
From: Stephanie Ayres
Sent: 17 September 2015 17:28
To: Martin Perks
Cc: Rob Ellis; Mark Godson; Mark Wildish

Please forward the contents of this email to the committee members and include this document at the appropriate committee meeting.

Dear Mr Perks

At the August planning committee meeting, our application for retrospective planning was turned down and the committee also voted to allow you to serve an Enforcement Notice requiring the demolition notice of our home.

We now understand that, the Enforcement Notice is being taken back to the committee for another vote, since the information you provided at this meeting about our alternative accommodation was incorrect.

At the August meeting, you will recall that some committee members expressed a hope that 'a compromise solution would be put forward which would avoid the need to demolish the building.' and you replied that we 'could submit another application seeking further amendments to the building' (ie. Orchard Rise). Can you please confirm this.

As you know, prior to the committee meeting and your decision to refuse our application, we had repeatedly requested a meeting with you to discuss compromises that might be reached to sort out the issues regarding changes made to the previously permitted application. We also wished to avoid the need for an Enforcement Notice, and particularly one that required demolition.

I have been advised by our Planning Consultant that Paragraph 207 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that, "*Local planning authorities should act proportionately in responding to suspected breaches of planning control*"

Unfortunately you were not prepared to meet with us at that time.

Since the demolition decision is now on hold pending a further vote and encouraged by your comments at the meeting in August we are very keen to meet with you to discuss the amendments that you would require us to take to rectify the situation, and to allow for a more proportionate response to the breach of control.

At the committee meeting you also stated that we 'could have converted the roof space of the permitted scheme without the need to apply for planning permission'. We therefore feel there are opportunities for this building to be brought more in line with the approved scheme without compromising the conversion of the attic space, since the house is only marginally bigger in terms of visual mass.

We also feel there are also a number of areas whereby the overall visual impact of the development could be reduced so that any future negotiated application is actually dramatically smaller than the 'as approved' development.

This includes changes to the permitted buildings which have not yet been constructed (Cotswold Stone Barn and Garage Block) and a comprehensive and improved landscaping scheme.

Although the planning committee members took a hard line with regard to our retrospective planning application, they were keen to see that a compromise solution would be put forward, which would avoid the need to demolish our home.

We are more than happy to comply with this should you give us the opportunity.

We hope therefore that you will now agree to meet with us before the next planning meeting, to draw up this alternative solution so that we can present this new information to the committee.

We are available to meet either on site or at the council offices at anytime at your convenience and look forward to hearing from you in this regard.

Yours sincerely

Stephanie Ayres