

**REPORT OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING  
HELD ON 20<sup>th</sup> DECEMBER 2005 AT OLD MILL HALL, GROVE**

Present: Cllr J M Stock (Chairman)  
Cllr W R Ackers  
Cllr K R Clarke  
Cllr W Evans  
Cllr D M Hadcroft  
Cllr P L Hadcroft  
Cllr A P Lunn  
Cllr M Mellersh  
Cllr F D Parnell  
Cllr B Williamson

In attendance: Cllrs R L Bashford, K Jones, R Hicks-Greene, J Nunn-Price

Clerk: Mrs C J Parry

**1 Apologies for absence**

There were no apologies for absence.

**2 Declarations of Personal or Personal and Prejudicial Interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3 Report of committee meeting held on 29<sup>th</sup> November 2005**

It was noted that the page should have been numbered "Page 1 of 1".

It was **MOVED** the chairman and **RESOLVED** unanimously.....

**"...that the report as amended be signed as a true record of the meeting."**

**4 Matters arising from previous meeting**

There were no matters arising.

**5 Planning applications considered**

**GRO/10245/1      5 SHANNON CLOSE**  
Single storey rear extension and replacement of flat roof with a single pitch

Comment: No objection.

**GRO/19370      4 ROMAN WAY**  
Single storey link extension between dwelling and garage, including two roof lights and two dormer windows

Comment: No objection.

**GRO/19391      10 MAYFIELD AVENUE**  
Demolition of existing garage. Erection of single storey side and front extensions and roof re-alignment to the rear

Comment: Whilst we have no objection to the proposals we are concerned at the loss of a garage parking space with no accommodation being made in the plans for the provision of additional parking spaces within the curtilage. We would also like to see a condition on the permission that the new extension could not be used as a separate dwelling.

## **6 Decision notices**

Permitted: GRO/1280/13, GRO/2387/7, GRO/7382/1, GRO/14284/2, GRO/16859/2, GRO/17888/1.

Refused: GRO/17861/1, GRO/18526/2

*Clerk's note: Planning permission was granted for GRO/18526/1 in March 2005. Amended plans -GRO/18526/2 have subsequently been refused. Therefore building is allowed to continue at the site so long as the original proposals are adhered to.*

## **7 VWHDC – Planning for the Future of the Vale: Consultation on Draft Statement of community Involvement**

The consultation period was to expire on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2006 and therefore a response to the document was required. After discussion it was generally agreed that the following comments be passed to the Vale for consideration.

- Too many repetitions made the document unnecessarily long.
- Notice of at least one week should be given to interested bodies before the start of any consultation period.
- Any changes shown on the Vale's web-site or at public libraries must be made known to interested parties and should preferably be conveyed by e-mail and not solely in the press. E-mail alerts should also be made available to anyone who requests them.
- How are the 1,000 members of the Citizens Panel selected?
- Exhibitions – either staffed or un-staffed – should be held at times convenient to the public with adequate notice and also when the buildings are open (the last OCC exhibition was held in Old Mill Hall but the building was shut for most of the time!)
- How would any questionnaires be distributed?
- Page 26 bullet point 5 should read 'publish' not public.

## **8 VWHDC's proposals for the Grove Development Forum**

The Vale had provided information for the establishment of the Grove Development Forum and had asked for the council's comments by the end of December. It was generally agreed that the following observations and questions be passed to the Vale.

- How much input would the forum have and how much would its views influence the district council?
- The parish council would require sight of the revised Supplementary Guidance Document before the first meeting of the forum.
- Evening meetings would be essential.
- Meetings should be open to the public.

- How many local groups would be involved, how would be they be selected and how many from each group could sit on the forum?
- The forum should be a working forum.
- We do not believe that the meetings should be resource intensive.
- The views and recommendations of the forum should be seriously considered and not overlooked by the Vale or the developers simply because they do not suit them and if the forum's recommendations are dismissed then reasons should be given as to why.
- Clarification was needed as to what type of service provision was required.

Clerk                      The clerk was asked to request sight of a copy of the Inspector's report on the Local Plan before it goes to press.

**9    Correspondence**

Clerk                      Although there was no correspondence the clerk reported that a buyer had been found for the land at Millbrook Square and that they intended to build the shops and crèche. The clerk was to ascertain the name of the new owners.

The meeting closed at 8.12 pm.

Confirmed 17<sup>th</sup> January 2006

\_\_\_\_\_ Chairman