

**DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT SUB-COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 29 JUNE 2006  
(FROM 5.30 PM TO 6.20 PM)**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Harrison in the Chair. Councillors Robin Adderley, Mrs Atkinson, Beer, Broadbank, de Courcey-Bayley, Galloway, Grange, Chris Lewis, Charlie Powell, Dr Rothwell, Webber and Willis.

**01/06 - APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE AND NOTIFICATION OF**

**SUBSTITUTES:** An apology for absence had been received from

Councillor Clark. Notification had been received that Councillor Beer was to act as a substitute for Councillor Freeman and Councillor Willis for Councillor Wilson.

**02/06 - DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST:** Declarations were made as detailed in Minute 05/06.

**03/06 - MINUTES:** The Minutes of the meeting held on 25 April 2006 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

(Eight Members voted for the motion and there were five abstentions)

**04/06 - EXEMPT INFORMATION:** There were no exempt information items.

**MATTER WHICH THE COMMITTEE DEALT WITH UNDER  
DELEGATED POWERS**

**05/06 - PLANNING APPLICATION REFERRED TO SUB-COMMITTEE  
FOR DETERMINATION:** The Sub-Committee considered an

application made by Mr and Mrs Ashby for the erection of an eighteen bedroom annex with staff accommodation and associated landscaping at Millstones Restaurant, Skipton Road, Felliscliffe, which had been referred up from the Planning Committee at its meeting held on 20 June 2006. The Committee made the decision indicated viz:

(D)

**05/06 (01)**

**CASE NUMBER: 06/01682/FULMAJ**  
**GRID REF: EAST 422220 NORTH 456170**

**APPLICATION NO.: 6.99.35.K.FULMAJ**

**LOCATION:**

Millstones Restaurant Skipton Road Felliscliffe Harrogate North Yorkshire HG3 2LT

**PROPOSAL:**

Erection of an 18 bedroom annex with staff accommodation and associated landscaping (Site Area 1.049ha) (Revised Scheme).

**APPLICANT:** Mr And Mrs Ashby

**REFUSED.** Reason(s) for refusal:-

- 1 The proposal does not provide the sequential test required by PPS6 in relation to such uses, and no exceptional circumstances have been advanced to justify the building of a new hotel in the open countryside and the proposal therefore conflicts with the provisions of Criterion B of Policy C1 and the requirement of Policy TR2 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.
- 2 The proposal would be contrary to the guidance contained in the Dept of Communities and Local Government Good Practice Guide on Planning for Tourism as the proposed location is not sustainable, nor would the development fit well within its surroundings.
- 3 The proposal will introduce an imposing and prominent building into an open and undeveloped area of countryside with the Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty that will be harmful to the landscape character of the locality. The proposal is therefore contrary to the provision of Criteria A and D of Policy C1; Criterion C of Policy C11; Criterion D of Policy A1 Criteria A, B and G of Policy HD20; Criterion A of Policy TR2 and Policy C2 of the adopted Harrogate District Local Plan.

(Councillor Mrs Atkinson declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that she was known to the agent and had recently attended a wedding event at the premises but, on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, she remained in the meeting, took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Councillor Grange declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that he was known to the applicants and agent and had also eaten at the premises but, on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, he remained in the meeting, took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Councillor de Courcey-Bayley declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that she was known to the applicants and agent and had also eaten at the premises but, on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, she remained in the meeting, took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Councillor Willis declared a personal interest in this item on the basis that he was a freelance journalist and had reported on previous developments at the site but, on the basis that the interest was not prejudicial, he remained in the meeting, took part in the debate and voted thereon).

(Ten Members voted for the motion and there were three against).