

Paper 5

APPENDIX 1

Extract from Approved
Minute of Planning
Committee Meeting held
24 June 2011

APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

12. Jaci Douglas proposed a Motion to approve the application as recommended in the Planning Report. This was seconded by Peter Argyle.
13. Willie McKenna proposed an Amendment to approve the application as recommended in the Planning Report but with the omission of Condition 3b, regarding amendments to the fenestration.
14. The vote was as follows:

NAME	MOTION	AMENDMENT	ABSTAIN
Peter Argyle	X		
Duncan Bryden	X		
Angela Douglas	X		
Jaci Douglas	X		
Dave Fallows		X	
Katrina Farquhar	X		
Kate Howie	X		
Marcus Humphrey	X		
Bob Kinnaird	X		
Eleanor Mackintosh		X	
Ian Mackintosh	X		
Mary McCafferty		X	
Willie McKenna		X	
Gordon Riddler	X		
Gregor Rimell	X		
Brian Wood	X		
TOTAL	12	4	0

15. The Committee agreed to approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.

16. **Action Points arising:** None.

AGENDA ITEM 7:

REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR AGRICULTURAL SHED AT ASHFIELD, DRUMGUISH, KINGUSSIE (PAPER 2) (11/097/CP)

17. Duncan Bryden informed Members that a request had been made to address the Committee from –

- Objector: John Barton

18. The Committee agreed to the request.

APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

19. Robert Grant presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
20. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) The height of the existing buildings in the vicinity of the proposed shed. Robert Grant confirmed they were of an equal height to the shed being proposed (approx. 5.5m high).
 - b) The materials to be used for the construction of the building. Robert Grant stated that the roadside elevation was to be timber clad whilst the remaining elevations were to be green coloured sheet steel.
 - c) The possibility of introducing timber cladding on the end gables was also raised. Robert Grant advised that discussion had taken place with the Applicant regarding this. However, the Applicant had not been keen to progress this idea and so appropriate tree planting had been proposed to screen the building.
 - d) If the tree planting were to replace the trees which had previously been felled. Robert Grant advised that the felling did not require planning consent and the proposed tree planting was to be part replacement and part landscaping.
 - e) Drumguish being a historical crafting community.
 - f) Concern regarding the size of the building, even after the reduction to the current proposed size.
21. John Barton, Objector, addressed the Committee. The presentation covered the following points:
- Not being opposed to the Applicant having a shed / garage, but concerned regarding the size of the proposed building and its visual impact, even after the reduction.
 - The settlement pattern of Drumguish.
 - The reduction over time in the number of crofts in Drumguish.
 - The Applicant having registered his property as a croft but there being no livestock on the croft and the construction / plant type machinery currently stored on the site.
 - The size of shed, as recommended by the Crofters Commission, being approximately 30m² for a croft of this size.
 - The proposed size of building being more suited to industrial purposes.
 - Welcoming the possibility of a Site Visit by Members to assess what size building could be feasibly accommodated on the site.
 - The negative visual impact the building could have for walkers using the Speyside Way and the impact on tourism to the area.

APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

22. The Committee were invited to ask questions of the speaker and the following points were raised:
- a) If local residents would rather see a shed on the site rather than the current collection of plant machinery. John Barton responded that he could only speak personally, but he would be happy to see a shed / domestic garage on the site but not an industrial building.
23. Duncan Bryden thanked the speaker.
24. The Committee discussed the application and the following points were raised:
- a) The possibility of a Site Visit for Members to assess the visual impact of the building, particularly due to the close proximity to popular walking routes in the area. It was also suggested that the CNPA Landscape Officer should be present at any Site Visit.
 - b) The large size of the proposed building when compared to the scale of the agricultural workings of the croft.
 - c) Concern regarding the height of the building in relation to the other buildings in the vicinity.
 - d) Timber clad buildings being more aesthetically pleasing in rural environments and the possibility of using fibre cement roofing.
 - e) Clarification if the Planning Committee have the ability to specify the dimensions of any approved building. Robert Grant confirmed that this was within the remit of the Planning Committee.
 - f) If the proposed building was the smallest size that the Applicant would consider. Robert Grant stated that the building had been reduced in scale from the original submitted proposal. Discussion had taken place and although there may be some scope to further reduce the height, the footprint of the building was the smallest the Applicant was currently willing to consider.
 - g) How the Committee could determine an acceptable size of building without refusing the current application. Robert Grant advised that an acceptable size of building would require further discussion with the Applicant.
 - h) The possibility of the Applicant providing professional architects drawings to demonstrate the proposed building in relation to the other buildings in the vicinity. Robert Grant advised that this would be possible. However it would involve some cost to the Applicant. In addition the Local Authority had validated the submitted plans which were before the Committee.
 - i) The options available to the Planning Committee being a) Refusal, b) Deferment with a clear steer to the Planning Officers that the current proposed building was too large and negotiations on size and external finishes were required, and c) Deferment for a Site Visit, which would not potentially add anything to Members ability to assess the application. The preferable option being b).
 - j) If deferment were agreed, it would allow time for a Site Visit to be arranged.

APPROVED MINUTES – 24 JUNE 2011

- k) The proposed height of the building being required to allow agricultural machinery to enter safely e.g. tractors with front loaders and bales. Therefore approval as recommended in the Planning Report was a viable option.
 - l) Concern about the potential time and travel required for Members to attend an arranged Site Visit. Normal practice being to arrange Site Visits for a time when a Planning Committee was at a nearby location. However, as no meetings were scheduled to take place close to Drumguish in the near future there was concern that there would be considerable delay in the application being brought forward for determination. Duncan Bryden reminded Members that they were free to visit the site in their own time.
 - m) Concern that deferring the application would not assist with encouraging young people into agriculture.
 - n) A proposal that the application be deferred for further discussion between the CNPA Planning Officers and the Applicant regarding a reduction in the overall size and scale of the building and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.
25. The Committee agreed to defer the application to allow for further discussion regarding the overall size and scale of the shed and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.
26. **Action Points arising:** CNPA Planning Officers to engage in discussions with the Applicant regarding the overall size and scale of the shed and appropriate construction materials to mitigate against any adverse visual impact.

AGENDA ITEM 8:

REPORT ON CALLED-IN PLANNING APPLICATION FOR ERECTION OF 2 FLATS AND 2 SEMI DETACHED HOUSES (4 IN TOTAL) AT SITE SE OF GRANT ARMS HOTEL, 25 - 26 THE SQUARE, GRANTOWN-ON-SPEY (PAPER 3) (11/117/CP)

27. Robert Grant presented a paper recommending that the Committee approve the application subject to the conditions stated in the report.
28. The Committee were invited to ask the Planning Officer points of clarification, the following were raised:
- a) Clarification of the flat roof glazed feature (North East elevation) and flat roof dormers (South West elevation). Robert Grant confirmed that the glazed feature and dormers were flat roofed and were considered to fit in with the flat roofed porch and the sleek lines of the contemporary building.
 - b) The proposal being for good housing of a modern and innovative design, in an area of Grantown on Spey in which people wished to live.