

WILLAND PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES FOR PLANNING, LIGHTING AND TRANSPORTATION
COMMITTEE ON 3rd MAY 2000.

Present: Mr. R Steele (Chairman), Mrs. P Balaam, Mr. E Dennis, Mr. S Lehner, Mr. G Roberts, Mr. J Spearing, Mr. G Vearncombe and the Clerk.

1. **Apologies.** None

2. **Application.**

a. Mark Snow, Verbeer Manor, Willand, Cullompton, Devon. Ref.4/59/2000/587

Listed Building Consent for internal alterations to provide revised toilet layout and disabled persons toilet facility at Verbeer Manor, Willand.

The Committee felt that this was an application to upgrade existing facilities and recommended that it should be approved.

b. Mr. and Mrs. Priday, 20 Chestnut Drive, Willand, Cullompton, Devon. Ref.4/59/2000/603

Erection of two-storey side extension to provide dining room and study with additional bedroom and en-suite bathroom over at 20 Chestnut Drive, Willand.

This house is situated in an area that is frequently congested, particularly in the evenings and at weekends. The Committee was very concerned that as this extension will mean the loss of the applicant's garage the problems with congestion will be made worse. However, as the extension is no further forward than the existing garage and will not be impinging on other residents the Committee recommends that this application should be approved, subject to the problems with parking being resolved.

c. Mr. Palmer, 3 Sycamore Close, Willand, Cullompton, Devon. Ref. 4/59/1999/3332

Erection of two-storey side extension to provide new lounge and two additional bedrooms and provision of parking and garage space at 3 Sycamore Close, Willand.

Mr. Lehner declared an interest and left the meeting.

Having looked at the revised plans that Mr. Palmer has submitted the Committee was impressed with the amount of work that has been done to address many of the problems that were present on the original application. However, for a house in this situation, the impact of a two-storey extension on the rear and side elevations of the building would be felt by a large number of residents in the area. The main concern was the twin peak roofline. It was proposed that the application should be refused. An amendment that it should be approved was put forward but fell because it was not seconded. A vote was taken on the original proposal, which was carried with 4 voting for, 0 against and 2 abstentions. Therefore the Committee recommended that this application should be refused.

Closure: There being no other business the meeting closed at 7.50 p.m.

R. Steele 12.5.00