

At a special Planning Meeting held in the village hall at Little Stukeley on Wednesday 21st March 2007 at 7.30pm the following were present; Mrs.S.Parkin, M/s. M. Reynolds, S. Lloyd, R. Hulstrom, H. Raby, D. Hossack, C.Cowdery, T. Pinner, M. Monk, D. Middleton and five members of the public.

APOLOGIES

were received from Mrs. S. Gifford and M/s R. Turpin, P. Hobson, P. Ryan, D. Adams.

CHAIRMAN

Mr. Pinner said that there was only one item on the agenda and that he had to declare a prejudicial interest and would take no part, he asked if it were alright if he remained in the hall, the Council agreed this to be in order. He then handed the meeting over to Mr. Monk the vice chairman.

OPEN MEETING

Mr. Monk said the only item was planning application for the conversion and extensions of a barn to form a dwelling at the rear of 38 Church Way Little Stukeley, Application 0700635FUL. He invited comments from the floor.

Mr Campbell said that he was representing an objection made by Mr. & Mrs. Payne of the Old Rectory.

He said the main objection was the use of the Rectory driveway for access, he said Mr. Pond only had casual user rights and that the existing access to 38 Church Way was an alternative or the provision of a new access through that properties grounds. He also stated that the proposed alterations were not acceptable as they impacted on the listed status of the Old Rectory, also that planning policy is to preserve buildings within a conservation area. It was also considered to be a backland development, he suggested that agreement could be achieved between the parties, as in principle there was not an objection, he further suggested that the application be withdrawn until such time as an acceptable access is established and planning detail agreed.

Mr. Pond then said that he had applied for the access on the grounds that it had been in use for some 40 years, he also stated the reason for the application was to attain a smaller property so as to reduce his workload in his retirement years, he also agreed that a solution may be negotiable.

Mr. Monk informed councillors that the decision had to be made upon the application before them and not on any other not submitted proposals.

He also said that major issues to consider were, material harm that may occur from additional use of the driveway and also visual intrusion and impact on the conservation area. On this issue Mrs. Parkin suggested that an extra 19 movements might be anticipated weekly. Mr. Hulstrom felt that the impact of the use of the driveway and also the visual impact on a listed building were sufficient grounds for refusal, Mr. Lloyd felt that as the building already existed and was

adequately shielded by the existing high brick wall there were insufficient grounds for refusal, he also added that he felt the proposals were an improvement to the environment and not a detraction, he was supported in this by Mr. Middleton. Much discussion on the relevant issues then took place, after this Mr. Hulstrom made the following proposition. The Application be refused on the following grounds.

- 1.The proposed access using the driveway of the Old Rectory, being a listed building, would be harmful to the setting of that building and the amenity and safety of it's residents.
- 2.The design of the proposed alterations and extensions would have an adverse impact on the setting of the Old Rectory as a Listed Building and an adverse impact on the Little Stukeley conservation area.
- 3.The proposal is backland development and therefore contrary to the policy set out in the development plan.

This proposition was seconded by Mr. Raby and in the following vote was agreed by five votes in favour, with four against.

It was further proposed by Mr. Monk and seconded by Mr. Reynolds that the District Planning authority be advised;

Notwithstanding the above recommendation, the Council further resolves that it does not object in principle to the sensitive conversion and extensions of the barn to form a dwelling subject to an alternative and satisfactory means of access being achieved and the design of any alterations and extensions being sympathetic to the Conservation Area and the setting of the Old Rectory, this was agreed with seven votes in favour with two abstentions.

The clerk was instructed to communicate these decisions to the District Council as soon as was practicable.