**EAST COTTINGWITH PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of an Extraordinary Meeting of the Parish Council held in the Village Hall at 8.00pm on Thursday 14th October 2019**

**Present:** Councillors P. Rhodes (Chairman), N. Hobbs (Vice-Chairman), D. Griffith, S. Ashton,

C. Cornmell, P. Shervington, C. Stevens

**In Attendance:** D. Cornmell (Parish Clerk)

**Members of the Public:** Seven

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

1. **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There were seven members of the public present, including the applicants.

1. **PLANNING**

Consideration was given to the following application:

(i) 19/02244/PLF: Conversion of former garage building to dormitory style accommodation intended for holiday use, with associated external and internal alterations, including raising the height of the eaves and ridge, installation of roof lights to both sides and erection of porch on side: Land and buildings North West of Wold View, Langrickgate Lane, East Cottingwith YO42 2TQ.

In opening debate, the Chairman indicated that he would invite the applicants and members of the public to address the Council, within a strict time limit of 15 minutes. Afterwards, it was for councillors to consider the proposal and come to a decision.

One of the two applicants addressed the meeting and outlined their intention, which was to convert a redundant building, formerly used as a garage, into a holiday let. At present, their house was used for letting purposes but if the application was successful, they would reside in the house and make use of the converted building for their business. He stressed that they did not wish to cause any upset in the village and as regards to noise, their immediate neighbours had not made any complaint regarding the existing letting arrangements.

Members of the public were then invited to speak and a number of them did so outlining their main areas of objection, which centred around use of the existing building for ‘hen parties’; the type of activities advertised ‘butler in the buff’; noise generated at present, that could be heard in the village; additional road traffic; the scale of the proposed development; drainage of the site; sewage disposal and the inappropriateness of the type of activities that the development would likely attract in relation to a conservation village.

In response, the applicant acknowledged the concerns that had been expressed but hoped that the type of future clientele would comprise family groups; hen parties, scouts and youth groups. Stag parties would not be allowed. So far as additional traffic, all vehicles would be parked off-road and the likelihood was that customers would arrive Friday evenings and leave Monday morning. Sewage and drainage problems were being addressed, whether or not the present application was successful. Conversion of the present building would turn it into something more visually attractive.

The Chairman invited Members to comment on the application, taking into account the concerns that had been expressed by those present and parishioners not present who had made representations to them.

Views expressed against the proposed development concerned its scale: in particular, the number of people likely to use the premises compared to the resident population; the type of activity likely to take place on the premises; the proximity of the property in relation to the Ings and the surrounding area; the need to protect the environment; the potential for increased noise generated from the site and increased road traffic.

In favour, was conversion of a redundant building into something more in keeping; encouraging local enterprise; providing facilities for scouts and youth organisations and any noise generated from the proposed development should be considered in the context of noise generated by the building being formerly used as a garage.

At the conclusion of debate, the Chairman asked Members to vote, by a show of hands, of those in favour and those against the proposed development. By a majority of four votes to two it was **resolved** to object to the application on the following grounds:

**Social impact** – although outside the Conservation Area, the scale of the development and the likely use of the building, was not in keeping with the village and its resident population.

**Environmental impact** – the scale of the development; its proximity to the Lower Derwent Ings and the potential for noise pollution was likely to have a detrimental effect.

**Action**: **Clerk**

1. **FINANCE**
2. **Payment:**

Proposed by the Vice-Chairman, seconded by Councillor Cornmell and agreed that the following payment be made:

N. Power Ltd – Street Lighting £58.11

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.45pm.