

**COUNCILLORS' QUESTIONS AND OFFICERS' RESPONSE – PLANNING COMMITTEE 4 FEBRUARY 2021**

Item and application	Question	Response
<p><b>ITEM 2.1</b>  <b>20/504677/FULL</b>  <b>Slips Cottage</b>  <b>Church Hill</b></p>	<p><b>Cllr Dendor</b></p> <p>I would like some clarification on the parking/access issue.</p> <p>I believe parking is a material planning consideration in this application but I stand to be corrected.</p> <p>The applicant's Design Access, and Heritage Statement does not mention access or parking. The curtilage shown on their plans does not incorporate the track next to their property (ZR293?) whilst the curtilage shown on the report plan does - which is correct? Presumably there is a right of way along this track.</p> <p>Neighbour's comments:</p> <p>"1) Access to the stables and grazing is over an unmade woodland track and public right of way owned by Sharsted Woods. It is unsuitable for regular vehicle use and would require further development to the detriment of the area.                  2) There is no provision for parking at Slips Cottage.</p> <p>Whilst the character of the property has changed considerably,                  I have no objection to a horse being kept at the property in principle. However, the plans should be revised to provide access and parking without encroachment."</p> <p>I am particularly referring to "There is no provision for parking at Slips Cottage". Is the overall lack of parking here</p>	<p>Yes, but stables do not normally have a specific parking requirement as they are normally in fields which have plenty of space for vehicles to stop.</p> <p>The neighbours pointed out an error in the site boundaries indicating that some of their land was within the application site boundary. We asked the applicant to amend it. A new plan was then received that resolved the overlap, but the original plan is printed with the agenda by mistake - apologies from us for that. I believe that we will be replacing the original plan with the new plan on the website very soon.</p> <p>The site is plenty big enough to enable a horse box to park in. there are access possibilities either via an</p>

a material planning consideration? Particularly that a horsebox may have to park there to load/unload horses.

Following on from this referring to "Parking vehicles in the track blocks access and prevent others using the public right of way", is this correct? And if so, what action can be taken to prevent blocking access?

Finally it has been said the PROW is for pedestrian access only - how does this stack up with occupiers of Slip Cottage using it to park vehicles or use vehicles to access their property?

adjacent track (subject a private right of way – an issue that the council does not need to be involved in) or via the garden of the cottage itself, along their western boundary. I do not see any great difficulty with the applicant getting their horse or feed etc on or off the site, but if they want to use other people's land (which they no longer claim to be in their ownership) they will need to ensure that they have a right of way.

The track is a vehicular track into the woods. It is on private land, but is also a public footpath. The council does not control access to the track (see above) or get involved in disputes over vehicles parking on or blocking access along the track. As I say above, the applicant will need to ensure adequate access rights over the land owned by others unless they simply get to the stables over their own land. This matter is not one that ought to affect determination of the planning application.

The track is perfectly wide enough for vehicles, but the public only has right to access it on foot (it's a public footpath) so the applicant will need to negotiate with the land owners if they do not yet enjoy a legal right of way by vehicles. Again, this is a private matter that the council should not need to be involved in..