

ETWALL PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning, Environment and Highways Committee held on 23rd May 2011

Present: Cllr Rushby
Cllr Bilbie
Cllr du Cellie Muller
Cllr Smith

Non-Committee Members:
Cllr Ireland
Cllr Payton
Five members of the public

- 196 **Apologies for Absence** – Cllr Cresswell, Cllr Heed and Cllr Warburton
- 197 **Declaration of Interest** – All Members of Etwall Parish Council attending this meeting being automatically Trustees of the Frank Wickham Hall Charity, declared their interest. Cllr Rushby declared an interest in the planning application relating to the rebuilding of Burnaston House at land off Bannells Lane, Etwall Road, Mickleover.
- 198 **Election of Chairman** – Cllr Rusby was proposed by Cllr Muller, seconded by Cllr Bilbie and unanimously elected Chairman.
- 199 **Election of Vice-Chairman** – Cllr Smith was proposed by Cllr Muller, seconded by Cllr Rushby and unanimously elected Vice-Chairman.
- 200 **Minutes of meeting held on 18th October 2011** – Already approved at full council.
- 201 **Matters arising from these minutes** – None
- 202 **Public Participation** – There were objections to the proposal to build three dwellings at Etwall Lawn, 82 Main Street, Etwall.

The comment was made that one of the reasons that the previous application for four dwellings had been refused was that the proposed new houses did not complement the listed Etwall Lawn. It was felt that the three houses now proposed would also not complement Etwall Lawn.

There were also concerns over access to and from the properties onto Burnaston Lane as there were currently five properties already using the current entrance. Space had been allocated for 12 vehicles, therefore a lot of additional access was anticipated using the existing private drive onto a very busy lane.

There were also issues of loss of privacy and light to adjacent properties.

There were a number of complaints concerning the information shown on the SDDC website as none of the plans showed where the houses were expected to sit on the plot. This information had now been provided in paper form and was displayed at the meeting.

Other issues raised with this application included:-

- (a) Unit A impinged onto the conservation area.

- (b) It was against SDDC's own policy on conservation areas in that it did not complement the conservation area.
- (c) The applicant had not complied with its statutory obligations by applying to English Heritage. Apparently this had now been done.
- (d) There was anecdotal evidence of bats and no Bat Survey had been carried out.
- (e) The tree survey was incorrect in that it failed to take notice of a Tree Preservation Order.
- (f) Unit A should be 16 m away from the trees – it was not.

203 **Planning applications to be considered –**

- (a) 9 2011 0299 – The erection of three dwellings at Etwall Lawn, 82 Main Street, Etwall – OBJECTION – It was decided to object to this application on the above grounds, with the exception of the objection concerning loss of privacy and light as this was not a valid reason for objection in planning terms.
- (b) 9 2011 0359 – Certificate of lawfulness application for installation of solar panels at 48 Chestnut Grove, Etwall – NO OBJECTION
- (c) 9 2011 0398 – The erection of flood lighting to existing tennis courts at John Port School – NO OBJECTION
- (d) 9 2011 0348 – The rebuilding of Burnaston House at land off Bannells Lane, Etwall Road, Mickleover – Only just received. Comments to be sent to Cllr Smith as Cllr Rushby had declared an interest.

204 **Committee Representation on Website** – It was felt that a note of planning applications with a link to the SDDC website was required.

205 **Review of Committee's Terms of Reference** – It was felt that if the trial system of notification of planning applications by electronic means were to be made permanent, the terms of reference of this committee needed to be amended.

206 **Any Other Business**

- (a) Cllr Muller had received a number of comments concerning the proposed Toucan crossing outside the Leisure Centre and its conflict with the proposed new car park. He was proposing to discuss this matter with Cllrs Patten and Brown before making any additional comments to DCC as it was strongly felt that the village would prefer a new car park to a toucan crossing.
- (b) It was felt that the lack of plans on the website showing the positioning of the proposed dwellings at Etwall Lawn should be raised with SDDC.
- (c) Cllr Smith raised the issue that when new dwellings were being constructed accommodation had to be made available for delivery vehicles on site but there was nothing which said that they had to use this space. There had been issues recently on the development on Sutton Lane where delivery vehicles were parked in the bus stop lay-by and on private land.
- (d) Cllr Rushby and Cllr Payton were meeting with the Bowls Club on Thursday 26th May to discuss the proposed alterations to the pavilion.

207 **Date of next meeting** – To be decided.

Signed

Date