

**P11**  
**MINUTES of THE PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**in the TURTON PAVILION**

**Monday 30<sup>th</sup> July 2018 at 7.30 p.m.**

1.   **Present**               AS (Chair), AB, CT, PG  
      **Apologies**        Nil  
      **Public**            Two members of the public

2.   **Minutes**

2.1     The minutes of the meeting of 5<sup>th</sup> June 2018 were approved and signed.

2.2     Matters arising – 4.2 PA 18/2620M – Nywen, Pickmere Lane – the Clerk reported that there had not yet been a decision on this application.

3.   **Declarations of Interest – nil**

4.   **Detailed Planning matters**

**4.1.1     PA No. 18/3159M – Outline – Two bungalows – Land at Sunnyside, Pickmere Lane**

Members agreed the following conclusions:

- There may be some discrepancy between the submitted application, which indicates that the applicant owns all the land edged in red on the application plan, and the Parish Council's previous understanding, which suggests that ownership here is more complicated and there may be a separate owner for the land shown to the north of a faint line identified on the submitted drawings immediately to the north east of the proposed bungalows, that line being consistent with a line shown on the Land Registry drawing forming part of the applicant's supporting evidence document. CEC is requested to investigate and assure themselves that the applicant's Article 14 Certificate is accurate.
- The Parish Council wishes to remind CEC that, pressed by the Parish Council, CEC is in the process of pursuing planning enforcement action in respect of the unauthorised retention on the application site of a mobile home/caravan and believes that that issue should be resolved before this application is dealt with. That process too was apparently being delayed by complexities over land ownership in this location. The Parish Council wishes to see that planning problem resolved before consideration is given to any other form of development.
- The application site lies within the Green Belt; this proposal does not contain the very special circumstances required to warrant contravention with Green Belt policy. The proposal does not constitute infill as described in NPPF.
- There is only a form of planning approval for one (mobile) home on the application site; there is absolutely no justification for that one dwelling being replaced by two, in this Green Belt context.
- The Parish Council therefore objects to the current application for the reasons given.

In coming to these views, the Parish Council and its Planning Committee have been in dialogue over several months with residents of the Sunnyside site, and understand the views that they have expressed. The Parish Council wishes to continue to be helpful to the local community but does not see this proposed development as the right way forward to resolve the future of the application site.

#### **4.1.2 PA No. 18/3531M – Variation of Condition 3 attached to PP 06/2171P – The Brambles, Pickmere Lane**

Members wished to support the retention of Condition 3 on PP 06/2171P on the basis that the extensions approved at that time exceeded the 30% limit normally imposed by the local planning authority on house extensions in the Green Belt. Further, without prejudice to that view, the construction of the extensions forming the subject of the recent planning application for this dwelling (18/2278M) added to the extensions built onto this property following 06/2171P would greatly exceed the 30% allowance defined in the local plan. The Parish Council would therefore not wish to support the further extension of this property.

Members also referred to its recent request that CEC investigate the activities being carried out at this property, evidenced by the storage of several shipping containers on the site and other characteristics, and in that context wished to draw CEC's particular attention to Condition 4 attached to PP 06/2171P which required that the dwelling's garage, parking areas and turning area be retained and made available for use at all times. It seems likely that the storage of the containers etc referred to above contravenes this condition.

#### **4.1.3 PA No. 18/3587M – Extension and conversion of former garage/playroom to ancillary accommodation – Crown Farm, Frog Lane**

Members had the following comments:

- The proposal would constitute a considerable increase in the property's footprint and would add significantly to the additions to the dwellinghouse previously approved under PA 00/1470P. It was noted that condition 11 attached to that permission prevented the construction of further permitted development additions to the building without explicit planning permission. Such extensions would exceed the 30% allowance for house extensions in the Green Belt defined in the development plan. The proposal would therefore conflict with CEC's Green Belt policy.
- No justification is given for the creation of what appears to be a new residential unit in this Green Belt location. Such a development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
- Members also referred to condition no. 19 attached to PA 00/1470P and requested CEC to check that the existing use of the 'playroom' referred to in this application (in the separate building) is in compliance with planning control and does not conflict with this condition.

#### **4.2 Newly received planning applications: PA No. 18/3463M – Construction of replacement dwelling – Caroldene, Park Lane**

Members had the following comments:

- The proposed extensions to the existing property specified in the CLUD 18/0956M would exceed CEC's normal policy of a maximum of 30% extension of dwellings in the Green Belt and if not permitted development would be likely to be unacceptable to CEC; the proposed new dwelling is comparable in size with this (proposed) extended dwelling and therefore

any justification that the replacement of the hypothetical extended dwelling with a new dwelling of equivalent size should not be countenanced.

- The likelihood of the 'permitted development' extensions to the current dwelling being built is unknown and is not a credible justification for the construction of a new dwelling in Green Belt. The proposal is not replacing an existing building but a notionally enlarged building which does not exist.
- Taken on its own merits, the proposal is a new dwelling in Green Belt, substantially larger than the existing, and with substantial related works to provide improved vehicular access etc. The proposal is inappropriate in Green Belt.
- Members noted that the 'existing driveway retained and improved' (shown on the submitted drawings) appears to constitute no more than a route across a field (see the photograph on page 9 of the Agent's Design and Access Statement), and there does not even appear to be an actual driveway within the gates to the existing dwelling. No driveway actually therefore seems to exist. The 'improvement' of both these elements will result in undue suburbanisation in this rural Green Belt location. It does not appear that works to 'improve' any such driveway were included in the CLUD permission 18/0956M.

**4.3 Current Planning Enforcement Issues** – The following situations were discussed:

- Caravan on land at Frog Lane – awaiting CEC's response to our enquiry;
- Activities and containers etc at The Brambles, Pickmere Lane – see above; awaiting CEC's response to our enquiry;
- Mobile homes at Sunnyside, Pickmere Lane – see above; awaiting CEC's response to our enquiry;
- 118 Pickmere Lane – encroachment of garden onto CEC highway land - awaiting CEC's response to our enquiry; Clerk requested to remind CEC.

**4.4 Current position in relation to Spinks Lane** – AS reported that we had not received a reply to our letter of 25 June 2018 to CEC's Acting Chief Executive, expressing extreme concern over the lack of action and of communication about progress in this matter. Members noted this with continued concern and dismay. AS also reported that a letter had been sent to the Environment Agency with regard to a resident's report of human waste being found on the footpath at Spinks Lane, and requesting the EA's comments on sewage disposal arrangements at the site. A response was awaited.

**Clerk: Jack Steel**