

Planning Committee

A meeting of Planning Committee was held on Wednesday, 14th June, 2017.

Present: Cllr Norma Stephenson O.B.E(Chairman), Cllr Helen Atkinson, Cllr Carol Clark, Cllr Nigel Cooke, Cllr Gillian Corr, Cllr Philip Dennis, Cllr Lynn Hall, Cllr Sally Ann-Watson(Sub Cllr Elsi Hampton), Cllr Paul Kirton, Cllr Mick Stoker, Cllr Tracey Stott, V Vacancy, Cllr Ian Dalgarno(Sub Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley), Cllr David Wilburn

Officers: Elaine Atkinson, Greg Archer, Peter Shovlin(EG&DS), Julie Butcher(HR,L&C), Sarah Whaley(A,D&ES)

Also in attendance: Applicants, Agents, Members of the Public

Apologies: Cllr Elsi Hampton, Cllr Mrs Sylvia Walmsley

P Evacuation Procedure

23/17

The Evacuation procedure was noted.

P Declarations of Interest

24/17

Cllr Philip Dennis declared a Personal Non Prejudicial interest in relation to item 17/0641/REM Land Adjacent To 12 Butts Lane, Eggescliffe, TS16 9BT as he was Ward Councillor for Eggescliffe. Cllr Dennis was not predetermined.

P Draft Minutes from the Planning Committee Meeting which was held on the 24th May 2017

25/17

Consideration was given to the draft minutes from the Planning Committee Meeting which was held on the 24th May 2017 for approval and signature.

Cllr Philip Dennis highlighted that his apologies had been submitted for the meeting of the 24th May 2017 however had not been recorded. It was agreed that the minutes of the 24th May 2017 were to be rectified to contain Cllr Dennis's apologies.

RESOLVED that the minutes from the meeting which was held on the 24th May 2017 be approved with the above amendment and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

P 17/0641/REM

26/17

**Land Adjacent To 12 Butts Lane, Eggescliffe, TS16 9BT
Application for reserved matters approval (scale, appearance layout and layout) for a three storey dwelling with attached garage and associated access.**

Consideration was given to a report on planning application 17/0641/REM Land Adjacent To 12 Butts Lane, Eggescliffe, TS16 9BT.

The consultees that had been notified and the comments that had been received were detailed within the main report.

Neighbours were notified and the comments received were detailed within the main report.

The planning policies and material planning considerations that were relevant to the consideration of the application were contained within the main report.

The Planning Officers report concluded that overall it was considered that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale and it was considered that the site could satisfactorily accommodate the proposal without any undue impact on the amenity of any adjacent neighbours.

It was considered that the reserved matters were in general accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Development Plan policies, and therefore the recommendation was to approve the reserved matters application subject to the conditions contained within the main report.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted an error at paragraph 7 of the report which stated that, 'Boundary treatments will consist of 1.8m high close boarded fence and hedge to the west side of the plot and with the existing 1.2m high estate railings to the north side being retained'. This should have stated that the 1.8m fence was to be to the north which would go in-between the host property and the proposed property. The 1.2m high estate railings which would remain was located at the western side.

Objectors attended the meeting and were given the opportunity to make representation. With the exception of those submissions already provided during the consultation period, and detailed within the report, objector's comments could be summarised as follows:

- The property was too large and would dominate, not blend with the existing environment.
- Exiting for the new residents would be difficult as movement of traffic was problematic on Butts Lane.
- The 20MPH speed limit was usually ignored.
- Yarm had been spoilt by wholesale development; Eggescliffe was being spoilt by piece meal development.
- The proposed dwelling was not in line with a covenant which stated that all buildings were to be set back 50 feet from the road.
- The proposed 3rd storey would dominate No.12's garden.
- No.12 would also only see the blank side of the proposed dwelling from their garden.
- Light pollution would disturb the varied and delicate wildlife population in the woodland.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by

Objectors. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- In terms of the size of the dwelling, the proposed building was to be 9.4 metres high where as the host property was 9.5 metres high. There were also other properties within the vicinity which were higher than 10 metres. Therefore the Local Authority did not believe the proposal to be excessive in terms of size as the 3rd storey was within the roof space.
- Traffic concerns had been dealt with at outline approval.
- Concerns relating to the covenant were a civil issue.
- Although there would be more light it was not considered to be significant to warrant refusal. the woodland however would remain

Members were given the opportunity to ask questions/make comments on the application and these could be summarised as follows:

- Questions were raised as to what types of materials would be used during construction.
- It was felt that there was a danger of back filling with new properties in the designated open space behind residents gardens, spoiling the character of the area.
- Assurances were sought as to the further information required by the Highways Transport and Design Manager in relation to highways as detailed within the report.

Officers were given the opportunity to respond to comments/issues raised by Members. Their responses could be summarised as follows:

- Where questions had been raised relating to building materials, it was highlighted that the Historic Buildings Officer was satisfied with the appearance as indicated, however a condition at outline application did exist to control the final details of the materials.
- In relation to the designated open space at the rear of resident's gardens, the Senior Planning Officer explained that if applications did come in they would be dealt with on an individual basis.
- Officers explained that there was no additional information required relating to traffic and highways. The visibility splays as requested in the outline application had been provided and the car parking had been provided in accordance with the SPD. The additional information which the report referred to was in relation to arboricultural details and also the fencing details which were conditions on the outline application and would be discharged should the application be approved.

A vote took place and the application was approved.

RESOLVED that planning application 17/0641/REM be approved subject to the following conditions and informatives;

01 Approved Plans

The development hereby approved shall be in accordance with the following approved plan(s);

Plan Reference Number	Date on Plan
1501-15-105	8 March 2017
1501-15-100 REV D	10 March 2017
1501-15-103 REV B	13 March 2017
1501-15-101 E	4 May 2017

Arboricultural Impact Assessment ARB/AE/1217
31 May 2017

INFORMATIVE OF REASON FOR PLANNING APPROVAL

Informative: Working Practices

The Local Planning Authority has worked in a positive and proactive manner and sought solutions to problems arising in dealing with the planning application by gaining additional information required to assess the scheme and by the identification and imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

P 27/17 Cllr Stephen Parry

Following the resignation of Cllr Stephen Parry, the Chair, Cllr Norma Stephenson offered her and Committee Members thanks for the support and help received from Cllr Stephen Parry during his time as Vice Chairman of the Planning Committee.

P 28/17 1 Appeal - Maher Entertainments Ltd - Land East Of 2 Bentley Wynd, High Street, Yarm 15/2082/FUL - DISMISSED 2. Appeal - Mr and Mrs Snowdon - Homefield Farm, High Lane, Maltby 16/2170/FUL - ALLOWED WITH CONDITIONS AND COSTS ALLOWED

The Appeals were noted.