves and ridge height were not measured relative to any window on site but from the external ground level, in order that officers who attended site had confidence in the heights that were reported.
4. In terms of the windows themselves on the ground floor, it does appear that these may be in a different position to the plans, but these openings are largely obscured by the 1.8 metre wall and, in officers opinion, do not adversely impact amenity of neighbours.