

Delegation meeting - Minutes

- **Date:** 16 April 2024
- **Time:** 11:00 – 12:30
- **Meeting held:** via Teams

Attendees: Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee), Rebecca Smith (Delivery Manager (DM West & Compliance)), Mary Collins (Senior Planner), Laise Facada (Planning Officer)

Apologies: Cllr Martin Cahn (Chair of Planning Committee)

Minutes approved by: Cllr Peter Fane (Vice Chair of Planning Committee) 22.04.2024

24/00579/HFUL – 22 Caxton Lane Foxton

Part removal, raising of ridge height and new roof of existing single-storey dwellinghouse to create second storey, two storey front and two storey rear extensions with part single storey side and rear extensions and alterations to existing fenestration, materials and windows.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish requested/objection -

Proposed extensions would change bungalow to a two storey dwelling which is uncharacteristic of Caxton Lane

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (MC) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together details of the site designations. The planning application relates to the raising the ridge height on the main element of the property to create a second storey, together with the addition of two storey front and rear extensions and a side extension. The site is located within the development framework and with open countryside to the rear.

The case officer advised that the Parish Council are in objection to the proposal on the grounds of the impact of the proposed extensions on the character of the dwelling and character of the street scene.

4 objections have been received from neighbouring residents, raising similar concerns relating to the nature of the proposal and impact on amenity.

The case officer outlined the relevant adopted local plan policies as well as the neighbourhood plan policy FOX1 which seeks to ensure extensions to existing buildings reflect and enhance the streetscene and respect the rural character of the village.

It was acknowledged that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not significant in context. There is limited public interest in the scheme, and it was not considered there were any policy implications. Consequently, in consultation with the Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee

24/00861/HFUL - 24 Fountain Lane Haslingfield

Demolition of existing single storey front extensions, two storey front and side extension and single storey flat roof rear extension.

Reason for Call-in Request:

Parish requested/objection -

All councillors objected to this application due to concerns about loss of privacy. The majority objected due to concerns about overdevelopment of the site. The PC requests that the application is considered by the planning committee.

Key Considerations:

The Case Officer (LF) introduced the application outlining the details of the planning application, as well as the existing context of the site and surrounding area, together details of the site designations (Surface water constraint). The planning application relates to the demolition of the existing front extension and erection of front, side and rear extension. The site is located within the development framework.

The case officer advised that the Parish Council are in objection to the proposal on the grounds of the overdevelopment of the site and subsequent impacts on the amenity of neighbouring residents by reason of loss of privacy.

1 objection has been received from neighbouring residents, raising similar concerns relating to the nature of the proposal and impact on amenity.

The case officer outlined the relevant adopted local plan policies relating to development of this scale and nature within a development framework, and clarified the nature of the use of the proposed rooms with windows on the side elevation. The concerns of the neighbouring resident relating to the accuracy of the plans was also noted.

It was acknowledged that the nature, scale and complexity of the proposed development is not significant in context. There is limited public interest in the scheme, and it was not considered there were any policy implications. Consequently, in consultation with the Vice Chair of the Planning Committee, the Delivery Manager considered, on balance, the proposal should not be referred to the planning committee.

Decision

Do not refer to Planning Committee