



Minutes of Kingsclere Parish Council Planning Committee Meeting PP 01/20  
Held at 10:00am on Monday 14<sup>th</sup> December 2020  
Using Zoom Online Meeting Software

**PP 01/20 – Present:**

Cllrs: Adams; Farey; Sawyer F; Sawyer J. Clerk – Jones, 2 members of the public from 10.13am until the end of the meeting.

**01/20.1 – Apologies:**

None.

**01/20.2 – Declarations of Interest:**

None.

**01/20.3 – To consider Planning Applications:**

**3.1 20/02986/FUL 4 Canons Court:**

This item was dealt with out of order after Item 3.7

The site has been viewed from the garden of the Old Vicarage by members of the planning committee, and residents spoken to. The council feel B&DBC should obtain the views of the Conservation Officer and Tree Wardens.

This application does not conform with policy K1 of the Neighbourhood Plan – Non-allocated residential sites within the SPB. In particular it does not have “a scale and form which would be complementary to surrounding properties and would result in significant loss of amenity to existing residents.” The property would dominate the view from Popes Hill and would overlook ‘Clanna’ on the opposite side of the road. Popes Hill is on a slope with the proposed property being situated on a higher point.

The application does not conform to policy K2 in the NP - Provision of Housing to meet Local Needs and Policy C3 of the Local Plan which states that “Development will be permitted where the mix of market housing includes a range of house type and size to address local requirements.” These policies seek to ensure that development meets the housing needs of local communities, providing a balanced mix of housing. The evidence set out within the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018) and the NP indicate a greater desire for smaller, more affordable units, not larger executive homes.

It also contravenes Policy K6 of the NP – Reinforcing Kingsclere’s landscape character. Part b states that “Planning applications do not detrimentally affect the important vistas and views identified in the Kingsclere Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan.” Map 5, reproduced in the NP, has an arrow at the top of Popes Hill pointing towards the important buildings along that street. The proposed building would be partially visible along the left hand side.

The application fails to conform to policy K7 of the NP – Protecting mature trees and hedgerows and enhancing rural character. Trees make a vital positive contribution to the character and appearance along with hedges, which contribute to the dominant character of the conservation area, particularly around Fox’s Lane and Popes Hill, allowing only limited glimpses of buildings in secluded and private settings. Such trees and hedges are an essential component of the special interest of this part of the village. The laurel hedge in Popes Hill has been severely damaged (see photo) by the applicant which somewhat contradicts the following paragraph in the design & access statement. “The application site has little impact on the Conservation Area but the dense hedgerow on its southern boundary with Popes Hill is a prominent landscape feature.” In addition, we are given to understand by the owners of The Old Vicarage, that the applicant illegally felled a mature tree on their (Old Vicarage) property earlier this year without obtaining the necessary planning permission. The stump and logs are clearly visible and has altered the visual impact of that part of Popes Hill. (See photo).

Finally, the planning committee fail to see how the proposed building would enhance and protect features in the Conservation Area. Placing new buildings, regardless of how well they are designed, in a small space next to or close by listed buildings would do nothing to enhance the street scene and ambiance of the area.

Kingsclere Parish Council believe this application fails to meet the three objectives of sustainable development as quoted in the NPPF. Namely - Economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and

competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth'. The council feel this is not land of the right type or the right place.

Social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations.....”

This property is a stand-alone property squeezed into a plot of land in a Conservation Area. Kingsclere requires smaller affordable properties to meet the current and future needs of its residents.

Environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity....

There is insufficient information in regard to the presence, or otherwise of protected species, or the affects that the development may have upon the ecological value of the site. The impact on biodiversity has not been quantified. Having said that, environmental damage has already been undertaken in preparation of this application.

Parking could become an issue in Canons Court which is a small cul-de-sac with little room for on street parking. Access to the proposed site for heavy vehicles is only viable via Canons Court which would cause considerable problems for residents.”

The effect of building works on the foundations of nearby listed buildings and the effect of excess water along Popes Hill, which already suffers from excess surface water, needs to be considered. Has any form of survey been conducted to assess the impacts on nearby listed buildings and excess groundwater? The proximity of the planning application to the boundaries of the site and the other buildings nearby is cause for concern. Also and finally, the replanting of trees could impact subterranean land and cause problems, also with any removal of the tree stumps causing instability in the bank where they sit.

**3.2. T/00604/20/TPO 26 Garrett Close:**

Cllrs advise they are unable to comment as there is no information available online. Cllrs request a complaint is sent to BDBC regarding the limited information that is being provided with planning applications and tree works, making it difficult for them to comment in some instances.

**3.3. T/00619/20/TCA The Old Vicarage, Foxs Lane:**

Cllrs agree the tree wardens advice should be adhered too but would like to suggest the walnut tree has the crown removed rather than be felled.

**3.4. 20/02941/FUL Land Adjacent To 4 Sandford House Cottages, Knowl Hill:**

The parish council are unanimous in their objection to this planning application on the following basis: It contravenes policy SS1 of the Local Plan as it is not an essential property to be located in the countryside.

It contravenes policy SS6 of the Local Plan (a) It is not clear from the documentation provided that there are any equestrian buildings to be demolished as no existing site plan has been provided. It is a large development which does not fit the criteria of SS6 (e) - A small scale residential proposal of a scale and type that meets locally agreed need. This is in accord with the Neighbourhood Plan.

It fails to satisfy policy CN3 which states that “Development will be permitted where the mix of market housing includes a range of house type and size to address local requirements.” Policy K2 of the NP supports housing to meet local need. These policies seek to ensure that development meets the housing needs of local communities, providing a balanced mix of housing. The evidence set out within the Housing Supplementary Planning Document (July 2018) and the NP indicate a greater desire for smaller, more affordable units, not executive homes.

It is true that the LPA cannot support a 5 year housing supply and therefore the presumption of sustainable development overrides the policies in both the LP and NP. But the council fail to see how executive homes in the countryside contributes to sustainable development. The Design statement quotes several clauses from the NPPF in support of this.

Economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth’;

The council would contend that this is not land of the right type or the right place.

Social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces

This property is a stand-alone property outside the village of Kingsclere. Residents would need transport to access village amenities which in itself would contribute to greater road use, village congestion etc. In any event there is no guarantee that the residents would use Kingsclere rather they could make use of facilities in Baughurst, Tadley or Newbury. Single homes miles away in the countryside do not help support strong, vibrant healthy communities.

Environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity....

There is insufficient information in regard to the presence, or otherwise of Protected Species, or the affects that the development may have upon the ecological value of the site so we are unable to assess the impacts on biodiversity.

**3.5. 20/03151/LDPU 27 Garrett Close:**

No objections.

**3.6. 20/03122/HSE 11 Wellmans Meadow:**

No objections.

**3.7. 20/03208/HSE 25 South Road:**

No objections.

**01/20.4 – Date of next meeting:**

To be scheduled as the need arises.

Meeting closed 10.40am

Signed:.....Chairman

Date:.....

Signed:.....Clerk

Date:.....

**Distribution: Cllrs:** S Adams; I Bowes; M Farey; C Mussett; N Peach; R Peach; A Price; F Sawyer and J Sawyer.

Noticeboard; Website: [www.kingsclere-pc.org.uk](http://www.kingsclere-pc.org.uk).