

Erratum

LA01/2019/1012/O

1.0 Update

1.1 Paragraph 8.5 of the Planning Committee report states;

The building to be replaced is located on a site that has become completely overgrown. The walls of the building to be replaced are completely covered with vegetation but are of a stone construction. The building has a corrugated iron roof. The site was very difficult to access but entry to the building was obtained. The external and internal walls remain but no chimney stacks or fireplaces were visible and there was only two small window openings on the element of the building that was accessed. There is a tiled floor on a section of the building and a plastered internal wall. Although this may have been a former dwelling, today given its state of disrepair this building does not exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling.

1.2 Paragraph 8.5 should state;

The building to be replaced is located on a site that has become completely overgrown. The walls of the building to be replaced are to the most part covered with vegetation and are of a stone construction. The building has a corrugated iron roof which is partially missing. The site was very difficult to access but entry to the building was obtained via the southern gable wall which was not substantially intact. This was confirmed by the ecologist during the inspection of the structure for the biodiversity checklist. The remaining external and internal walls remain but no chimney stacks or fireplaces were visible and there was only two small window openings on the element of the building that was accessed. There is a tiled floor on a section of the building and a plastered internal wall. Although this may have been a former dwelling, today given its state of disrepair this building does not exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling. Further to this the southern gable wall is not substantially intact.

1.3 Refusal reason 1 currently states;

1. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY 1 and CTY 3 of Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the existing structure does not exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling.

1.4 Refusal reason 1 should state;

1. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY 1 and CTY 3 of Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the existing structure does not exhibit the essential characteristics of a dwelling and all external walls are not substantially intact.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the proposed development in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.