

# Erratum

## LA01/2020/0815/O

### 1.0 Update

#### 1.1 Paragraph 8.15 of the Planning Committee Report states;

In addition to the above consideration, a number of PAC decisions exist where off-siting of the replacement was not allowed when the individual contexts were assessed. One such example is 2019/A0199, where the appeal was dismissed. The existing site was considered to be of a sufficient scale and would easily accommodate a dwelling of modern scale and standard. The proposed site was across the road from the existing, and the decision outlined that any impacts as a result of farming activity would not be resolved by siting a dwelling on the opposite side of the road. This is comparable as the proposed site would still be within proximity to the farming activity and any impacts would remain to be felt. A second example is 2017/A0060 which was dismissed on similar grounds. The existing curtilage was of a sufficient scale and it remained within close proximity to farm buildings and that an off-site replacement would not result in demonstrable amenity benefits.

This should state;

In addition to the above consideration, a number of PAC decisions exist where off-siting of the replacement was not allowed when the individual contexts were assessed. One such example is 2019/A0199, where the appeal was dismissed. The existing site was considered to be of a sufficient scale and would easily accommodate a dwelling of modern scale and standard. A second example is 2017/A0060 which was dismissed on similar grounds. The existing curtilage was of a sufficient scale and it remained within close proximity to farm buildings and that an off-site replacement would not result in demonstrable amenity benefits.

## **2.0 Recommendation**

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