

**Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of Mautby Parish Council held on
Wednesday 7th September 2022 at 7.30pm at Runham Village Hall**

Present: Martin Lamb (Chairman)
Vivyan Bishop
Mark Bullant
George Gay
Dean Hewitt
Jean Hodgson
Catherine Moore, Parish Clerk

Also present: Borough Councillor Adrian Thompson and 7 members of the public.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Amanda Bayfield.

2. Public Forum

a) Public
None.

3. Declaration of Interest for items on the agenda

None.

4. Planning

a) New Applications

06/22/0689/HH 1 Barn Lane, Runham: Proposed 2 storey side and rear extensions with side garage extension.

The Council had received one letter from a member of the public putting forward observations as the immediate neighbour, the contents were noted.

The Chairman invited the applicant to answer questions from the Council and the public, during which the following key points were raised:

- The property was around 120 years old with a 1970's flat roof extension which would be demolished. The extension would be approx. 1M from the boundary of the property to allow access to the rear and the two storey section would be approx. 3.5M tall. All building works would be accessible from within the curtilage of the property.
- The small window at the top would be frosted as this would be a bathroom. The other windows were Velux roof lights.
- There would be a gap of approx. 1 inch between the development and the wall of the neighbouring property and a gully / side return would be required between the two properties.
- The extension would effectively double the size of the building and would increase parking provision within the property.
- The cladding would be timber and would be a sober colour. The wall with the gap would be unclad masonry and the wall of the neighbouring property would be checked for peak condition before building as further maintenance would not be possible.

- The apple tree near the boundary was within the neighbouring property but was overhanging the applicant property. This had been measured and was not expected to affect the application.
- The top level of the extension would be within the boundary of the property but would be wider than the lower level so access to the rear could be maintained.
- The building had been set in the proposed position because the Borough Council liked to see symmetrical lines, and any new build had to be subservient to the existing so it had not been designed with the lines of the existing. Moving it inline would decrease the off road parking available.

A proposal was made that the Council object to the application on the basis that it would dominate the neighbouring property and was very close to the neighbouring boundary, proposed by Dean Hewitt, no seconder, motion fell.

A proposal was received that the Council responds with 'The Council neither supports or objects to the application but notes that the development is very close to the neighbouring northern boundary with only a one inch gap between walls' proposed by Mark Bullant, seconded by Jean Hodgson, 3 in favour, 3 against, **agreed** on the Chairman's casting vote in favour.

A proposal was received that an additional comment would be made that 'If the Borough Council is minded to approve the application the Parish Council would wish to see the colour and material for the cladding to be conditioned as a reserved matter' proposed by Vivyan Bishop, seconded by Martin Lamb, 5 in favour, 1 against, **agreed**.

The Clerk would submit the response to the Borough Council.

ACTION: Clerk

5. **Date of Next Meeting**

Wednesday 28th September 2022 7.30pm, Runham Village Hall

The meeting closed at 8.05pm.

CHAIRMAN