

DC.78

**MINUTES OF A MEETING
OF THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL
COMMITTEE**

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON ON
MONDAY, 16TH OCTOBER, 2006 AT 6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors Terry Quinlan (Chair), John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Terry Cox, Tony de Vere, Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Jenny Hannaby, Monica Lovatt, Jim Moley, Briony Newport and Margaret Turner.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Eddy Goldsmith for Councillor Roger Cox, Councillor Bob Johnston for Councillor Jerry Patterson, Councillor Peter Jones for Councillor Pam Westwood and Councillor Robert Sharp for Councillor Peter Saunders.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Martin Deans, Mike Gilbert, Laura Hudson, Geraldine Le Cointe, Carole Nicholl and Alick Natton.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 36

DC.141 NOTIFICATION OF SUBSTITUTES AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The attendance of Substitute Members who had been authorised to attend in accordance with the provisions of Standing Order 17(1) was recorded as referred to above with apologies for absence having been received from Councillors Roger Cox, Jerry Patterson, Peter Saunders and Pam Westwood.

DC.142 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Development Control Committee held on 25 September 2006 were adopted and signed as a correct record.

DC.143 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members declared interests in report 94/06- Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Member</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
R T Johnston	Personal	CHI/16952/1-X	He was a member of the Radley Village Hall Management Committee.	DC.156
Jim Moley	Personal	CHI/16952/1-X	Up until the annual meeting of the Council in May 2006, he had been the Council's representative on the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners. However, he no longer had a declarable interest.	DC.156
Robert Sharp	Personal and Prejudicial	GFA/19649	He was acquainted with the objectors.	DC.158

Tony de Vere	Personal	GFA/19649	He was acquainted with the objectors but not to such an extent that he would be unable to consider the application impartially.	DC.158
--------------	----------	-----------	---	--------

DC.144 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair reminded Councillors and advised members of the public to switch of their mobile telephones during the proceedings.

The Chair explained that in accordance with paragraph 9.2 of the Local Code of Good Conduct for Members and Officers dealing with Planning Matters 2003, he had allowed the distribution of a verbatim record of Mr N Murrin's statement in respect of application GFA/19649.

DC.145 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.146 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.147 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 33

It was noted that 13 members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting. However, 4 members of the public declined to do so.

DC.148 MATERIALS

None.

DC.149 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal which had been allowed, one which had been dismissed and two which had been withdrawn.

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.150 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

A list of forthcoming public inquiries and hearings was presented.

RESOLVED

that the list be received.

DC.151 ENFORCEMENT PROGRAMME

The Committee received and considered report 96/06 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which sought approval to take enforcement action in respect of 15 Bertie Road, Cumnor to secure compliance with Condition 3, of planning permission CUM/18270/1.

One of the local Members raised no objection to the proposal.

By 14 votes to nil, with 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED

that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee, to take enforcement action in respect of 15 Bertie Road, Cumnor to secure compliance with Condition 3, of planning permission reference CUM/18270/1, if he considers it expedient to do so.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 94/06 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) detailing planning applications, the decisions of which are set out below.

Applications where members of the public had given notice that they wished to speak were considered first.

DC.152 ABG/1145/10 – CO-OP CONSTRUCTION OF REPLACEMENT RETAIL STORE WITH 9 FLATS ABOVE CO-OP, 5 – 11 WEST ST HELEN STREET, ABINGDON

The Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application a further condition should be added to require acoustic treatment of the plant.

One of the local Members raised no objection to the proposal. It was noted that the impact on local air quality would be acceptable and that the objectives of the Air Quality Management Area would not be compromised.

Other Members welcomed the revised scheme commenting that it would complement the street scene.

By 14 votes to nil with 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to approve application ABG/1145/10 subject to: -

- (1) the completion of a Section 106 obligation to secure a financial contribution towards the Abingdon Integrated Transport Strategy;*
- (2) the removal of the residents of the new flats from the Residents Parking Scheme;*
- (3) conditions, including materials, architectural details, landscaping, parking, servicing and acoustic treatment of the plant.*

DC.153 KBA/10378/8 - ERECTION OF A DETACHED GARAGE. (RE-SUBMISSION) OSIER COTTAGE, FARINGDON ROAD, SOUTHMOOR, ABINGDON

By 15 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that application KBA/10378/8 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.154 SUT/15716/4 – ERECTION OF A DWELLING. RELOCATED ACCESS TO SERVE BOTH NEW AND EXISTING DWELLING. 12 THE GREEN, SUTTON COURTENAY

Further to the report, it was highlighted that the proposal would result in the loss of two trees which were not worthy of Tree Preservation Orders.

Furthermore, the new access location was explained.

Finally, it was clarified that a sill height condition was proposed to the first floor window of the new dwelling facing Swan Acre lying to the east of the application site.

Mr Hignall, made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly referred to concerns regarding the principle of development; the proposal being dominant and intrusive; harmful impact on the Conservation Area; adverse impact on the setting of a nearby Listed Building; and adverse impact on the character of the area. He commented that the Parish Council had objected to a substantial dwelling on the adjacent site and suggested that it was not necessary to fill every gap in the Conservation Area. He referred to the vulnerability of the area and expressed concern regarding adverse impact. Finally, he suggested that consents for development locally should not be regarded as precedents for development on this site.

Mr A Woodfield, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the previous scheme which had proposed a dwelling closer to Bekynton House had been withdrawn. He commented that this scheme provided for development in the corner of the application site and in this new position, the dwelling positively addressed the public lane; the existing high timber fence would be removed opening up the area which would be a visual improvement; and the double access had been removed from the proposal and the proposed shared access had been welcomed by the County Engineer. Finally, he explained that the proposal was for a small scale cottage of a traditional vernacular design which respected the Conservation Area and materials to be used would be appropriate for such a proposal.

One member commented that he disagreed with the views of the parish Council and in his opinion the proposal would enhance the Conservation Area.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that application SUT/15716/4 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.155 GRO/16525/1 – PROPOSED ALTERATIONS FOR A MICRO WIND TURBINE ATTACHED TO THE SIDE OF THE PROPERTY. 7 MEMBURY WAY, GROVE

The Committee was advised that it had not been possible to demonstrate the noise levels of this type of micro wind turbine and therefore it was suggested that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, permission should be granted for a temporary period of one year to enable monitoring of the wind turbine in terms of noise.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the turbine was now to be set back in line with the end of the garage and therefore the Officers considered that there would be no visual impact.

The Environmental Health Officer who was present at the meeting explained that there was limited noise data available in respect of these wind turbines. He reported that the Council had to rely on information from other local authorities. He commented that it had not been possible to identify this type of turbine in an urban setting anywhere, although there were other models where advice could be given based on actual noise data. He reported that he had been contacted by the manufacturer of the proposed turbines and had been informed that they would be carrying out an assessment of noise for this model but that this would take some time and that in his opinion it was unreasonable to defer consideration of this application pending that research.

Mr C Colliass the applicant made a statement in support of the application commenting that the Committee should grant planning permission without a temporary condition attached. He commented that the Council had had significant time to obtain evidence that the proposed turbine would cause a nuisance in terms of noise. He commented that the Council had been informed where this type of turbine was sited but relevant information had not been obtained and there was no proof that harm would be caused. He suggested that permission should be granted particularly having regard to a precedent established through the granting of permission for a similar application in Abingdon. Finally, he referred to no objections being raised in terms of visual impact and advised that this type of turbine was being sold in local DIY stores and that there would be many applications for their siting.

In response to a question raised, the Environmental Health Officer advised that if permission was granted for a temporary period he would plan with applicant and local residents some regular monitoring and measurements having regard to different winds and directions.

One Member questioned why the turbine in Abingdon had been considered acceptable. The Environmental Health Officer explained that every model produced a different noise signature and consequently not all turbines were the same. It was reiterated that noise data for this type was scarce and therefore the Council had to rely on data from other authorities. However, it had been possible to identify where some types of turbines had been successfully installed without complaints.

Some Members spoke against the application considering that the turbine would be unsightly and there was uncertainty regarding noise. However, other Members spoke in support of the application but agreed that permission should be granted for a temporary period to allow monitoring.

By 14 votes to 1 it was

RESOLVED

that application GRO/16525/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.156 CHI/16952/1-X – RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH ASSOCIATED COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND ACCESS. LAND TO THE SOUTH OF CHILTON FIELD, AVON ROAD, CHILTON

Councillor Jim Moley advised that he had ceased to be the Council's representative on the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners and therefore no longer had a declarable interest in this regard.

Councillor Bob Johnston had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance withstanding Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report, the following was reported: -

- The Committee was reminded that all matters of details were reserved except access.
- 9.1 hectares of the allocated 14.8 hectares of land were to be developed which equated to 30 dwellings per hectare.
- The applicant had clarified that no trees protected by Tree Preservation Orders would be lost.
- The history of the site going back over many years was explained – this included details of the planning permission for 275 houses subject to a section 106 obligation on the neighbouring area; allocations in the former and current adopted Local Plan and the nearby Synchrotron development).
- The Officers considered that the new site had a feel of being in the open countryside and that it was a sensitive site and therefore a high quality design was needed.
- The County Council had accepted an offer of £750,000 towards secondary school education.
- Contributions required by the County Council totalled approximately £1,600,000.
- The applicant had agreed a further contribution of £71,500 for transport.
- A firm costing for upgrading the surfacing and lighting of the underpass to be carried out prior to the occupation of any of the units on the site had yet to be agreed and therefore a Grampian condition was proposed to address this.

The Committee was specifically asked to consider the following points: -

(1) Affordable Housing - In the report reference was made to a 25% provision for affordable housing. However, the new Local Plan specified a provision of up to 40% affordable housing and the Committee was asked to consider this.

(2) Art - Reference was made to a percentage for art in the application file. However, this matter had not been included in the application discussions as it had not been taken up as part of the previous proposal.

(3) Open space and community buildings – Options being discussed included one cricket pitch and one football pitch; changing rooms in a pavilion; a community room; a play area for under 10's; and a shop shell which would be marketed and if it was not taken up, it would become residential. Maintenance of these facilities needed to be discussed. It was commented that either the District Council or the Parish Council could take on maintenance although the willingness to do so was unclear. It was explained that there would be a commuted sum for maintenance for an agreed period (most likely 10 years). However, there was also the option of a management company.

Further to the despatch of the agenda the Committee had regard to additional papers which had been circulated prior to the meeting setting out amendments to Head of Terms requested by Chilton Parish Council. The following comments were made in response by the Officers: -

Affordable housing – the Officers recommended that the percentages mentioned in the Section 106 obligation should remain unaltered.

Play area - there would be a payment of £40,000 to cover play equipment. This would be included in the Section 106 obligation.

Housing provision - 275 houses would be specified in the Section 106 obligation because of the possibility of additional residential units which could be achieved instead of the shop unit.

Design and layout – the Officers considered it inappropriate to include a clause regarding design and layout in the Section 106 obligation. Instead an informative should be added to any permission to address this.

Provision of safe access to the village – this was covered by the underpass.

Preservation of community facilities level in Chilton Village – the Officers drew the Committee's attention to the report in this regard. It was explained that in the Officers' view on balance a community room on the site rather than an extension to the existing village hall was preferable because of the distances involved. It was commented that the application site was isolated from the village.

Further to the report, the Committee noted that pages from a letter from the North Wessex Downs AONB Council of Partners had inadvertently been omitted from the agenda. The Officers advised that the Partners had raised concerns regarding the development in terms of detrimental impact and lack of supporting information. The partners had suggested an environmental impact assessment. The Partners had also set out that whilst appreciating the history of the site, they were not convinced that this was an appropriate site for development. Finally, the Partners had raised concerns regarding the remoteness of the site; the need for conservation of the open countryside; the need for sustainable travel and impact on the AONB. The Partners had also offered their guidance and assistance.

Maura Launchbury made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the Parish Council's letter circulated prior to the meeting. She particularly commented that this would be the largest development outside the main towns in the Vale in recent years; it would double the size of the village; proposed payments were inadequate when compared with other developments; the application should address the needs of the community which had changed; the community room was welcomed but there was also a need for a Parish Clerk's office; the shop shell was welcomed but adequate marketing of it was essential; provision should be made for adolescents such as a youth shelter, skate park, or BMX track; the pitch and pavilion was no longer a priority for the village; the village hall was too small; the village would struggle to maintain a community room and a pavilion; two pitch spaces should be allocated as a free public amenity with money saved being spent on extending the village hall and adolescent facilities; maintenance of the new amenities should be for at least 10 years; the possibility of a management company was being considered; safe access within the village was crucial; the pedestrian route from the underpass to the development should be upgraded to include pavements on Upper Farm Road; and bus contributions should increase with hourly bus services needed.

Mr Marriott made a statement objecting to the application commenting that he represented the views of 60 to 70 residents in Chilton. He commented that whilst he appreciated the need for new housing this application was flawed. He emphasised that UKAEA was a licensed nuclear site and that a residential development so close to it was inappropriate. He referred to the possibility of an emergency evacuation of the site commenting that there had been significant difficulties with a previous evacuation which had involved only 12 houses. He asked Members to consider such an event with significantly more houses. He raised concerns regarding the proposal in terms of visual impact; size; density; development of green field land; the proposal being out of keeping; and visually harm for a long time until new trees were mature. He commented that there should be no development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty unless natural beauty was conserved or enhanced. He stated that the traffic survey was useless. He commented that it could take some time for one vehicle to exit from the access let alone many vehicles as would be the case with this development. He commented that this was the situation before the new ISIS development and before the Synchrotron was fully operational. He commented that the local school would soon reach full capacity. He stated that binding conditions should be added to any permission but he considered that the site should be reduced in size and that trees should be protected.

Nicky Green, the applicant's agent made a statement in support of the application commenting that the site was allocated in the Local Plan and therefore the principle was accepted for a development of 275 dwellings. She advised that the scheme was in outline with the playing fields and houses being illustratively laid out. She reported that the Environmental impact assessment was to address concerns regarding visual impact. She reported that she was aware of concerns regarding layout which she stated could be addressed at the reserved matters stage. She referred to a previous planning permission on the adjacent site for 275 dwelling, explaining that the legal agreement for that had formed the basis for this application with extra financial contributions. She reported that affordable housing had been discussed at 25% under the previous Local Plan requirement. She stated that it was reasonable to continue on that basis now. She explained that a contribution toward art had not been discussed. She reported that there was no objection to a contribution towards improvements to the existing village hall instead of towards a new community hall. She stated that there was to be a significant contribution of £1.7mil as well as the affordable housing element. Finally, she advised that there was a risk that approval of the application might be delayed pending matters to be negotiated.

One of the local Members commented that the section 106 obligation had never been completed in respect of a planning permission which was to be issued on an adjoining site. She commented that the Parish Council had been in negotiation with developers and planners in this regard for many years. She commented that she was not opposed to the principle of development but expressed concern regarding the financial contributions. She referred to the main concern of the Parish Council that the head of terms had been based on those some years ago and that circumstances had now changed and requirements had also changed. She suggested that an extension to the village hall would be preferable to a new community room especially having regard to new disabled access rules and a good management arrangement for the hall already being in place. She commented that design was important and that soft and hard landscaping was essential. She commented that whatever percentage of affordable housing was provided, preference should be given to local people. She advised that footpaths and upgrading of existing footpaths was needed and that bus services to the new development and village should be provided. Finally, she commented that consideration of the application should be deferred if it was likely that acceptable heads of terms could be negotiated.

In considering the application, Members made the following comments: -

Principle of Development

- The principle of development had been firmly established as part of the planning process.

Affordable Housing

- The percentage of affordable housing sought should remain at 25% as most of the application negotiations had taken place when a 25% policy had been in place.
- If there was the possibility the percentage of affordable housing could be increased this should be sought, it being suggested that the Council had a duty to get the highest amount possible.
- Further negotiations to increase the percentage of affordable housing might detract from the other benefits arising from this development.
- The applicants had negotiated 25% affordable housing in good faith.
- The chances of securing more than 25% affordable housing were negligible and the development might become unviable. Therefore there would be less money for other community benefits.

Village Hall Extension/Community Room

- An extension to the existing village hall was preferred particularly as its management was already in place. It was commented that establishing a management regime for a new facility might be difficult.
- It was further commented that a separate community room might divide the community.
- An extension to the village hall in preference to a community room was supported.
- A scheme for an extension to the village hall needed to be costed up it being noted that the applicant would provide the community room as part of the development.
- By way of a straw poll there voted 14 for, nil against with 1 abstention in favour of an extension to the village rather than the provision of a new community room.

Facilities for Adolescents

- Consideration should be given to providing facilities for adolescents as suggested by the Parish Council.
- There should be some provision made for the youth. By way of a straw poll this was supported nem con.

Play Equipment

- A financial contribution of around £155,000 mentioned by the Parish Council should be provided for all play equipment.
- If £155,000 was requested for play equipment a costed acceptable proposal needed to be drawn up.

Maintenance

- The District Council should not bear the cost of future maintenance of the open space or play area.
- Any maintenance should be in perpetuity. A costed figure need to be agreed for this.

Shop Shell

- There were concerns regarding the shop shell, it being noted that a similar facility in Radley had had little interest in it.
- Concerns were expressed that the chance of the shop shell being successful was remote.
- If the Committee was not convinced that a shop shell would be successful then this might be offset for better facilities for youths.
- The one shop in Chilton had closed a few years ago and it was considered that there was little chance of a shop being successful in this area. By way of a straw poll there voted 11 for, nil against with 4 abstentions in support of not having a shell shop as part of this proposal.

Layout/Design

- The illustrative layout was not supported.
- An informative should be added to advise that the Council would be seeking design and construction to be of a very high standard. An excellent marker should be sought.
- In terms of design and layout there was a lack of detached housing and terracing.
- It was agreed that the layout of the site needed to be reconsidered as set out in paragraph 5.7 of the report and that an informative to this affect should be added to any permission.

Financial Contributions

- Financial contributions sought by the County Council and the Parish Council were clearly set out. It was suggested that the Officer should have thought about financial

contributions which this authority might want as part of this proposal and to bear this point in mind for future applications.

Minibus

- A minibus to transport youngsters to the village hall from the application site should be considered.

Percentage for Art

- A percentage for art was a requirement under the previous and current Local Plan and a calculation to determine this was available.
- Adding a percentage for art did not necessarily mean that another benefit would be compromised. By way of a straw poll it was agreed that a percentage for art should be sought.

It was noted that the application was due to expire of 26 October and that the Officers had tried to ensure that this major application was determined within the statutory period. However, it was important that the heads of terms for the section 106 obligation covered all matters satisfactorily.

It was explained that it was not unreasonable to have the initial head of terms as a basis for discussions as part of this application.

It was noted that the Committee could refuse the application. The applicant might then appeal to the Planning Inspector against refusal. The matter would then be in the hands of the Inspector who would be able to determine the appeal and either set out that there should be financial contributions made or not. As such there was the possibility that there might be fewer benefits achieved for the community.

It was suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred to enable negotiations with the applicant. It was commented that the time to allow for this should be three months, but the Officers asked that the time be left to their discretion as three months was insufficient.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

- that consideration of application CHI/16952/1-X be deferred to enable the Officers to conclude negotiations concerning the Section 106 heads of terms having regard to the comments set out above;*
- that local Members be kept informed of the progress of negotiations; and*
- that a report be presented back to Committee seeking final approval of the head of terms.*

DC.157 ABG/19609/1 – ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSIONS TO FORM A BATHROOM AND LARGER LOUNGE SPACE. 34 AUSTIN PLACE, ABINGDON

One of the local Members raised no objection to the proposal.

Members had regard to the Officer's comments and considered that it would be reasonable in this case to omit the rear window and provide a roof light to prevent overlooking.

By 15 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/19609/1 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.158 GFA/19649 – CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS ROAD TO SERVE ALLOCATED HOUSING SITE. LAND ADJOINING COXWELL HOUSE AND WINSLOW HOUSE, COXWELL ROAD, FARINGDON

Councillor Robert Sharp had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

Councillor Tony de Vere had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 he remained in the meeting during its consideration.

The difference between the original plan and the amended plan was explained. In respect of some objections that had been made it was clarified that ownership of land was not a material planning issue.

Mr C Davis had given notice that he wished to make a statement objecting to the application, but he declined to do so.

Mr N Murrin made a statement objecting to the application raising concerns regarding density; vehicle movements and traffic; access; visibility; vision splay; vehicle and pedestrian safety; land ownership; traffic speed; the traffic survey being inadequate; lack of public transport; lack of infrastructure and on street parking.

One member spoke in support of the application commenting that the site was an allocation site in the adopted local plan and that the provision of an access was necessary. The proposed access met the requirements of the County Engineer and there were no grounds to refuse the application.

By 14 votes to nil, it was

RESOLVED

that the Chief Executive in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee be delegated authority to approve application GFA/19649 subject to:-

- (1) the completion of the consultation period on the amended drawings; and*
- (2) conditions including vision splays, construction of the access, movement of the main carriageway, landscaping and the provision of a bus shelter.*

DC.159 SUT/19729/1 – ERECTION OF A DOUBLE GARAGE. 48 MILTON ROAD, SUTTON COURTENAY

Mr Hignell made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council objecting to the application, raising concerns regarding the bulk of the garage; its relationship to the adjacent properties; size; unneighbourliness; overlooking; loss of open outlook; and vehicle movements causing noise and disturbance. He emphasised that the external staircase was inappropriate in this location and the neighbour would suffer loss of privacy. Finally, he referred to the “fall back”

position commenting that development with a lower ridge height would prevent the conversion of the roof space.

Mr R McGovern the neighbour, made a statement objecting to the application explaining that he had no objection to a garage in principle but that the current proposal should be reduced in size. He explained that the proposal was very large and would be dominant. Whilst similar proposals had been approved nearby, he explained that these were in the part of the road which had a mix of houses and the land dropped away reducing impact and bulk. He explained that on this site the land rose to the back and there were mostly bungalows in the area. He commented that the top of the garage would be clearly visible on the landscape. He also expressed concerns regarding overlooking explaining that it would be possible for people to stand in the doorway at the top of the external staircase and overlook his garden. This was not the case for the other neighbouring garages where the staircases were internal.

Some Members expressed concern regarding the potential for overlooking and loss of privacy and considered that the external staircase was unneighbourly.

In response to a comment made, the Officers explained that siting the staircase internally had not been discussed with the applicant as the garage was to be sited far down the plot. It was suggested that given the length of the garden the external stairs were not so harmful as to warrant refusal.

The higher ground at the end of the garden was highlighted and it was suggested that consideration of the application should be deferred to allow negotiations with the applicant to relocate the staircase internally.

One Member commented that should the Committee consider that the application should be approved, a slab level condition should be added to any permission.

It was proposed by Councillor Terry Cox, seconded by Councillor Monica Lovatt and by 11 votes to 4 it was

RESOLVED

that consideration of application SUT/19729/1 be deferred to enable discussions with the applicant seeking the relocation of the staircase inside the garage.

Exempt Information under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972

None.

The meeting rose at 9.55 pm