



The Beaudesert & Henley-in-Arden Joint Parish Council

Working for the Benefit of the Residents of Henley-in-Arden

Clerk : Gill Peacock email : clerk@henley-in-arden-pc.gov.uk

Tel: 01564 795499 or 01926 814491

The Minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee Meeting of the Beaudesert and Henley-in-Arden Joint Parish Council that took place on Monday, 29th October at 6.00 pm in the Heritage Centre, 150 High Street, Henley-in-Arden.

Present: Cllrs. Peter Cornford, David Tomlinson, David Broadbent, Marijana Bainbridge and Sally Harfield.

Public Participation Session

Simon and Natasha Gouldson, Linda and David Shaw, Michael Wilmott.

Commencement of the Council Meeting

Shaw

- 1 **Apologies for absence and acceptance of apologies**
Peter Crathorne Elaine Field and Gill Peacock (Clerk)
- 2 **Declarations of Interest and Dispensations**

David Tomlinson declared an interest in Appeal ref: APP/J3720/W/18.
- 3 **Minutes of The Planning Sub- Committee held on 1st October were approved.**
- 4 **To consider the Council's responses to planning applications**

Application no.	Proposal	Address	Submitted by	Comments due by / decision	Planning Comments
18/02866/ADV	Erection of illuminated and non-illuminated signs to the exterior of the building.	The Nags Head, 161 High Street, Henley in Arden	Ms C Atkin Star	01.11.2018	Object to size and style in regard to a historic building in a conservation area. Out of keeping with the street scene
18/02018/LBC	Installation of replacement illuminated and on-illuminated signs and repainting of the building.	The Nags Head, 161 High Street, Henley in Arden	Mr Beetham	12.11.2018	Support in that the signage needs updating but needs to conform to the recent SDC District Design Guide, Appendix B - Shopfronts & Signage.
18/00233/FUL	Appeal: Retrospective permission for the erection of a contemporary office to the side of a residential dwelling. Permission additionally being	Mulberry House, Orchard Rise, Henley in Arden	Mr S Leighton	Appeal ref: APP/J3720 /W/18/3209 278	Objection. The Planning Sub Committee support the statement by 6 local neighbours (see below) In addition the existing Building & proposed Boundary treatment obscure the Open Outlook of the

	<p>sought for the construction of new boundary treatment consisting of a low brick wall, brick piers and fence infill panels</p>			<p>Street Scene which was a condition of the original Design Statement for the development.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Statement from 6 local neighbours who attended the Sub Committee meeting:

Application reference 18/00233/FUL
 Planning Inspectorate Reference No. APP/J3720/W/18/3209278

Further to our previous representation statement

Having read through the grounds of appeal and conclusion, we consider that a number of items have NOT been fully addressed.

These include the impact on privacy and overlooking, loss of visual amenity from properties facing the garden office and/or boundary treatment which would be to the detriment of the area character, along with harming the 'openness' of the street scene.

Additionally, whilst it is argued that the high-quality design complies with all relevant policies and guidance, as the office is a contemporary design, it is certainly not in-keeping with the surrounding properties within the Orchard Rise development. The materials and styling are out of character with the frontage and layout of the existing street scene. This is contrary to the Core Strategy and other adopted guidance.

A number of the items raised by the appellants representatives are considered to be opinion-based with respect to its scale, height, position and design appropriateness. Further, the report uses language such as 'harmonising with surroundings', 'positive contribution to street scene' and 'sensitive to Mulberry House' none of which are shared by the immediate residents or the council officers.

The appellants representative continues to argue that whilst flat roof structures are discouraged, they are not unacceptable. How can this be in keeping with the street scene if it is one of the unique features of the structure? *(CS.9. ensure continuity of key design features)*
 Even with the suggested boundary treatment in position, the structure will not be obscured.

Whilst the appellant erected the building 'in good faith' there was no consultation with any of the adjacent neighbours neither did the appellant seek guidance on the planning aspect and covenants until the building was in position. This seems a bullish attitude and whilst a compromise has been suggested, to partially obscure or even stain the building, this is surely further indication that it is not in-keeping with the surrounding properties.

Original planning permission (App Ref No. 06/01697/FUL) with removed Part 1, Class E Permitted Development Rights was granted, at that time, in order to maintain the development features which this retrospective application will damage.

5 Items for private session- None

To confirm the date and time of the next JPC Meeting- 19th November 2018, commencing at 7.00 pm at The Memorial Hall & Planning Sub-Committee meeting 3rd December, Heritage Ctre at 6pm

PLEASE NOTE THAT IF ANYONE WOULD LIKE A HARD COPY OF THE DRAFT AGENDA OR MINUTES FOLLOWING THE JPC MEETING AND DOESN'T HAVE ACCESS TO A COMPUTER, PLEASE CONTACT THE CLERK ON 01926 814491 TO REQUEST A COPY.

The meeting finished at 19.21

...
 Signed

Dated