



# WINDERMERE TOWN COUNCIL

*Representing the interests of the communities of Windermere, Bowness and Troutbeck Bridge*

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning sub-committee 17<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 7.00pm, The Council Chamber, Broad Street, Windermere

Minute No	
	<b>Present:</b> Cllrs Jenny Borer (in the chair), Sandra Lilley, Magda Khan & Adrian Legge. Also: Mrs Julie Hartley, Town Clerk and Cllr Lisa Greasley. The meeting opened at 7.00pm.
92.	<b>Apologies and absence:</b> Cllr Alan Hands
93.	<b>Minutes:</b> The minutes of the meeting held on 27 <sup>th</sup> March 2019 were approved and signed.
94.	<b>Declarations of Interest:</b> NONE
95.	<b>Requests for Dispensations:</b> NONE
96.	<b>Public &amp; Town Councillor Input</b> NONE
97.	<b>Member/Clerk Announcements:</b> The following outstanding planning issues with the LDNPA were listed and it was agreed that the Clerk would maintain an ongoing list for follow up and review by the sub-committee and that the list would be issued with the agenda for the meeting. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to the LDNPA about the following and add to the list. a) Acme House air conditioning - the deadline for the external ductwork to be changed to black has passed and this has not been carried out.  It was agreed that the following pending items should also be recorded: b) Building at Ferry Nab on the left near the modern garage. The LDNPA have confirmed that this structure has no planning permission and will, as a minimum, require screening. The Planner is following this up, but we should check for a response. c) Lake View garden bar. The LDNPA have responded to our enquiries to confirm that the design has not been approved and that the owner is due to submit a revised design. This item should be kept under review. d) The approval of Thot y Wil recently by the LDNPA does not have an officer report on the website. The Clerk will request a copy. e) Planning application 7/2018/5530 (Highfield access onto Rayrigg Road). The sub-committee recommended refusal and the Chair will look to attend the Development Control committee. The Clerk will obtain dates.
98.	<b>Planning Applications:</b> The following recommendations were agreed: a) 7/2019/5197: 1 Fellside, Kendal Road, Windermere: Variation of condition no 3 on

Signed as a true and accurate record:



# WINDERMERE TOWN COUNCIL

*Representing the interests of the communities of Windermere, Bowness and Troutbeck Bridge*

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning sub-committee

17<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 7.00pm, The Council Chamber, Broad Street, Windermere

	<p>planning approval ref 7/2018/5403 to move the local occupancy clause from Fellside and add to 4 Helm Close (19/4). No justification has been given on the application as to why this should happen. The sub-committee understands that all new build houses should be subject to local occupancy, so would recommend that both properties are so designated.</p> <p><b>b)7/2019/5188: 4, Brantfell Place, Bowness: Loft Conversion (24/4)</b> No objection.</p> <p><b>c)7/2019/5222: 1 Langrigge Park, Bowness: Porch &amp; Internal alterations (30/4)</b> No objection.</p> <p><b>d)7/2019/5230: Fold Head House, Fallbarrow Road, Bowness: Replacement windows and doors, repairs to roofs, partial removal of boundary wall to create new vehicular access, internal alterations and repairs including removal of 20th C. fireplaces and stud wall with new WC and kitchen. (2/5)</b> This project is a good renovation of a historic house and appears to give adequate consideration to the needs of conservation. It is to be regretted that part of the old wall will be lost, but parking provision is important locally. The Town Council supports the retention of original features as listed on the heritage statement and would hope that all original and unique features, for example, the spice cupboard, will be retained.</p> <p><b>e)7/2019/5180: 27 Fairfield Road, Windermere: Extension to existing house and new front porch (3/5)</b> Recommend refusal on the grounds that this proposal, at 2 stories high, will result in unacceptable loss of daylight and sunlight to the neighbours. We believe it represents an un-neighbourly over development that has a negative impact on privacy and would think that a single storey extension would be more appropriate.</p> <p><b>f)7/2019/5198: Louper Weir, Newby Bridge Road: New timber jetty (7/5)</b> No objection.</p> <p><b>g)7/2019/5219: Fellside, Kendal Road, Bowness: Proposed house, revised elevations (8 May)</b> No objection.</p>
99.	<p><b>Tree Applications:</b> The following tree works applications were noted.</p> <p><b>a)T/2019/0052: 1, Foldhead Cottage, Fallbarrow Road, Bowness: Fell 1 Beech Tree.</b></p> <p><b>b)T/2019/0057: Hawthorn Cottage, Queens Drive, Windermere: Remove stem on willow.</b></p> <p><b>c)T/2019/0060: Windermere School, Elleray site, Windermere: Cut back all laurel over hang by 4 metres to clear footpath, Crown raise Lime tree to 5 metres &amp; Crown raise Ash group to 5m</b></p> <p><b>d)T/2019/0062: Cleeve How, Carriage Drive, Windermere: Storm damaged Oak tree to be reduced down to main trunk and additional Oak tree to fell. 2A, 3A, 4A A Number of conifers to reduce and shape. 3A, Cherry tree to reduce.</b></p>
100.	<p><b>Planning Decisions:</b> The planning decisions of the Lake District National Park listed on the agenda were noted.</p>

Signed as a true and accurate record:



# WINDERMERE TOWN COUNCIL

*Representing the interests of the communities of Windermere, Bowness and Troutbeck Bridge*

## Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning sub-committee

17<sup>th</sup> April 2019 at 7.00pm, The Council Chamber, Broad Street, Windermere

101.	<b>Dates of Next Meetings:</b> Wednesday 22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2019 at 7pm Wednesday 26 <sup>th</sup> June 2019 at 7pm
	<b>The planning sub-committee meeting closed at 8pm. The Chair then opened the meeting to discuss the Pre-submission Local Plan.</b>
102	<b>Pre-Submission Local Plan:</b> Councillors and the Clerk had taken time to look in detail at the information contained on the LDNPA website. Eventually, they were able to establish that the LDNPA are not re-consulting on the updated Local Plan, but very specifically on the process. The Town Council is being asked to confirm that the LDNPA have met all legal requirements and, particularly the requirement to consult adequately with the local community. The following wording was agreed to be submitted to Town Council for approval on 8 <sup>th</sup> May: “You recently wrote to us to ask for our views on the pre-submission Local Plan. We have to admit that it took time, poring over detail on your website and, in particular, the response form, to establish the questions that we were being consulted on. We believe that this latest example of consultation is over-complex, directional and lacking in flexibility. We understand that the LDNPA has legal requirements to fulfill and that the process itself is complex, but this only underlines the requirement for clear communication. The Town Council does not feel that the LDNPA have met the challenge of communicating this process clearly to the community. Our original response to you on 30 June last year highlighted the shortcomings of the consultation process and these comments are repeated again below, as they continue to be appropriate. All Town Councillors who attended the public consultation events were complimentary about the LDNPA staff, who were friendly and helpful, but were extremely concerned at the lack of information readily available to the public. The draft Local plan is a very long document and, in addition, there are further in depth background papers that need to be read to understand the nature of the proposals for Windermere & Bowness. An individual would need to be particularly motivated and have the wherewithal to dig around a complex website to come to any reasonable and informed opinion. There was a real need for a plain English summary for local people and this was not delivered. Some felt the advertising of the public consultation events was cursory and inadequate and the posters gave no indication of the importance of the Local Plan to local people. The online consultation response document is way too simplistic for such a complex set of proposals - yes/no answers are not appropriate in many cases and the questions do not encompass the proposals which are of most interest to the local community. There is little scope for true interactive public debate and opportunities to engage meaningfully with the community have been lost. In some cases this is already causing misinterpretation and stress amongst residents.”

Signed as a true and accurate record: