

DRAFT

Note: These Minutes will remain DRAFT until approved at the next meeting of the Committee

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON WEDNESDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2016

Councillors Present: Jeff Beck, Dennis Benneyworth, Paul Bryant (Vice-Chairman), Hilary Cole, Adrian Edwards, Paul Hewer, Clive Hooker (Chairman), Anthony Pick, Garth Simpson and Virginia von Celsing

Also Present: Derek Carnegie (Team Leader - Development Control), Sarah Clarke (Team Leader - Solicitor) and Rachel Craggs (Principal Policy Officer (Equalities))

Apologies for inability to attend the meeting: Councillor Billy Drummond

Councillor Absent: Councillor Howard Bairstow

PART I

24. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on 31 August 2016 were approved as a true and correct record and signed by the Chairman, with the following amendments:

Item 1, page 6, 5th paragraph, 3rd line: change 'the proposal' to 'the approval'.

Item 1, page 9, 3rd paragraph, 3rd line: change 'buyer's' to 'buyer'.

Item 1, page 9, 8th paragraph, 3rd line: change 'sided' to 'agreed'.

Item 2, page 13, 3rd paragraph, 2nd line: change 'ask' to 'asked'.

Item 2, page 14, 1st paragraph: change the resolution to read 'RESOLVED that the application should be granted contrary to Officers' recommendation but that the matter maybe referred to the District Planning Committee by the Development Control Team Leader'.

The Committee requested that the paragraphs in the minutes were numbered.

Councillor Hilary Cole requested Officers clearly outlined, when presenting a planning application, that if Members were minded to go against the decision, it would be referred to the District Planning Committee. Derek Carnegie, the Development Control Team Leader, suggested that this was discussed at the Planning Policy Task Group. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Jeff Beck and unanimously agreed by the Committee.

25. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared an interest in Agenda Items 4(1) and 4(2) and reported that, as her interest was personal and an Other Registerable Interest or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain to take part in the debate and vote on the matter.

Councillor Clive Hooker declared that he had been lobbied in relation to Agenda Item 4(1).

26. **Schedule of Planning Applications**

(1) Application No. and Parish: 16/01993/FUL - Mostyn, Shop Lane, Leckhampstead, RG20 8QG.

(Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(1) by virtue of the fact that she knew the architect. As her interest was personal and not an Other Registerable Interest or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain and take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

(Councillor Clive Hooker declared that he had been lobbied on Agenda Item 4(1) in his capacity as Ward Member. He therefore stepped down from the position of Chairman and Councillor Paul Bryant took over for this item.)

Councillor Paul Bryant in the chair

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(1)) concerning Planning Application 16/01993/FUL in respect of the demolition of an existing dwelling, garage and shed and erection of replacement dwelling with associated parking, turning and landscape works.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Mrs Patricia Croysdill, objector, Mr Peter Crozier, agent, and Councillor Clive Hooker, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
3. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members and in so doing took account of all the relevant policy and other material planning considerations. He noted that the item had been called in by Councillor Clive Hooker due to the number of objections. In conclusion the report detailed that the proposal would have an acceptable impact and conditional approval was recommended.
4. Councillor Jeff Beck expressed dismay about paragraph 6.5.2 in the report where a concern about flooding had been raised and yet no response had been forthcoming from the Council's Drainage Engineer. Derek Carnegie replied that if the Engineer had been concerned about a flood risk, a response would have been received. However Councillor Beck asserted that since this concern had been raised by residents, the lack of response was not satisfactory. Derek Carnegie pointed out that the resources within the Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SUDS) Team were currently very limited and it was not possible to provide a response to every planning application.
5. Councillor Bryant requested clarification about the condition relating to the use of bonded material across the width of the access, as he questioned how this would be conditioned, since it would also affect the neighbouring property. Derek Carnegie confirmed that the developer would have to restrict the resurfacing to the area of the access that related to Mostyn as the owner of the neighbouring property would not agree to the resurfacing.
6. Councillor Bryant then commented on the third bullet point on page 16 which noted that the footprint of the proposed development would be twice that of the current dwelling. Derek Carnegie stated this was not correct, as it was the floor space that was twice the size of the existing dwelling, because the new dwelling would be on two floors.
7. Councillor Hilary Cole questioned whether the additional condition mentioned in the update sheet in relation to the bonded material to be used across the access would apply to both properties, since it was a shared driveway. Derek Carnegie confirmed that the condition only applied to the new development.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

8. Councillor Hooker asked if this resulted in the retaining wall being taken down to allow access, if it would require the involvement of Highways, which Derek Carnegie advised would be the case.
9. Councillor Adrian Edwards noted that there must be a point where a shared driveway was jointly owned. Derek Carnegie responded that this would need to be resolved by the property lawyers.
10. Mrs Patricia Croysdill, Objector, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - She was the joint owner of Wyverne and was speaking on behalf of the other objectors.
 - They were concerned that the proposed development was inappropriate to the character of the other properties in the Shop Lane as 13 of the 15 properties were bungalows.
 - The planning application contravened Policy ENV23.
 - The current property was at the highest point of the lane and was already higher than the lane.
 - The applicant had used the precedent set by the two earlier planning applications for two storey houses. One of these was Redwood, which was built next to an existing house and had been built one metre higher than agreed. This had set a precedent for the second planning application for Mulberry.
 - Both of these planning applications differed from the planning application for Mostyn, as they did not have shared driveways, were not located at the highest point of the lane and nor were they positioned in the middle of a row of bungalows.
 - The roof level of the proposed dwelling could only be made lower by excavating.
 - The proposed dwelling would be disproportionate to the dwelling that it was replacing.
 - It would cut out the light and the roof light to the neighbouring property.
 - It would not be in keeping with the design of the other properties and would be more appropriate in an urban rather than a rural environment.
 - Another planning application in the area had been refused as a result of policy ENV24 and they requested that this application was refused on the same grounds.
11. Councillor Bryant asked which aspect of Policy ENV23 was been referred to. Mrs Croysdill responded that it was in relation to overall size, scale, massing, site characteristics of the replacement, impact in relation to the adjoining properties and whether it enhanced or detracted from the rural location. Derek Carnegie advised that Policies ENV23 and ENV24 were not applicable to this application as they related to new developments in open countryside. Mrs Croysdill pointed out that the planning application she had referred to was for Redwings, which was also situated in Leckhampstead; however Derek Carnegie concluded that it might not have been within the village settlement boundary.
12. Councillor Cole noted that a number of new policies had recently been introduced in relation to new dwellings in the countryside, which had changed the whole aspect.
13. Councillor Edwards asked if the applicant had discussed the proposals with the neighbours. Mrs Croysdill replied that the applicant's son-in-law had discussed the

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

- plans with them and their intention to excavate in order to maintain the existing roofline.
14. Councillor Edwards further asked what the distance was from the other two houses in the lane and he was told they were on the opposite side of the road and about 40 metres away.
 15. Councillor Anthony Pick enquired about the objectors' views on the proposed plans to excavate. Mrs Croysdill explained there was great concern about this but she added that as she was not an engineer, she did not understand the full details of what was involved.
 16. Mr Peter Crozier, Agent, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The main reason for the new dwelling was to enable the applicant to continue to live on the site in her retirement with her daughter and son-in-law.
 - The development complied with Policy CS4, which sought to ensure that residential developments led to a mix of houses.
 - Policy CS4 also stated that the development should be appropriate to the area and they felt that the design did so.
 - The neighbouring properties did not have a consistent form as they had all been extended in different ways and therefore the street scene in Shop Lane was already very varied.
 - He concurred with the Officer's report and could see no reason why the proposed dwelling could not co-exist alongside the neighbouring properties.
 - He did not believe that because the design of the proposed dwelling was different from the neighbouring properties, this constituted a reason for refusal.
 17. Councillor Pick asked how much lower the new property would be in relation to the neighbouring properties. Mr Crozier advised that the slab level was 1.45 metres and the maximum depth of the excavation would be 1.442 metres.
 18. Councillor Pick further queried whether a retaining wall would be required and whether there would be a water runoff. Mr Crozier confirmed that the architects had looked at this and had confirmed that the retaining wall would be sufficient and there would not be any additional surface water runoff from the site as it stood.
 19. Councillor Bryant asked Derek Carnegie to confirm that the personal circumstances of the applicant were not a planning matter, which he affirmed.
 20. Councillor Clive Hooker, Ward Member, in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - He had called in this planning application to provide the objectors with the opportunity to voice their concerns.
 - He was aware that this sort of planning application could upset people and the residents would have to live with the decision of the planning committee.
 - This application had caused stress and anxiety, particularly to the neighbouring property.
 - He hoped that this process would help restore harmony to the community and repair the damage that had been caused as whatever the outcome, their concerns had been heard.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

21. Councillor Cole inquired whether Councillor Hooker was supportive of the application and he confirmed that he was.
22. Councillor Edwards asked Councillor Hooker for his view of the other two houses in the lane. Councillor Hooker replied that one of them had not been constructed in accordance with the agreed plans, which had been passed retrospectively and this had created a negative attitude towards the current application.
23. Councillor Edwards further queried whether lowering the roof height would help. Councillor Hooker said that this had raised other issues in relation to subsidence; however this was not something that the Committee was able to take into account.
24. Councillor Bryant requested Councillor Hooker to state what grounds he proposed could be applied for refusal of the application. Councillor Hooker offered the view that it could be refused as it was overbearing in appearance and because of the width, since it was very close to the boundaries of the neighbouring properties.
25. Commencing the debate, Councillor Cole commented that she could understand the concerns of the residents but could not see any firm reason for refusing the application. She noted that a considerable amount of thought had gone into the planning application and it would not be particularly dominant. Additionally, she was of the opinion that the Council would lose an appeal against refusal.
26. Councillor Paul Hewer agreed with Councillor Cole. He stated that he knew the area well, even though he had been unable to attend the site visit. The lane was a mismatch of properties and he thought the proposed dwelling would sit well in Shop Lane. He did have a concern about access and suggested that perhaps the applicant could remove the bank during construction and then replace it afterwards. Councillor Hewer, therefore, proposed that the Committee approved the conditional planning permission and this was seconded by Councillor Cole.
27. Councillor Edwards remarked that he had looked at the application from all perspectives and he was unsure that the excavation would make much difference to the height of the proposed dwelling. Consequently, he was unable to support the planning application.
28. Councillor Pick expressed the view that the planning application was an improvement and stated there were good planning reasons for approving it. He was concerned about the problems with the neighbours and suggested that consultation took place with them, to ensure any difficulties were overcome in relation to the protection of April Cottage by the retaining wall. Derek Carnegie advised that both these issues were civil and not planning matters.
29. Councillor Garth Simpson proposed that a condition was included requiring the applicant to ensure that flooding did not occur and that they should take out insurance to this effect. He felt the shared access would be solved during construction by widening the access to the site, and he concluded it was not possible to ignore improvements in standards of living with bungalows being replaced by houses.
30. Councillor Bryant asked whether there was a condition requiring the resurfacing of the driveway and Derek Carnegie confirmed that there was.
31. Councillor Bryant also noted that when he had viewed the property from the other side of the road, there was a tree that partially obscured the view of Mostyn. Consequently he questioned whether there should be a condition requiring the retention of this tree and for landscaping to be carried out. Derek Carnegie confirmed that the Case Officer would consult the Tree Officer and the tree would

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

be protected, if it was possible to do so. It was also noted that Condition 4 on Page 22 of the report covered this aspect.

32. Councillor Bryant invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Hewer, as seconded by Councillor Cole, to grant planning permission. At the vote, six Members voted in favour, with one against and two abstentions, so the motion was carried.
33. Councillor Edwards requested that, in accordance with paragraph 7.11.2 of the Constitution, his vote against the proposal be recorded.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the following conditions:

Conditions

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).

2. The development hereby approved shall be carried out in accordance with drawing no. 160244-02 C received 18th July 2016.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interest of proper planning.

3. No development shall take place until samples, and an accompanying schedule, of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the dwelling have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Samples shall be made available to be viewed at the site or by arrangement with the Planning Officer. Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved materials.

Reason: To ensure that the external materials are visually attractive and respond to local character. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

4. No development shall take place (including site clearance and any other preparatory works) until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall include the treatment of hard surfacing and materials to be used, a schedule of plants (noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers/densities), an implementation programme, and details of written specifications including cultivation and other operations involving tree, shrub and grass establishment. The scheme shall ensure:
 - a) completion of the approved landscaping within the first planting season following the completion of the development; and
 - b) any trees, shrubs or plants that die or become seriously damaged within five years of the completion of the development shall be replaced in the following year by plants of the same size and species.

Thereafter the approved scheme shall be implemented in full.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

Reason: To ensure the implementation of a satisfactory scheme of landscaping in accordance with the objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policies CS14 and CS19 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

5. The dwelling shall not be occupied until the vehicle parking and turning space has been surfaced and provided in accordance with the approved plans. The parking and turning space shall thereafter be kept available for parking (of private motor cars and/or light goods vehicles) at all times.

Reason: To ensure the development is provided with adequate parking facilities, in order to reduce the likelihood of roadside parking that would adversely affect road safety and the flow of traffic. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS13 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

6. No demolition or construction works shall take place outside the following hours:

7:30am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays;
8:30am to 1:00pm Saturdays;
nor at any time on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of adjoining land uses and occupiers. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

7. The annexe hereby permitted shall not be used at any time other than for purposes ancillary to the residential use of the new dwelling being created at Mostyn. The annexe shall not be used as a separate dwelling unit and no separate curtilage shall be created.

Reason: The creation of a separate planning unit has not been considered under this application and the consideration of the creation of an entirely separate unit would be different from that of the creation of this annexe. This is in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and policies CS13 and CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

8. No development shall take place until full details of how all spoil arising from the development will be used or disposed have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall:
 - a) Show where any spoil to remain on the site will be deposited;
 - b) Show the resultant ground levels for spoil deposited on the site (compared to existing ground levels);
 - c) Include measures to remove all spoil (not to be deposited) from the site;
 - d) Include timescales for the depositing/removal of spoil.

All spoil arising from the development shall be used or disposed of in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure appropriate disposal of spoil from the development and to ensure that ground levels are not raised in order to protect the character and

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

amenity of the area. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

9. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended) (or any order revoking, re-enacting or modifying that Order), no windows or dormer windows which would otherwise be permitted by Schedule 2, Part 1, Classes A, B or C of that Order shall be constructed at first floor level on the northern or southern elevations of the dwelling hereby permitted, without planning permission being granted by the Local Planning Authority on an application made for that purpose.

Reason: To prevent the overlooking of April Cottage and Hardway in the interests of neighbouring amenity. This condition is imposed in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 2012 and Policy CS14 of the West Berkshire Core Strategy 2006-2026.

Informatives

1. This decision has been made in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development having regard to Development Plan policies and available guidance to secure high quality appropriate development. In this application whilst there has been a need to balance conflicting considerations, the local planning authority has secured and accepted what is considered to be a development which improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

27. **Application No. and Parish: 16/00784/HOUSE - Straight Ash, Ashampstead Common.**

(Councillor Virginia von Celsing declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(2) by virtue of the fact that she knew the architect. As her interest was personal and not an Other Registerable Interest or a disclosable pecuniary interest, she determined to remain and take part in the debate and vote on the matter.)

Councillor Clive Hooker resumed the role of Chairman

1. The Committee considered a report (Agenda Item 4(2)) concerning Planning Application 16/00784/HOUSE in respect of the erection of a detached cartshed and store, with home office above.
2. In accordance with the Council's Constitution, Ms Trudi Butcher, Parish Council representative, Ms Carol Garbutt, objector, Mr Mark Pettitt, agent, and Councillor Virginia von Celsing, Ward Member addressed the Committee on this application.
3. Derek Carnegie introduced the report to Members, which took account of all the relevant policy and other material planning considerations. It had been called in by Councillor Virginia von Celsing due to the number of objections. The report concluded that whilst the proposed building was disproportionate, the characteristics of the site and surrounding area were such that no significant harm on the rural character of the area had been identified to warrant refusal.
4. Councillor von Celsing inquired whether the amendment included on the update sheet would be included if Members were minded to approve the application. Derek Carnegie confirmed that this would be the case.
5. Councillor Anthony Pick noted that the detail of the objection from Ashampstead Parish Council was not included in the report and he read the letter of objection

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

- received from them on 22 April out to the Committee. Their objections included the positioning of the cartshed in an obtrusive location and that they felt a single storey building would be more appropriate to the site.
6. Councillor Jeff Beck queried whether a condition could be added restricting the hours and days of construction work if the application was approved, bearing in mind the close proximity of the neighbour's swimming pool. Derek Carnegie confirmed this could be included.
 7. Councillor Hilary Cole expressed frustration that the report had included the old plan of the main house, as the orientation of the dogleg had since changed following the recent extension. She requested that Members were provided with up-to-date plans in future.
 8. Councillor Cole pointed out that Policies ENV24, C3 and C6, mentioned earlier in connection with the planning application, related to extensions and she asked how relevant they were, since this application was for a detached building.
 9. Councillor Adrian Edwards questioned why the update sheet included details of the amended plan, which had been submitted less than five working days before the meeting and, therefore, could not be considered. Derek Carnegie informed him that this was because it provided an indication of what might be acceptable from the applicant's point of view. Sarah Clarke, the Legal Services Manager advised that Officers had included this for Members' information. She reminded them that they could consider deferring the planning application to enable consultation to take place, they could add a resolution stating this was subject to consultation, or they could disregard it. As a result, Members agreed unanimously to disregard the additional information.
 10. Ms Trudi Butcher in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - On 6 November 2015, the applicants were granted permission to extend the property and they demolished the garage to do so.
 - The existing screening between the new development and the boundary fence with the Forge was cut down exposing the area.
 - The new cartshed was 6.1 metre high at the tallest point but as the ground was raised here by 1 metre, in reality it would be 7 metres high and drastically overlook the neighbouring garden.
 - The footprint for the new dwelling was disproportionate due to visual dominance and would have a materially greater impact on the countryside.
 - It would only be 1 metre away from the neighbours' boundary, which contravened the supplementary planning guidance that stated buildings should be sited as unobtrusively as possible.
 - It would occupy one third of the overall floor space of the main dwelling which was not proportionate under Policy ENV24.
 - It would be more visually prominent than the existing dwelling from the public right of way that ran along the eastern boundary.
 11. Councillor Paul Bryant asked if the Parish Plan provided any guidance in relation to this application and Ms Butcher replied that it did not.
 12. Ms Carol Garbutt in addressing the Committee raised the following points:

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

- She was the resident at The Forge and shared a long adjoining boundary with Straight Ash.
 - The cartshed was like a small house and it would be visually prominent.
 - It would be right next to a public footpath and ancient woodland.
 - It contravened ENV24 as it was not proportionate and it would change the look and feel of the boundary with the common, which was in an area of outstanding natural beauty (AONB).
 - It would overlook their property from the outside staircase.
 - This was effectively part of the earlier planning application for the extension to the main dwelling, which included demolition of the existing garage.
13. Councillor Edwards inquired whether there had been any consultation with them on the plans. Ms Garbutt replied that their neighbour had come to see them about it, but only to tell them what they were proposing.
14. Councillor Pick asked if Ms Garbutt had any comment on the removal of the former screening. She responded that the screening of the main house remained, however there was now no screening where the cartshed would be located.
15. Mr Mark Pettitt in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
- The concerns related to the need for the building, its location, the scale and the loss of privacy.
 - All the properties in the area had detached garages and the office on the second storey was required to enable the applicant to work from home, away from the main home.
 - The applicant was agreeable to the inclusion of a condition restricting the use of the top floor of the building.
 - The size of the plot was more than capable of taking the building.
 - The height of the building had been reduced by 6 metres in response to the neighbours' concerns.
 - Alternative locations for the building had been considered but this would result in the loss of the cherry tree.
16. Councillor Pick commented that the purpose of the building was unclear. Mr Pettitt confirmed that the ground floor would be used for storage and the first floor as an office.
17. Councillor Pick inquired why the cartshed was required, as the earlier extension to the main dwelling had created a very large house. Mr Pettitt responded that the applicant wished to use the office in the main house as a music room. Councillor Pick further inquired why the original planning application had not included space for garden equipment. Mr Pettitt replied that the applicant's priority had been to move into the house as soon as possible and this application was the next stage.
18. Councillor Beck noted that the use of the word 'cartshed' to describe the building was very misleading and he questioned why it was being positioned on the right hand side of the plot next to the neighbours' swimming pool. He added, that this appeared to be very insensitive, as any development in this position would impinge on the neighbouring property. Mr Pettitt acknowledged that the development would have been insensitive if it overlooked The Forge, however it would not. It could not

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

- be positioned elsewhere on the site, as the gap between the boundary and the cherry tree was insufficient and if it was repositioned, it would overlook The Forge.
19. Councillor Bryant questioned whether there was a Tree Preservation Order on the cherry tree and Mr Pettitt replied that there was not.
 20. Councillor Garth Simpson asked why the building could not be positioned further away from the boundary and Mr Pettitt explained that this would disconnect it from the house. It would also require a large amount of hard standing to be installed in order to access it.
 21. Councillor Cole noted that there had been a considerable amount of comment about the dormer windows, but her concern was with regard to the bulk of the building which would dominate this part of the garden. Mr Pettitt pointed out that part of it would be screened to which Councillor Cole retorted that there was no screening there at the moment. Mr Pettitt concluded that because a building could be viewed, it did not mean it was visually intrusive.
 22. Councillor Cole observed that it was not surprising that The Forge were the only objectors to the building, as this was a sparsely populated area, but it did not mean that their concerns were any less significant.
 23. Councillor Edwards asked if the staircase would be open which Mr Pettitt confirmed was the case. Derek Carnegie interjected that a condition could be added requiring the staircase to be screened from overlooking The Forge.
 24. Councillor Hooker noted that no screening was included on the site plan and there would not be much room for it. Mr Pettitt responded he could look at this.
 25. Councillor Virginia von Celsing in addressing the Committee raised the following points:
 - The building would be 12.5 metres long and 6 metres high, although it would appear 7 metres high to the neighbouring property, as the ground was higher in this location.
 - It was a disproportionate building on the edge of ancient woodland.
 - It was hypocritical to demolish the garage in order to extend the main house and then submit a planning application for a garage.
 - There had been substantial concern about this application and a number of people had contacted her about it, although she had not received any contact from the applicant.
 - The detached garage at the Forge was single storey and a single storey garage in this location would be more appropriate.
 - A cherry tree could be replaced and removal of it would not be a problem.
 - The applicant had a 3.5 hectare garden and it seemed very selfish to put this building only one metre from the neighbour's boundary with no space for any screening shrubs.
 26. Commencing the debate Councillor Bryant noted that it was a large plot and deserved a commensurately sized garage. However when they had looked at the location from The Forge, it was clear that the cartshed would be overbearing and it would be more appropriately positioned further away. Therefore, he had great difficulty in supporting the application.

WESTERN AREA PLANNING COMMITTEE - 21 SEPTEMBER 2016 - MINUTES

- 27. Councillor Cole concurred with Councillor Bryant and added that if the cartshed was positioned elsewhere, it would be possible to produce a design that would not overlook The Forge.
- 28. Councillor Pick expressed concern about the massing and scale of the building and the disproportionate and overbearing effect it would have on the front drive. He therefore proposed refusing planning permission, against Officer's recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Beck.
- 29. Councillor Edwards commented that the building looked very large on the plans and when they had seen where it would be positioned during the site visit, he had concluded that there was no way they could approve the application.
- 30. Councillor Beck added that the scale and location were wrong and the application should not be allowed.
- 31. Derek Carnegie advised that the fact the application did not enhance the character of the area and was disproportionate could be possible grounds for refusal.
- 32. Councillor Pick pointed out that if the comments from the Parish Council had been considered, the Case Officer might not have recommended the application for approval. However Derek Carnegie asserted that the Case Officer would have been aware of these comments.
- 33. Councillor Hooker invited the Committee to vote on the proposal of Councillor Pick, as seconded by Councillor Beck, to refuse planning permission. At the vote there was unanimous agreement and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED that the Head of Planning and Countryside be authorised to refuse planning permission, contrary to Officers' recommendation for the following reasons: Overbearing, massing, scale, screening, disproportionate, location.

28. Appeal Decisions relating to Western Area Planning Committee

Members noted the outcome of appeal decisions relating to the Western Area.

(The meeting commenced at 6.30 pm and closed at 8.37 pm)

CHAIRMAN

Date of Signature