

SCOTTER PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday 4th September 2006

Present : Councillor S. Rayner (Chairman), Councillors M. Brown, J. Allen, B. Billam, D. Capes, J. Fillingham and A Sheardown, M. Brown (Clerk).

Apologies : None

P24 2006/07– MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

It was proposed by Councillor Brown and seconded by Councillor Fillingham that the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 7th August 2006, as circulated, be approved and signed by the Chairman of that meeting.

P25 2006/07 – NEW APPLICATIONS

The Committee discussed the applications on the agenda and at the conclusion of its deliberations, Councillor Billam, seconded by Councillor Rayner, proposed that the following observations should be made to WLDC. All present were in agreement.

M06/P/0860 REAR OF 14 MESSINGHAM ROAD, SCOTTER – an outline planning application for one dwelling and approval of access.

NO OBJECTION

M06/P/0856 PONDEROSA, GAINSBOROUGH ROAD, SCOTTER – a planning application for extension to dwelling to provide snooker room, gymnasium, garage and conservatory.

NO OBJECTION

M06/P/0798 PLOT 1, REAR OF 17 MESSINGHAM ROAD, SCOTTER – a reserved matters planning application to erect a detached dormer bungalow with attached double garage (granted outline planning permission under M03/P/1551).

Considering the requirements of the outline planning permission, the Clerk is to examine the planning approval in place for Plot 2 (M05/P/0573) and, if the requirements have not been covered in this permission, make an appropriate comment to this end (such comment to include the observation that the erection already appears to be at an advanced state).

NO OBJECTION Having examined the approval in relation to M05/P/0573, the Clerk added the following comment in relation to the new application:

“My Council has considered this application in relation both to the outline application M03/P/1551 and to the reserved matters application M05/P/0573 submitted in relation to Plot 2. Whilst my Council has no objections in principle to the application, it is keen that condition 5 of the outline requirement (the requirement that details of landscaping of the western boundary are agreed in writing by the local planning authority) is also a requirement of any permission granted under this application, to minimize the impact of the development on the adjoining countryside. It would also wish to point out that this condition (which was also made a condition of M05/P/0573) required that the landscaping details were agreed before the commencement of any development. My Council is surprised and disturbed to note that it would appear that the erection of a dwelling on Plot 1 is already at an advanced state, prior to the consideration of any reserved matters and the granting of approval. This is totally contrary to the planning process”.

Initialled Chairman

M06/P/0886 97 GAINSBOROUGH ROAD, SCOTTER - a planning application to erect extension and alterations to provide additional accommodation.
NO OBJECTION

P26 2006/07 PUBLIC OPEN SPACE UNDER APPLICATION M06/P/0677 (BEAL HOMES)

The Clerk explained to the Committee her recent discussions with Mr A. Broome, Planning Officer, in relation to the Council’s decision to object to the proposal on the grounds that the investment in the public open space did not appear to meet the requirements of Condition 10 of the outline planning permission which stated that “no development shall take place until details of proposals for the provision and long term management of informal recreational land or play space have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, including a timetable for the construction and landscaping of and provision of seating and other equipment within such areas and the areas shall then be provided in accordance with the agreed details.”

Mr Broome has confirmed by e-mail that “the plan meets the necessary criteria in terms of its area and a second play area is not really appropriate here – we are looking at an amenity area, landscaped with a path and a seat”. Mr Broome understands that the Council’s decision to object was made to prevent future disagreement over investment in such facilities, as currently witnessed in relation to the Waggoners Close development (a development of similar size). However, the wording of the conditions in relation to the two developments does vary and Mr Broome confirmed that this is because the nature of the proposed housing on the Beal Homes’ development does not lend itself to the requirements placed on the Waggoners Close development. Mr Broome feels that the Council may be better served by raising the question of the application and interpretation of such conditions as a matter of principle with the planning authority. He went on to point out that, if the Council continues to object on this issue, this will force the application to the planning authority’s Planning Committee and result in a delay.

The Committee considered Mr Broome’s comments against the background that the Chairman and Clerk will be meeting Beal Homes to discuss the arrangements for this open space on Friday 8th September 2006. It was agreed that the objection be withdrawn on the basis of Mr Broome’s advice but that the Clerk should write for full clarification on the application of conditions in relation to open spaces and to request that, in future, such conditions are clearly spelled out to avoid differences in interpretation.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 7.44pm.

Clerk:

Chairman:

Date:

Initialed Chairman