

## **Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10th December at 6.15pm in the Great Shelford Sports Pavilion.**

Present; Cllrs Hodge (Chairman), Coggins, Fane, Shelton, Talbott and Nightingale.

1. Apologies: Cllrs Harwood and Milson.

2. No declarations of interest.

7 members of the public were present who commented were on 19 Tunwells Lane and The Railway Tavern site. The developers of Shrublands spoke about their proposal for the site.

3. The minutes of the meeting of 18<sup>th</sup> November were received, approved and signed.

4. Current applications.

S/2714/15/FL, Former Shrublands, Kings Mill Lane. Mr. Shepherd. Demolition and erection of new house.

(Initially the vote on this application was tied and no recommendation was proposed but subsequently a member of the committee reported that their recommendation was refusal and not approval, because of overdevelopment and the recommendation was changed to refusal.)

Recommend refusal.

In the Village Design Statement (VDS) Kings Mill Lane is identified as one of the 'scenically..most attractive parts of the village which reflects the original rural settlement'.

Whilst much of the development in the vicinity of the application site was built in the 1970's, it is modest in scale and form and sits quietly in the street scene.

The VDS states that new development should respect the scale of the village setting and SCDC's Design Guide states ' architectural styles should be relevant to the particular location' and in terms of streetscape ' infill sites (which this will be if the existing house is demolished) should complement the street pattern by continuity of form and design. They will be expected to make best use of the site whilst enhancing the rhythm of the established street pattern' and consideration should be given to factors such as heights and storey heights of buildings compared to their width.

We appreciate that the floor area occupied by the proposed building is no greater than that of Dandy's opposite but that building has a much smaller first floor area and the basic form is rectangular with gables and single storey additions which reflect the agricultural buildings characteristic of this part of the village.

We believe that the statement in the VDS that 'the formal simplicity of traditional village building is a model for new development ' should definitely apply in this sensitive location in the conservation area.

The proposed building by virtue of its design, bulk, form and materials is out of character with the existing development in Kings Mill Lane and contrary to advice in design guides.

S/2562/15/FL, 39 Tunwells Lane. Mr. P. Rhodes. Enlargement of gateway, replacement gates and railings.

Recommend approval but would like the yew to be replaced by another tree to retain the green edge to Tunwells Lane.

S/2859/15/FL, 38 High Green. Mr & Mrs. Barnes. Side and rear roof extension.

No objections to side roof extension but the proposed dormer is too large, will be visually intrusive when viewed from Maris Green and is out of keeping with the character of the conservation area.

Refuse as a whole.

S/2904/15/FL, 3 Redhill Close. M. De Simone. Extensions and alterations.

No objections as long as the neighbours are happy.

S/2806/15/FL, 78 High Street, Mr Gary Vindis, Erection of detached car port (Part retrospective)

No objections.

S/2820/15/FL, The Railway Tavern, Station Road, Demolition of existing building and erection of 12 dwellings and associated new access and landscaping.

Recommend refusal.

The amendments to the design and layout in S/0291/15 /FL are minor and insufficient to overcome our original objections. We continue to believe the proposal will have an adverse impact on the residents of neighbouring properties and on the character of the surrounding area.

S/2903/15/FL, 19, Tunwells Lane, Mr & Mrs Main, Extension to roof to provide 2nd floor

Recommend refusal.

The proposed extension by reason of its design, height and bulk is out of keeping with the street scene and the character of this part of the conservation area and is therefore contrary to Policy DP/2 of the approved LDF.

In addition the increased height and bulk to the south of 17 Tunwells lane will have an adverse impact on the residential amenities of that property and is there contrary to policy DP/3.

S/2854/15/FL, 3 Halatte Gardens, Mr Alex Munoz, Conversion of attic space to create additional bedroom.

We feel the velux windows are too large and should be reduced in size.

No recommendation.

S/2857/15/FL, 2 Woollards Lane, Mr & Mrs D Scahill, Single storey front extension to form porch entrance and wet room.

No objections.

5. To note applications determined since 18<sup>th</sup> November.

Approved.

S/0743/15/FL and S/0762/15/LB, 68 High St. Dr. A. Roberts. Extension to chimney.

S/2053/15/FL 7 Davey Crescent. Mr & Mrs Staines. Two storey side extension and porch.

S/2455/15/FL 31 Maris Green. Mr & Mrs Shackleton. Replacement bay window.

S/2574/15/FL, 26 Buristead Road, Mr & Mrs Summerfield , Single storey extension to front and rear / two storey extension to side of house.

S/2614/15/FL Ash Cottage, Tunwells Lane. Mr & Mrs Lewis. Single storey rear extension.

S/2718/15/FL, Block C, Quern House, 5 Mill Court. Tarras Park Properties Ltd. Installation of 5 wall mounted condenser units.

S/2562/15/FL, 39 Tunwells Lane. Mr. P. Rhodes. Enlargement of gateway, replacement gates and railings.

#### Refusals

S/2783/15/FL, 19 Hinton Way. Mr. D. Southby. Rear dormer window.

S/2560/15/FL, 74 Hinton Way. V.Bowkett. Single storey side extension to provide ancillary accommodation.

#### 6. Tree applications.

No objections to work proposed at 9 Hinton Way and 10 Elms Ave.

Strongly oppose felling of larch at 3 Woodlands Rd. Application refused by SCDC.

7. Neighbourhood Plan. Prior to the meeting on Jan 26<sup>th</sup> there will be a meeting with Stapleford P.C. to discuss the format of the meeting.

#### 8. Matters for future consideration.

It was agreed that the proposal by SCDC to take an area of land out of the green belt adjacent to Nine Wells for employment would be discussed at the next full council meeting.

BH to draft a response for consideration.

9. As there were no other matters for consideration the meeting was closed at 7.05pm.

