

DC.29

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

**HELD AT THE GUILDHALL, ABINGDON
ON MONDAY, 2ND JULY, 2007 AT
6.30PM**

Open to the Public, including the Press

PRESENT:

MEMBERS: Councillors John Woodford (Vice-Chair), Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Jenny Hannaby, Hayward, Lawrence, Marchant, Jerry Patterson, Shaw, Margaret Turner and Tony de Vere.

SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS: Councillor Jim Moley for Councillor Terry Quinlan, Councillor Zoe Patrick for Councillor Richard Farrell, Councillor Reg Waite for Councillor Peter Saunders and Councillor Chris Wise for Councillor Richard Gibson.

OFFICERS: Sarah Commins, Rodger Hood, Laura Hudson, Carole Nicholl, Andrew Thorley and Stuart Walker.

NUMBER OF MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC: 41

Prior to the formal business of the Committee for the benefit of members of the public, it was announced that in the absence of Councillor Terry Quinlan the Chair of the Development Control Committee, the Vice-Chair, Councillor John Woodford, would be chairing the meeting. It was reported that Councillor Woodford wished it to be known that he had a slight speech impediment as a result of a stroke suffered in 2002 and he therefore occasionally found it difficult to find his words.

DC.40 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 Richard Farrell, Richard Gibson, Terry Quinlan and Peter Saunders.

DC.41 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meetings of the Development Control Committee held on 23 April and 21 May 2007 were adopted and signed as correct records.

DC.42 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations were made in report 28/07 – Planning Applications as follows: -

<u>Councillor</u>	<u>Type of Interest</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Reason</u>	<u>Minute Ref</u>
Roger Cox Terry Cox Tony de Vere Jenny Hannaby	Personal	CUM/95/8	In so far as they were acquainted with Dr H Dickinson, the speaker on behalf of the Parish Council,	DC.51

Angela Lawrence Jim Moley Zoe Patrick Jerry Patterson Margaret Turner Val Shaw Chris Wise John Woodford			who was a former District Councillor.	
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/1615/51	In so far as she was a Member of Abingdon Town Council which had commented on the application.	DC.52
Roger Cox Terry Cox Angela Lawrence	Personal	MAR/5011/4	In so far as they were acquainted with Mr J Martin, a speaker objecting to the application, who was a former Council Officer.	DC.53
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/8524/9	In so far as she was a Member of Abingdon Town Council which had commented on the application.	DC.54
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/8757/7-A	In so far as she was a Member of Abingdon Town Council which had commented on the application.	DC.55
Carole Nicholl – Head of Democratic Services	Personal and Prejudicial	WAT/13873/3	In so far as she owned a neighbouring property in and also had an interest in other land in the vicinity of the application site.	DC.56
Rodger Hood – Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy)	Personal and Prejudicial	SHR/20042	In so far as he lived in Shrivenham and he was acquainted with many of the residents. He advised that he had had no dealings with the application.	DC.58
Angela Lawrence	Personal	ABG/20061	In so far as she was a Member of Abingdon Town Council which had commented on the application.	DC.59
Roger Cox Terry Cox Tony de Vere Jenny Hannaby Anthony Howard Angela Lawrence Jim Moley Jerry Patterson Margaret Turner Reg Waite John Woodford	Personal	SAH/20100	In so far as they were acquainted with David Calvert, the speaker on behalf of the Parish Council, who was a former District Councillor and had been a candidate in the recent elections.	DC.60

DC.43 URGENT BUSINESS AND CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair reminded Councillors and members of the public that they should switch their mobile telephones off during the meeting.

The Chair announced that application GRO/19162 – Provision of a new Railway Station north of Grove, on land adjacent to the A338, the former railway station at Grove, had been withdrawn from the agenda. In response to a question raised, it was reported that this was at the request of the County Council, who was the applicant.

Finally, the Chair announced that application SHR/20042 – Erection of 14 dwellings and new access, land adjacent to 31 Stainswick Lane, Shrivenham, would be considered first.

DC.44 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER
32

None.

DC.45 QUESTIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER 32

None.

DC.46 STATEMENTS AND PETITIONS FROM THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER
33

It was noted that twelve members of the public had each given notice that they wished to make a statement at the meeting.

DC.47 MATERIALS

None.

DC.48 APPEALS

The Committee received and considered an agenda item which advised of one appeal which had been allowed by the Planning Inspectorate as follows:-

Appeal by S J Alden against the Council's decision to refuse to permit the erection of a dwelling and garage at 2 Abingdon Road, Sutton Courtenay (SUT/4647/1-X).

RESOLVED

that the agenda report be received.

DC.49 FORTHCOMING PUBLIC INQUIRIES AND HEARINGS

The Committee received and considered a list of forthcoming Public Inquiries and Hearings.

RESOLVED

that the report be received.

DC.50 ENFORCEMENT REPORT

The Committee received and considered report 27/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) which sought approval to take enforcement action at 29 Park Road, Abingdon to secure the removal of an unauthorised fence. However, further to the report Members were advised that the owner of the property had since reduced the height of the fence to 1 metre. In addition, a hedge had been planted and a new fence of 1.8 metres high had been erected beyond this. The Officers explained that both fences were now deemed to be permitted development and as such no further action could be taken.

RESOLVED

that no further action be taken with regard to pursuing enforcement action and that this item be removed from the active enforcement list.

PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Committee received and considered report 28/07 of the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) regarding various planning applications, the decisions of which are recorded below.

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

DC.51 CUM/95/8 - PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT OF 4 X 2 BED FLATS WITH REFUSE BIN AND CYCLE STORES. RE-POSITIONED AND UPGRADED VEHICULAR ACCESS AND DRIVE. (RESUBMISSION). PLOT 2, 205A CUMNOR HILL OX2 9PJ

Councillors Roger Cox, Terry Cox, Tony de Vere, Jenny Hannaby, Angela Lawrence, Jim Moley, Zoe Patrick, Jerry Patterson, Margaret Turner, Val Shaw, Chris Wise and John Woodford had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Further to the report the Committee was advised that should it be minded to approve the application, an additional condition, standard condition LS10 regarding landscaping, should be added to require the maintenance of the landscaping at a specified height.

Dr H Dickinson made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council, objecting to the proposed development, raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He particularly raised concerns regarding its bulk, design, density, size, parking and proximity to the Green Belt. He explained that this site was too small for the development proposed and as such would have an adverse impact on the character of the area. Finally, he referred to the rumble strips, suggesting that they

could result in a noise nuisance to residents and neighbours and that other forms of traffic calming should be used.

Mr P Blake, the applicant's agent, made a statement in support of the application, advising that the objections raised concerning bulk, overlooking and parking had been addressed in the Officer's report. He explained that there would be six dwellings and not seven as stated by the Parish Council and that the Highways Authority had suggested that only one rumble strip should be provided but the applicant was willing to consider other traffic calming measures. He explained that the footprint was similar to the footprint already approved, there would be parking to the rear and that the landscape scheme he submitted would provide screening for the car parking area.

The local Member raised no objection to the application, commenting that it was very similar in appearance to the development already approved. However, he commented that alternative methods of traffic calming should be considered as rumble strips could result in a noise nuisance.

Some Members spoke in support of the application, agreeing that an alternative scheme of traffic calming should be considered; the proposal was not so significantly different to that approved to warrant refusal and providing appropriate materials were used, such as brick and render, the development would have the appearance of a large house which would not be out of keeping in this location. It was commented that the proposal was not in the Green Belt and that although being adjacent to the Green Belt was a material planning issue, in this case the site was separated from the Green Belt boundary by existing new dwellings.

One Member referred to waste collection, questioning whether a condition could be added requiring the developer to provide waste bins. In response, the Officers advised that it would not be appropriate to put a condition requiring the provision of waste bins. It was explained that this sort of requirement would normally be secured through a Section 106 obligation and that the Council currently did not have a policy in place requiring such provisions from small developments of this type. However, it was suggested that Condition 10 set out in the report should be amended to provide that notwithstanding the detail of the submitted plans, a revised bin and cycle storage arrangement should be agreed and available for use prior to first occupation to ensure ease of access for waste collection vehicles.

In response, to a further question raised, it was explained that it was not necessary to impose a condition to prevent development into the roof space of the new building as flats did not have permitted development rights and that planning permission would be sought for such development.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application CUM/95/8 be approved subject to:-

(1) the conditions set out in the report, with

(a) Condition 10 being amended as follows:-

“notwithstanding the detail of the submitted plans, revised bin and cycle storage should be agreed and available prior to first occupation”;

(b) Condition 6 being amended to require that a scheme of access and traffic calming measures should be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(2) additional conditions to address landscaping (standard condition LS10) and external lighting.

DC.52 ABG/1615/51 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARDEN CENTRE. EXTENSION TO STORE AND CAR PARK. TESCO, MARCHAM ROAD, ABINGDON

The Committee recalled that at its meeting held on 21 May 2007 it had been resolved that this application be refused with the reasons for refusal to be formally endorsed at a future meeting of the Committee.

By 8 votes to 1, with 6 abstentions, and it being recorded in the Minutes that those Members who had abstained had not been present at the meeting when the application was considered, it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/1615/51 be refused for the reasons set out in the report.

DC.53 MAR/5011/4 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND OUTBUILDINGS. ERECTION OF 4 X 4 BEDROOM DWELLINGS, ACCESS, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. COTSDALE, ABINGDON ROAD, MARCHAM, OX13 6PX

Councillors Roger Cox, Terry Cox and Angela Lawrence had each declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 they remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Mr D Hutchinson made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council, commenting that whilst no objection would be raised to a sympathetic and appropriate development of the site, there were concerns regarding this proposal in terms of its scale, mass and design. He commented that there were too many houses proposed and that this would be too high, especially as there was an incline on the site resulting in even higher building. He referred to the access, commenting that the road was already an over busy route through the village. He expressed surprise that there had been no consultation with appropriate authorities and he referred to the listed building next to the development site. He reiterated concerns regarding height and explained that at the eastern gateway to the village properties were low level and previous applications for two storey properties had been refused. Finally, he suggested that a single storey development of no more than two units might be acceptable and that the application should be deferred to enable consideration of this.

Mr J Martin made a statement objecting to the application, raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. He commented that four large dwellings on this site were not acceptable in view of their proximity to the highway, their adverse visual impact on this main approach into the village, density, inadequate screening and height. As a result the proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the surrounding area. He referred to a previous decision to refuse planning permission which he considered had not been taken into account and commented that planning policy statement 3 provided that villages should not be dealt with in the same way as urban areas and that Members should have regard to the rural character of this site. Finally, he commented that the proposal was contrary to Policies DC1 and DC9 of the Council's Local Plan and that Members should be consistent in their decision making and refuse this application.

Mr N Lyzba, the applicant's agent, made a statement in support of the application, commenting that the proposal was in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 3 in terms of density; it was a good development and made a good use of the land. He reported that the site was currently occupied by an undistinguished bungalow and that the development proposed would be more traditional in design. He explained that the bedrooms were to be in the roof space so the proposal was not two storey; access was adequate, height was acceptable and there had been no objections from the Highways Authority. He explained that the density was low in view of the sewer across the site which needed to be safeguarded and retained. He commented that a bungalow would be out of keeping and that the scheme had no real impact on the listed building referred to, apart from a visual improvement. Finally, he commented that the proposal was neighbourly and should be supported.

One of the local Members commented that the Parish Council had been proactive in encouraging housing in the village but the key to this was protecting the character of the village. She advised that the entrance to the village was undistinguished because the existing property was barely noticeable. She explained that the development was proposed on a raised site and would be two storeys and would present the entrance to the village in a different way. She commented that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, an additional condition to require slab levels to be agreed should be included and she requested to be consulted as local Member on the scheme. Finally, she commented that the current gateway to the village should be retained and raised concerns regarding the existing level of traffic on the access road and pedestrian safety.

Some Members spoke in support of the application, agreeing that the proposal accorded with Planning Policy Statement 3; the density was low and there was no reason to refuse the application. One Member commented that there was a well in the garden to which the Officers responded that in light of this the Council's Environmental Health Officer's comments with regard to the application would be checked.

Another Member made reference to the sewer in the site, questioning the easement between the structures, to which the Officers advised that Thames Water had raised no objection in planning terms.

One Member questioned whether a financial contribution could be sought towards waste collection. However, the Officers responded that the Council had yet to establish a policy regarding smaller developments and that the likely sums involved were less than the likely costs in securing such contributions.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee and the local Member, be delegated authority to approve application MAR/5011/4 subject to:-

- (1) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (2) a further condition to provide for slab levels to be agreed and the slab constructed before any development above slab level proceeds;*
- (3) the Officers seeking confirmation from the Environmental Health Officer that he has no objections to the proposal in terms of the well on the site.*

DC.54 ABG/8524/9 - ERECTION OF TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO PROVIDE 4 ADDITIONAL BEDROOMS AND A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE A NEW LAUNDRY, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED PARKING. LEAFIELD CARE HOME, SPRINGFIELD DRIVE, ABINGDON, OX14 1JF

Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Mr Darter made a statement objecting to the application on behalf of his mother who had lived nearby for some 30 years. He raised concerns regarding size, proximity, continuous development and extension, parking, increased traffic, noise, proximity of the driveway to neighbouring properties and the adverse impact as a result of the laundry room in terms of noise and smell. He referred to previous problems in the past where the Environmental Health Officer had had to intervene and whilst recognising the need for the Care Home, he considered that the proposed extension was out of keeping and inappropriate in this residential area.

One of the local Members raised no objection to the proposal and considered that there were no grounds for refusal.

Another Member commented that having regard to the concerns raised regarding the potential noise from the laundry room, a condition should be imposed restricting its hours of use.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/8524/9 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition to restrict the hours of use of the laundry room between 7.00am to 10.00pm daily.

DC.55 ABG/8757/7-A - ERECTION OF TWO.. ILLUMINATED PROJECTING SIGNS, ONE ILLUMINATED FASCIA SIGN, TWO ILLUMINATED MENU/POSTER BOX SIGNS AND ONE ILLUMINATED POLE SIGN. PIZZA EXPRESS, 9 STERT STREET, ABINGDON, OX14 3JF

Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

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

By 13 votes to 2 it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/8757/7-A be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

DC.56 WAT/13873/3 - ERECTION OF A DETACHED FOUR BEDROOM HOUSE. LADYS CLOSE, 27 HIGH STREET, WATCHFIELD, SN6 8SZ

Carole Nicholl, Head of Democratic Services had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 35 she withdrew from the meeting.

Some Members expressed concern at the proposal in terms of its height and to this end it was considered that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, a slab level conditions be added. One Member expressed concern that the proposal was too large and over dominant and it was noted that the access might require other consents in addition to planning permission although it was accepted that this was not a material planning consideration.

By 12 votes to 3 it was

RESOLVED

that application WAT/13873/3 be approved, subject to:-

- (1) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (2) a further condition to require slab levels; and*
- (3) the informative set out in the report.*

**DC.57 GRO/19162 - PROVISION OF A NEW RAILWAY STATION NORTH OF GROVE, ON
LAND ADJACENT TO THE A338. FORMER RAILWAY STATION AT GROVE**

As referred to elsewhere in these Minutes this application was withdrawn from the agenda.

**DC.58 SHR/20042 - ERECTION OF 14 NEW DWELLINGS AND NEW ACCESS. LAND
ADJACENT TO 31 STAINSWICK LANE, SHRIVENHAM, SN7 8DX**

Rodger Hood, Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) had declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 35 he withdrew from the meeting during its consideration.

The Committee's attention was drawn to one of the requirements of the exception site policy, which was that the scheme should be supported in principle by the local community and represented by the Parish Council. Officers had been concerned by the level of local objection. However, the Parish Council fully supported the scheme which was vital. Officers acknowledged that the proposal would have an impact on the character of the rural edge of the village. However, exception sites were usually proposed on edge of village locations due to the very nature of the policy. It was emphasised that as stated in the report, the majority of the housing was set back from the road frontage and most of the hedging would be retained. A Section 106 Agreement would be required to restrict occupation and the County Engineer had no objection in terms of access and parking.

The Committee was advised that the applicants had agreed to amend the plans in accordance with the requirements of the Consultant Architect's suggestions.

The Committee was advised that two further letters reiterating objections previously raised had been received, and an additional email stating that the Defence Academy was undertaking an internal establishment development plan review as a result of which some sites, perhaps including the telephone exchange site might be considered for other uses.

Furthermore, the Committee was advised that the Council's Arboricultural Officer had raised no objection to the proposal, commenting that no major trees would be harmed as the substantial oaks were far enough away from the development. However, he had suggested that there should be a fence round the development.

Furthermore, it was noted that Natural England had commented that trees and hedgerows both provided important roosting and foraging habitats for bats and providing that no current dwellings, trees or hedgerows would be lost to the development, no reasons could be seen why bats would be affected.

Furthermore, the Officers explained that the applicant had submitted an email received from its consultant relating to the surveys undertaken as part of the eco home accreditation. It was explained that the applicant wished to provide eco homes seeking to maximise the credits available in respect of the ecology of the site and as such ecological assessments should be undertaken before any major development.

The statement received from the applicant in this regard was read out in full at the meeting.

The Committee was advised that a statement had been received from Councillor Peter Saunders, one of the local Members, which was also read out in full. The local Member expressed support for the proposal, referring to the need for affordable housing which would benefit local people; the results of the housing needs survey conducted in 2004 and the comments to the Parish Council from the District Council's Deputy Director (Housing), indicating that there were 191 people currently on the housing register and that 14 houses would only contribute a very small proportion of the local housing need; the consideration given to alternative sites; the Oxfordshire Diocese support for the proposal; the proposal meeting the criteria for development on an exception site.

Finally, the Officers advised that should the Committee be minded to approve the application, approval should be subject to receipt of amended plans to reflect the comments of the Consultant Architect, an amended plans condition and a condition to provide for a footpath to the front of the site.

Sarah Day made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council in support of the application, commenting that she had been approached to sign a petition opposing the development and it had been suggested that the new housing would be occupied by criminals. She referred to the ever increasing prices of houses, commenting that the proposal would provide affordable housing for local people.

Colin Holman also made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council in support of the application advising that 14 houses would be provided and that there currently 191 people on the housing register who had expressed a preference to live in the Shrivenham area. He referred to the investigation of alternative sites including the telephone exchange site, and whilst noting the strong local opposition, the current site was proposed based on its merits and the willingness of the owner to allow the land to be sold for affordable housing for local people. He emphasised that this was the only site available in Shrivenham.

Anne Davis made a statement objecting to the application, raising concerns relating to matters already covered in the report. She raised concern that the site had been chosen ignoring the comments in the survey and the views of some 66% of the residents. She referred to the petition opposing the site advising that signatures had been given freely. She raised concern that the proposal would detract from the tranquil buffer between the village and the countryside, harmful impact on the habitat for wildlife; loss of open space; inadequate pavement; vehicle manoeuvrability; pedestrian safety; increased traffic; proposal being out of keeping with the surrounding area. She commented that bungalows would have been more sympathetic to the surrounding area and whilst it had been suggested that there would not be affordable housing in Shrivenham, the Chair of the Parish Council had indicated that should the application be unsuccessful an alternative site would be found. She emphasised that a large proportion of the community objected to the proposal and stressed that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, she suggested its deferral for proper consultation, commenting that a previously unidentified site would be becoming available.

Stuart Roberts, the applicant's agent, made a statement in support of the application, referring to the significant number of successful schemes previously undertaken. He referred to the overwhelming need for affordable housing in this area and that the houses would be allocated to local people. Furthermore, the applicant would be entering into a Section 106 Obligation to retain some of the houses to prevent them being sold outright.

Members spoke in support of the application, referring to a similar proposal elsewhere which had initially been unpopular but had subsequently been accepted. It was noted that there were no highway objections and that deeds and covenants were not a relevant planning consideration. It was noted that the proposal accorded with planning policy and that there was no reason for refusal. In response to a question raised, the Officers advised that the proposed footpath would link to the existing footpath network and that there would be some changes internally to the access layout resulting in the removal of a footpath and the provision of additional landscaping.

With reference to potential other sites, the Committee noted that it needed to consider each application on its merits as submitted. It was noted that there was sufficient need for housing and that the local people would benefit from the proposal.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that the Deputy Director (Planning and Community Strategy) in consultation with the Chair and/or Vice-Chair of the Development Control Committee, be delegated authority to approve application SHR/20042 subject to:-

- (1) the completion of a Section 106 Agreement to ensure that the housing remains affordable for local people in perpetuity;*
- (2) the submission of amended plans to reflect the comments of the Consultant Architect;*
- (3) the conditions set out in the report;*
- (4) a further condition to provide for amended plans; and*
- (5) a further condition to provide that the footpath shown on the plans shall be implemented.*

DC.59 ABG/20061 - ERECTION OF A GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO LIVING ACCOMMODATION. 14 DUFFIELD CLOSE, ABINGDON, OX14 2RS

Councillor Angela Lawrence had declared a personal interest in this item and in accordance with Standing Order 34 she remained in the meeting during its consideration.

Another local Member, whilst noting the comments of the Town Council, expressed no objection to the proposal.

By 10 votes to 4, with 1 abstention, it was

RESOLVED

that application ABG/200/61 be approved subject to the conditions set out in the report and a further condition to provide for the receipt of amended plans.

DC.60 SAH/20100 - EXTENSION OF EXISTING GARAGE TO FRONT OF PROPERTY AND SIDE EXTENSION TO CREATE WORKSHOP. 53 ROOKERY CLOSE, SHIPPON, OX13 6LZ

David Calvert made a statement on behalf of the Parish Council, advising that whilst the Parish Council had no objection to some extensions which complemented the design of the area, the Parish Council had concerns regarding the side extension which would be located right up to the boundary of the neighbouring house. He raised concern regarding proximity and the overhang gutters. He commented that virtually all houses in the area had a passageway and the Parish Council would wish to see the front of the side extension set in by half a metre with the corner taken from the front. Finally, he advised that the Parish Council had no objection to the bringing forward of the garage.

Steven Coates, the applicant, made a statement in support of the application advising that he had lived in the area for some 30 years and was concerned to ensure the visual appearance and character of the area would be maintained. He explained that there was no difference between his proposal and similar extensions elsewhere in the road which he outlined. He commented that there was no difference in proximity and that the proposed extension was to be sited where a garage had previously been erected. Finally, he commented that the proposal did not amount to terracing and that there would be no adverse impact.

The local Member raised no objection.

By 15 votes to nil it was

RESOLVED

that application SAH/20100 be approved, subject to the conditions set out in the report.

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

None.

The meeting rose at 9.00 pm