

**Advisory Management Committee
Notes of the Meeting Held at The Spirella Building on 12th March 2020**

Committee Members
in attendance - [REDACTED] (Chair)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Others in attendance - Claire Pudney - LGCHF
Emma Parkins – LGCHF

Apologies - [REDACTED]

**MINUTES OF THE ADVISORY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE OF 12th
March 2020**

1. Minutes of the last meeting

1.1 The minutes of the last meeting, held on Thursday 9th January 2020 were agreed by those in attendance and will be signed by the Chair of that meeting, [REDACTED] (PG).

2. Election of Chair

2.1 The Committee agreed that [REDACTED] (AC) would be the Chair of the meeting. AC confirmed that he will be able to attend the Householder Applications Committee (HAC) meeting to be held on Friday 24th April 2020.

3. Matters Arising

3.1 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

3.2 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

3.3 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ■

3.4 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED].

3.5 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

4. Declarations of Interest

4.1 None

5. 35 Aubreys – Frontage alterations including increased hardstanding (retrospective)

5.1 CS explained the scheme to the Committee.

5.2 CS advised that following completion of the extension, brown vertical timber cladding should have been re-instated; as opposed to grey. CS advised that this case has now become an enforcement matter. CP requested that this case is not discussed on whilst on site.

5.3 CS advised that the hardstanding was noted at the time of applying for the extension, and during a site visit. The applicant was advised to submit a retrospective application which was subsequently refused, due to being contrary to the Design Principles. CS advised that the hardstanding measures between 75-80%.

5.4 It was noted that the frontage also comprises a section of artificial grass.

5.5 CS advised that one of the conditions contained within the First Stage Approval for the ground floor front extension & garage conversion was: *The frontage area shall maintain parking for 2 cars and 50% of the area shall be soft landscaping.*

5.6 The Committee queried whether the cross-over has been widened?

5.7 CS identified and annotated photographs provided by the homeowner of a number of properties. CS advised that historic photographs show that many of these frontages are of the original size

5.8 The Committee discussed [REDACTED] – CS advised that the frontage exceeds 50% and was granted retrospective consent in 2017. CS advised that the frontage was of the same size 15 years ago and therefore it would be difficult to take action on this.

5.9 The Committee discussed [REDACTED] – CS advised that refusal was granted in 2000.

- 5.10 The Committee carried out a site visit and viewed the property from the front.
- 5.11 Whilst on site, the homeowners highlighted the attractiveness of the road and the lack of vehicles parking on the road.
- 5.12 The Committee felt that a number of homeowners have implemented and encouraged soft landscaping.
- 5.13 Whilst on site, the homeowners advised that they would be prepared to remove the area of artificial grass and re-landscape the area.
- 5.14 The Committee queried the boundary line, due to the artificial grass encroaching the neighbour's frontage area. The homeowners advised that the neighbour has consented to this.
- 5.15 The Committee advised that the homeowners are proposing to plant low level hedging on the side boundary, which will wrap around towards the front.
- 5.16 The Committee noted that the condition of the grass verge in front of the property.
- 5.17 The Committee reviewed JG's comments, which in summary are: the owner has not maintained the original planning consent conditions in terms of the percentage of landscaping and the use of artificial grass. The application appears to be a straightforward support of the original decision and to meet the original conditions.
- 5.18 The Committee were unanimous in supporting the decision to refuse consent, made by the Heritage Advice Service; due to the hardstanding exceeding the 50% Design Principle rule. The Committee felt that negotiations should continue in relation to a suitable re-planting scheme.

6. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[Redacted text block containing multiple lines of blacked-out content]

7. Any Other Business

7.1 [Redacted text]

8. Date of next meetings

8.1 14th May
9th July
10th September
12th November

The meeting closed.

Signed:

Date: