

Minutes

Planning Committee

19th January 2010



Present

Councillors	Present	Councillors	Present
J E Abbott	Yes	D Mann	Yes
E Bishop	Apologies	Mrs J M Money	Yes
J C Collar	Yes	Lady Newton	Apologies
Mrs E Edey	Apologies	J O'Reilly-Cicconi	Yes
Ms L B Flint	Yes	Mrs W D Scattergood (Chairman)	Yes
T J W Foster	Yes	Mrs L Shepherd	Yes
Mrs B A Gage	Yes	Mrs G A Spray	Yes
Mrs M E Galione	Yes		

Councillors R J Bolton and N G McCrea were also in attendance.

126 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The following declarations of interest were made:

Councillor R J Bolton declared a personal and prejudicial interest in Application No. 09/01524/FUL – Finkle Green Cottages, Finkle Green, Birdbrook as he was a Member of Birdbrook Parish Council, his sister and brother-in-law lived at Finkle Green Farm, Birdbrook which was adjacent to the application site, and some objectors were known to him. Councillor Bolton indicated that he wished to speak on the application during Question Time, but he left the meeting whilst the application was discussed and determined.

Councillor J C Collar declared a personal interest in Application No. 09/01524/FUL – Finkle Green Cottages, Finkle Green, Birdbrook as some objectors were known to him.

Councillor D Mann declared a personal interest in Application No. 09/01424/FUL – Chelmsford Star Co-operative Society Ltd, 62 Church Street, Braintree as he was a member of the national Co-operative Society and occasionally he shopped at the store which was the subject of the planning application.

In accordance with the Code of Conduct Councillors remained in the meeting and took part in the discussion when the applications were considered, unless stated otherwise.

127 MINUTES

DECISION: That the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 15th December 2009 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

128 QUESTION TIME

DECISION: Due to the number of people requesting an opportunity to speak on Application No. 09/1463/FUL - land adjacent to 2 Whitlock Drive, Great Yeldham and to enable equal numbers of people to speak for and against the application it was moved, seconded and subsequently resolved that the period of 30 minutes allocated for Question Time be extended by 21 minutes.

INFORMATION: There were seventeen statements made, a summary of which is contained in the Appendix to these Minutes.

Any amendments to the Officers' recommendations having taken into account the issues raised by members of the public would be dealt with by conditions, a summary of which is contained within the appropriate minute. Full details of the Decision Notices are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

129 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPROVED

It was moved, seconded and agreed that planning applications 09/01596/FUL – 2 Spinney Cottages, Brent Hall Road, Finchingfield and 09/01498/FUL – 24 Elm Walk, Rayne contained within Part B of the Agenda be approved en bloc in accordance with the Head of District Development's recommendations.

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning applications be approved under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, including Listed Building Consent where appropriate, subject to the conditions contained in the Head of District Development's report, as amended below, details of which are contained in the Register of Planning Applications.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01524/FUL (APPROVED)	Birdbrook	Mrs Wendy Norris	Erection of wind turbine, Finkle Green Cottages, Finkle Green.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the amendment of Condition No. 3 and to an additional Condition and Information to Applicant as follows:-

Amended Condition

3. The noise emission (LA90, 10 minute) from the wind turbine at any property shall not exceed the greater of 35 dB(A) or 5 dB(A) above background noise (LA90, 10 minute) during the period 0700hrs to 2300hrs and shall not exceed the greater of 43dB(A) or 5dB(A) above background noise during the period 2300hrs to 0700hrs.

Additional Condition

6. If at any time the wind turbine ceases to be operational it shall be dismantled and permanently removed from the site.

Additional Information to Applicant

2. In respect of Condition 3 above, any noise assessment for the purposes of demonstrating compliance with the condition shall be carried out in accordance with the recommendations and methodologies set out in the ETSU-R-97 Guidance as required by PPS22 appropriate for a single turbine and agreed by the local planning authority.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/1424/FUL (APPROVED)	Braintree	Chelmsford Star Co-operative Society Ltd	Variation of condition no. 9 on previously approved application 02/00750/FUL to enable the delivery of newspapers prior to 7am Mondays to Sundays inclusive, Chelmsford Star Co-operative Society Ltd, 62 Church Street.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the first sentence of the second paragraph of Condition No. 1 being amended to read:-

‘Deliveries on Sundays and Bank Holidays shall be restricted to newspapers only and shall only take place between the hours of 0700 hours and 1800hours.’

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01542/FUL (APPROVED)	Cressing	Mr Ennosel Domonic Savio	Erection of extension to 20 Mill Lane and erection of a new 3 bed dwelling on land adjacent together with new crossover and parking for both properties, 20 Mill Lane.

Councillor Clive Hawkins, the Chairman of Cressing Parish Council, attended the meeting and spoke on this application. Councillor Hawkins considered that the proposal represented overdevelopment of the site and that the visibility sight lines in Claude Ince Avenue, Cressing would be compromised by the development. Councillor Hawkins stated that Claude Ince Avenue and Mill Lane were on a bus route and that buses had restricted access at the junction of the two roads due to parked vehicles. There was also a bus stop near to the site in Mill Lane. Councillor Hawkins expressed concern about safety issues, particularly for young families and older people. Councillor Hawkins stated that the proposed access arrangements to the development would lead to the loss of the greensward and he expressed concern that there would be no rear access and restricted provision for refuse containers. The Parish Council considered that the proposal would affect the character of the area.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the amendment of Condition No. 5 and to an additional Condition and Information to Applicant as follows:-

Amended Condition

5. Development shall not be commenced until a scheme(s) including an implementation timetable for the following has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority:-
- (a) water efficiency, resource efficiency, energy efficiency and recycling measures, during construction
 - (b) measures to secure water conservation, recycling of rain water, sustainable drainage and other devices to ensure the more efficient use of water within the completed development
 - (c) measures for the long term energy efficiency of the building(s), and renewable energy resources
 - (d) details of any proposed external lighting to the site.

The development shall be constructed in accordance with the approved details and thereafter so maintained.

Additional Condition

13. Notwithstanding the approved plans, details showing the location and design of refuse bin and recycling materials storage area (for internal and external separation) and collection points for both properties shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. These areas shall be constructed and made available for use prior to occupation of the new property.

Additional Information to Applicant

5. You are advised that in respect of Condition No. 13 above, that it is suggested that the position of the refuse areas shown on the approved plan is not acceptable, and where possible these should be located to the rear of each of the properties.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01596/FUL (APPROVED)	Finchingfield	Mr Knight	Erection of two storey extension and cartlodge, 2 Spinney Cottages, Brent Hall Road.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/1463/FUL (APPROVED)	Great Yeldham	Dr William Littler & AH Medical Properties Plcs	Application for a new planning permission to replace an extant planning permission in order to extend the time limit for implementation - Erection of G P Practice, multi purpose clinical room with associated parking, land adjacent, 2 Whitlock Drive.

Councillor Mrs Pat Slimming, the Chairman of Great Yeldham Parish Council, attended the meeting and spoke on this application. Councillor Mrs Slimming stated that Great Yeldham was in desperate need of a new Doctors' Surgery as the present Surgery was inadequate, having no privacy, no treatment room, no parking, no access for people with disabilities and it was too hot for staff to work in comfortably during the Summer. Councillor Mrs Slimming stated that if planning permission was not granted, the Doctors would withdraw from Great Yeldham and people would have to go elsewhere which would be particularly difficult for people without transport. Councillor Mrs Slimming stated that Great Yeldham was the focal point for many of the surrounding villages. Councillor Mrs Slimming indicated that other sites within the village had been considered as possible locations for the new Surgery, but none of these was suitable.

The Committee approved this application, subject to the amendment of Condition No. 15 and to an additional Information to Applicant as follows:-

Amended Condition

15. No development shall commence until plans showing visibility splays with dimensions of 2.4m x 33m as measured from and along the nearside edge of the carriageway have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until sight splays in accordance with the approved details have been provided and each splay shall be kept clear of any obstruction exceeding 600mm in height at all times thereafter.

Additional Information to Applicant

5. Your attention is drawn to the Highway Authority's comments that Doctors' Surgeries are notorious traffic generators and that the 17 / 18 parking spaces proposed seems to be an under provision. You are advised that the Local Highway Authority would give a favourable consideration to additional parking spaces being provided on site if this were felt appropriate by the applicants and this may be considered as part of your application to discharge Condition 19 above.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01482/FUL (APPROVED)	Hatfield Peverel	Hatfield Peverel Parish Council	An extension of permission from 31st December 2009 to December 31st 2011 on planning application 06/02022/FUL, Hatfield Peverel Sports Ground, Wickham Bishops Road.

Councillor Peter Endersby, representing Hatfield Peverel Parish Council, attended the meeting and spoke on this application. Councillor Endersby stated that it was hoped that a planning application for the permanent use of the site would be submitted soon, but that an extension of the existing temporary permission was required in the meantime. Councillor Endersby indicated that the facility was very important to the Village and it was currently used by 10 youth teams who were supported by a dedicated group of Officials and parents. Councillor Endersby stated that a car-sharing scheme for local players and visiting teams had been set up in 2008 and this continued to work very successfully. Furthermore, no complaints had been received regarding the playing of football at the site.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01498/FUL (APPROVED)	Rayne	Mr Keith Phillips	Erection of first floor side extension over existing garage (to be converted to habitable rooms), erection of rear conservatory and provision of bow window to front, 24 Elm Walk.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01537/FUL (APPROVED)	Witham	Katie Humphris	Change of use of annexe to become an independent property, 74 Mill Lane.

130 SECTION 106 AGREEMENT

DECISION: That, subject to the applicant entering into a suitable planning obligation pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, or the imposition of a suitably worded condition, to require that 30% of the units are affordable housing, equating to five units (three of these units should be on a rental basis, with the other two being shared equity, or intermediate tenure); and to provide £250 per unit towards the provision and maintenance of play equipment in the local area prior to the occupation of the units, the Head of District Development be authorised to grant planning permission for the following development, in accordance with the conditions and reasons set out in his report, as amended below. Alternatively, in the event that a suitable planning obligation is not provided by the target date for determining this

application, the Head of District Development be authorised to refuse the grant of planning permission.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01427/FUL (APPROVED)	Silver End	George Wimpey East London Ltd	Erection of 19 residential apartments with associated amenity space, access and parking, land at Wood Grove, Boars Tye Road.

The Committee approved this application, subject to Condition No. 6 being amended by the addition of the following sub-paragraphs:-

Amended Condition

6.
 - iv) The bulkhead light at the entrance to plots 67, 69 and 71 shall not be installed.
 - v) The ADS Litehouse 42w lighting on the amenity area shall be internally louvred downwards
 - vi) The wall mounted 28w lights to the parking areas shall be eyelid and not bulkhead units.

131 PLANNING APPLICATIONS REFUSED

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning application be refused for the following reasons:-

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01330/FUL (REFUSED)	Ridgewell	Mrs Sophie Reddan	Erection of single/two storey side extensions and alterations to existing elevations, 6 Rose Walk.

Reasons for Refusal

1. The application site lies within the Village Envelope of Ridgewell where Policies RLP3, RLP17 and RLP90 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review seek to ensure that extensions to existing dwellings by virtue of their siting, bulk and form are compatible with the original dwelling, in harmony with the character of the area and do not have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residential properties.

The proposed extension by reason of its size and bulk would result in an unacceptable form of development out of keeping with the host dwelling and out of character with the pattern of surrounding development. Furthermore, the size and bulk of the rear extension would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring property No.5 Rose Walk. It would have an overbearing impact on the southern boundary and result in overshadowing and loss of outlook to the rear of the property to the detriment of the occupier's amenity.

- The application site lies within the Ridgewell Conservation Area where Policy RLP95 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review seeks to ensure that any new development is in harmony with the existing street scene and does not detract from the character, appearance and views into and from the Conservation Area.

In this case it is considered that the size, bulk and complexity of the design will be at odds with the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding pattern of development. As such the proposal neither preserves nor enhances the character or appearance of the Conservation Area contrary to the above policies. Furthermore, it is not considered that the imposition of planning conditions could satisfactorily overcome these objections.

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning application be refused for the reasons contained in the Head of District Development's report.

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01378/FUL (REFUSED)	Sible Hedingham	Mrs Valerie Bell and Miss Melanie Bell	Erection of new stables and hay store to form commercial stable, provision of a sand paddock and relocation of existing access, Crows Cross, Halstead Road.

DECISION: That the undermentioned planning application be refused for the following reasons:-

<u>Plan No.</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Applicant(s)</u>	<u>Proposed Development</u>
*09/01518/FUL (REFUSED)	Silver End	Mr G Leckie	Erection of single storey side extension, replacement conservatory and change of use to class C2 care home for people with learning disabilities, Rascasse, Sheepcotes Lane.

Reasons for Refusal

- The site lies outside the development boundary for Silver End, as identified in the Adopted Local Plan Review, within an area of countryside. Policies RLP18 and RLP78 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review (BDLPR) provide for the extension of existing dwellings in the countryside subject to the siting, design and materials of the proposed extension being subordinate to the existing dwelling.

Policy RLP21 of the BDLPR relates to proposals for institutional uses in the countryside and indicates that residential care homes may be permitted, as an exception to countryside policies, where they relate to the conversion of or minor extension to existing habitable dwellings, subject also to there being sufficient amenity space; parking provision; a high quality design; landscaping and boundary treatment.

The proposals the subject of this application involve extensions that are of a scale that is not considered minor in nature, nor subordinate to the scale and form of the host property, to the detriment of its character and contrary to the policies outlined above.

2. Policy RLP11 of the Braintree District Local Plan Review relates to proposals for change of use affecting residential areas; it states that permission will not be granted for employment or other new uses which, by virtue of their character or appearance, or the noise, fumes, smell and traffic which they generate, will harm the character of a predominantly residential area and make it a less pleasant area in which to live.

The proposals, the subject of this application, involve a change of use that would result in a level of activity that is considered to harm the character of a predominantly residential area, contrary to RLP11 of the adopted Local Plan. It is also considered material that the proposed use would take place in close proximity to an existing residential care home, and in such circumstances regard should reasonably be had to the cumulative impact of such uses upon the quiet residential character of the locality.

A motion to approve this application subject to the number of residents being restricted to no more than seven was moved and seconded, but on being put to the vote it was declared LOST.

At 10.15pm, in accordance with the Constitution, it was moved, seconded and agreed that the meeting should continue until all business on the Agenda had been dealt with.

PLEASE NOTE: The full list of standard conditions and reasons can be viewed at the office of the Head of District Development, Council Offices, Causeway House, Bocking End, Braintree, Essex CM7 9HB.

(Where applications are marked with an * this denotes that representations were received and considered by the Committee).

The meeting closed at 11.00pm.

MRS W D SCATTERGOOD

(Chairman)

APPENDIX

PLANNING COMMITTEE

19TH JANUARY 2010

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Summary of Questions Asked / Statements Made During Public Question Time

1. Statements Relating to Application No. 09/01524/FUL – Finkle Green Cottages, Finkle Green, Birdbrook

(i) Statement by Mr Stephen Filbey, Finkle Green Farm, Birdbrook

Mr Filbey stated that he lived adjacent to the site and he considered that there were inaccuracies in the Agenda report, particularly regarding distances. Mr Filbey expressed concern about potential problems which could be caused by the 'shadow flicker' of the turbine's blades and, in particular, its effect on people on horse back.

(ii) Statement by Councillor Robert Bolton, Elstree, Birdbrook

Councillor Bolton read from a prepared statement and he stated that he was the District Councillor for the area and Vice-Chairman of Birdbrook Parish Council.

Councillor Bolton stated that a previous application had been refused on appeal on the grounds of noise disturbance. Councillor Bolton expressed concern that a noise test carried out in July 2009 had been undertaken at a time when the area was quieter than normal with the most significant background noises recorded being aircraft and birdsong. Furthermore, Councillor Bolton indicated that the flight path for aircraft using Stansted Airport was dependent on wind direction. Councillor Bolton stated that at the time of the test, the noise receptors had been placed away from Finkle Green Farm, not in accordance with Guidance and that the test had been based on a turbine which was of a different height and type to that proposed in the application. Councillor Bolton expressed concern about the proximity of the proposed turbine to the public highway, which was regularly used by people on horse back, and to potential problems which flicker could cause. Councillor Bolton stated that the Highway Authority had a duty to protect the rights of the public using the highway, but he noted that they had not been consulted on the application. Councillor Bolton considered that approval of the application could set a precedent.

(iii) Statement by Mrs Wendy Norris, 4 Glenarm Road, London (Applicant)

Mrs Norris stated that the previous application had been refused on the grounds of visual impact, but that this point had been overturned on appeal. The Inspector had considered that noise was an issue, but following a subsequent noise impact assessment the Council's Environmental Health

Officer had not raised any objection. Mrs Norris considered that the wind turbine would have a low impact. Mrs Norris stated that she was a horse rider herself and that she may keep a horse at the site. Mrs Norris considered that people must take action to reduce the effects of climate change.

2. Statements Relating to Application No. 09/01463/FUL – Land adjacent to 2 Whitlock Drive, Great Yeldham

(i) Statement by Mr Jeremy Dunn, 4 Whitlock Drive, Great Yeldham

Mr Dunn stated that a restrictive covenant prevented the use of the land as a Doctors' Surgery and the owner of the land had indicated that he was not prepared to release the covenant, therefore if the planning application was granted it could not be implemented. Mr Dunn stated that there were two other sites in Great Yeldham which the Parish Council had not investigated and that refusal of the application would require the Parish Council to find a better suited location.

(ii) Statement by Mr Colin Eschborn, 2 Whitlock Drive, Great Yeldham

Mr Eschborn referred to the District Council's adopted Green Spaces Strategy and he questioned why the planning application was being recommended for approval when the site had been designated as open space. Mr Eschborn stated that there had been no change to the District Council's policy for the site and he considered that this was an important area of open space which should be retained.

(iii) Statement by Mr Stuart Hornsby, 7 Whitlock Drive, Great Yeldham

Mr Hornsby queried the content of the report. Mr Hornsby stated that 84% of the comments submitted had been against the application and that the petition referred to had nothing to do with the application and should be ignored. Mr Hornsby stated that the Parish Council had not voted on the application.

(iv) Statement by Mr Barrie Townsend, 16 Market Grove, Great Yeldham

Mr Townsend stated that he was against the proposal. Mr Townsend considered that there were other options, but that these were not being pursued whilst the current proposal was being considered. Mr Townsend stated that it was not true that the majority of Parish Councillors supported the application as no vote had been taken. Mr Townsend expressed concern that approval of the application would lead to the loss of an area of open space, traffic would increase and children would no longer have a safe place to play.

(v) Statement by Dr William Littler c/o Mr N Richardson, The Priory, Stomp Road, Burnham, Nr Slough, Bucks (Applicant)

Dr Littler stated that he had been a GP in the Great Yeldham and Castle Hedingham areas for ten years. Dr Littler stated that the current Surgery building wasn't suitable as it was small, with limited privacy and no wheelchair access.

(vi) Statement by Mrs Linda Cordell, 80 Highfields, Great Yeldham

Mrs Cordell stated that she had moved to Great Yeldham two years ago and had hoped that the Doctors' Surgery would be provided. Mrs Cordell stated that the number of people supporting the application outnumbered those objecting to it and she considered that there was a clear mandate for the extension of the existing planning permission.

(vii) Statement by Mr Jimmy Cumaranetunge, 46 Butlers Way, Great Yeldham

Mr Cumaranetunge stated that he had lived in Great Yeldham for some time and that he had started the project to build a new Doctors' Surgery. Mr Cumaranetunge considered that a new Doctors' Surgery was badly needed and he asked the Committee to approve the application.

(viii) Statement by Mr Dave Dyson, 2 Camoise Close, Great Yeldham

Mr Dyson stated that objectors to the application had suggested that the Surgery should be built on an alternative site, but they had not named one. Mr Dyson stated that all sites had been looked at and none of them was considered suitable for a Surgery. Mr Dyson stated that reference had been made to a restrictive covenant for some years, but he had not seen the covenant and it was not registered with the Land Registry. Mr Dyson considered that the existing grassed area was not a safe place to play and he indicated that it sloped steeply towards the main road.

3. Statement by Mrs Melanie Bell, c/o Whymark and Moulton, 20 North Street, Sudbury, Suffolk (Applicant)
Application No. 09/01378/FUL – Crows Path, Halstead Road, Sible Hedingham

Mrs Bell stated that the application was for a small livery business and that it would only lead to a small number of traffic movements. Mrs Bell referred to the discussions which had taken place with the Highway Authority regarding the access to the site. Mrs Bell indicated that although it had not been possible to resolve the highways issues she hoped that some flexibility could be allowed. Mrs Bell stated that she would accept the imposition of a condition requiring a survey being carried out on the impact of the proposal on trees and protected species.

4. Statements Relating to Application No. 09/01427/FUL – Land at Wood Grove, Boars Tye Road, Silver End

(i) Statement by Mr Adrian Fecitt, 1 Wood Grove, Silver End

Mr Fecitt referred to a previous application for the site which had been refused. Whilst Mr Fecitt considered that the current application was an improvement on the commercial units which had originally been proposed, he felt that the proposed three-storey building was not characteristic of Silver End, that there was insufficient car parking, and that there were problems with the access to the site. Mr Fecitt stated that there was insufficient lighting at the site and that the new car park would reduce the amount of open space available. Mr Fecitt stated that Silver End Primary School was already over-subscribed and that approval of this application would increase the demand

on the School.

(ii) Statement by Mr John McLarty, Bidwells, Number One, Legg Street, Chelmsford (Agent)

Mr McLarty stated that the application had been through rigorous testing, that the scale of the development had been reduced and that the current scheme addressed the concerns of local residents. Mr McLarty indicated that the imposition of a condition regarding car parking would be acceptable.

5. Statement by Mr Graham White, The Old English Barn, Canterbury Grange, Bocking Church Street, Braintree
Application No. 09/01424/FUL – Chelmsford Star Co-operative Society Ltd, 62 Church Street, Braintree

Mr White stated that his property and all of the windows to the barn fronted the Co-Operative shop. Mr White acknowledged that the shop benefited the community, but he indicated that the business created a noise problem. Mr White stated that the existing condition restricting delivery times to the shop had been breached and, on appeal, the Inspector had concluded that noise from vehicles delivering goods to the shop outside the hours specified in the condition would be particularly intrusive. Mr White considered that there would still be a problem even if smaller delivery vehicles were to be used.

6. Statements Relating to Application No. 09/01330/FUL – 6 Rose Walk, Ridgewell

(i) Statement by Mrs Helen Morris, 5 Rose Walk, Ridgewell

Mrs Morris expressed concern about the scale and design of the proposal and, in particular, about the adverse impact of the proposed rear extension on her property. Mrs Morris indicated that the measurements shown on the plans were inconsistent.

(ii) Statement by Mr Don Fitzgerald, 2 Rose Walk, Ridgewell

Mr Fitzgerald stated that the proposal, if approved, would lead to an over-sized building and he considered that the development should retain its mix of single and two storey dwellings which provided a pleasant character. Mr Fitzgerald considered that the proposal would detract from the appearance of the Conservation Area.