

Shottisham Parish Council

Minutes of a Planning Meeting held on Tuesday 7th February 2017 at Shottisham Trust Hall

Present: Chairman Mike Hazelwood, Cll Nigel Good, Cll Kevin Dunnett

Attendees: Clerk Lesley Roberts, Cll Christine Block and 5 members of the public.

1-07/08/17 Apologies received: Cll Jay Fletcher

2-07/08/17 No Declaration of Interest

3-07/8/15 To consider response to planning application DC/17/0180/FUL Rushlake House, The Street, Shottisham. Proposed conversion of existing building from office to form annex accommodation.

Councillors looked at the plans at the start of the meeting before the Chairman MH read out some pre-prepared notes to provide more detailed background information about the original planning application in 2013. He then outlined the basis for the decision to change the use of the unit from B1 use to a residential annexe and provided some questions to help with the decision making process.

To ensure compliance with Policy DM10 of the SCDC core strategy July 2013 the applicant needs to demonstrate compliance with one of the two statements below.

1. That there is no current or long term demand for the retention of the site for employment use.

The councillors agreed that there was a lack of evidence that there is no current or long term demand for an office building on the site because it has never been marketed as being available for use. There is also no evidence available to prove that the rural location and lack of facilities nearby has had a detrimental effect because the building has not been marketed to test for local interest.

2. That there would be planning benefit from permitting an alternative use.

The applicant is concerned that operating a separate business in the unit would potentially cause a loss of amenity to the occupiers due to noise and increased traffic movements. However, councillors were reminded that this was a condition of the original approval so cannot now be viewed as a loss.

The councillors also discussed the benefits that the applicant states that the conversion of an annex to the main house would bring, and came to the following conclusions. The increase in potential traffic movements could be alleviated by carefully vetting the person who took on the lease to ascertain that the industry was suitable for the space and did not involve the use of large delivery vehicles. The unit is only 80m sq so would only employ a few people and as it only has 3 parking spaces allocated to it the level of traffic should not prove more annoying and noisy to neighbours than that generated by residential use. A significant amount of money needs to be spent on improving the building fabric and converting it to an annex would ensure that this work is carried out. There was some debate

as to why this could not be done while keeping it for its original purpose. However, councillors thought it unlikely that the building would be maintained if it was kept as a B1 unit rather than converting it to an annex.

When the debate was finished both Cll KD and Cll NG declared that they had no objections to the planning application - based on their view that it would be preferable to convert to residential use rather than leave the building empty - and they could see no reason why it should not be approved. The chairman Cll MH disagreed with their decision and reminded them that the application did not comply with the two statements from Policy DM10 above. Two members of the public also questioned why the councillors were not taking any note of the planning legislation.

Given the strong views that led to the requirement for B1 use being included in the original approval DC/13/2042/FUL, and that there had been no material change in the intervening period, but wishing to respect the views of Cllr KD & NG, it was agreed that the Council would submit a verbatim report of the meeting as their response to SCDC.

Chairman:

Date: