APPENDIX A

Extract from Area North Committee minutes – 27th June 2012

12/00875/OUT (Pages 57-62) – Outline application for the erection of a dwellinghouse (GR 342381/120419), Island House, Stembridge – Mr. Brian Stuckey.

Prior to summarising the details of the application, the Planning Officer, in updating members reported the details of an additional letter received in objection to the application. She further reported the receipt of a letter from the applicant's agent stating that ten local residents had indicated that they had no objection to the application.

The Planning Officer, with the aid of slides and photographs, then summarised the details of the application as set out in the agenda report. She referred to the key considerations to be taken into account being the location of the site outside of any development area and the planning history of Stembridge where there was a consistency of dismissed appeals for residential development, details of which were included in the agenda report. The Committee noted that the recommendation was one of refusal for the reason set out in the agenda report and that, if the Area Committee was unwilling to accept the officer's recommendation, it would need to be referred to the Regulation Committee.

The Committee noted the comments of the applicant's agent, Mr. M. Williams, who indicated that the applicant was grateful for the opportunity of bringing the application to Committee. He referred to the applicant's family being long standing members of the community and indicated that the dwellinghouse would be used within the family, details of which he explained to the Committee. Reference was made to the applicant wishing to build a two or three bedroom house, which he commented would meet with the Parish Council's objective of having smaller dwellings in the village. He commented that the site was not in open countryside and had buildings adjacent on three sides. He did not feel that the building would be intrusive and indicated that it would not be visible from the through route. He explained the reasons for his view that the proposed dwelling would be in a sustainable area and also why he felt that the application could be granted in policy terms. In referring to the objections, he mentioned that they had not been submitted by people who lived locally and that local people had confirmed their acceptance of the proposals. Reference was also made to the applicant being willing to improve the lane from which the property was accessed. He asked the Committee to approve this outline application to enable the applicant to prepare detailed plans for a dwelling, which would enable an extended family to live in the village and provide a dwelling of a smaller size.

Cllr. Derek Yeomans, ward member, referred to there having been no facilities or services in Kingsbury Episcopi until recently. He informed members of the facilities that were now available including a shop and a pub as well as the primary school. In referring to the history of other residential development in Stembridge having been refused, he commented that those applications had been refused for good reasons. He referred to Stembridge having deliberately been kept separate from Kingsbury Episcopi so that the two villages did not run as one. He referred, however, to this site being between two existing houses and although the access lane was in a poor state of repair, the applicant had indicated that he would be prepared to do some remedial work to it. He further commented that the lane had to be traversed to reach some Yarlington homes and its improvement would, therefore, be beneficial to the public. He indicated his support for the application, which he felt was on an eminently suitable site, not in open countryside and would bring benefits to Stembridge.

During the ensuing discussion, other members indicated their support for the comments of the ward member and were of the view that the application should be referred to the Regulation Committee with the recommendation that it be approved because it was considered that Stembridge was not an unsustainable location for new residential development, the site was situated between existing houses and not in open countryside and would cause no harm to residential amenity. It was also felt that the proposals would benefit the community given the offer of the applicant to carry out remedial work to the access lane. In that respect it was felt that any permission should be subject to a Grampian condition to require improvements to the access road.

The Committee was also of the view that it would be beneficial for members of the Regulation Committee to hold a site visit prior to determining the application.

RESOLVED: (1)

- that the application be referred to the Regulation Committee with the recommendation that it be approved because it was considered that Stembridge was not an unsustainable location for new residential development, the site was situated between existing houses and not in open countryside and would cause no harm to residential amenity. It was also felt that the proposals would benefit the community given the offer of the applicant to carry out remedial work to the access lane. In that respect it was felt that any permission should be subject to a Grampian condition to require improvements to the access road;
- (2) that members of the Regulation Committee be recommended to visit the site prior to determining the application.

(11 in favour, 1 abstention)