

EAST WOODHAY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

5.30 p.m. MONDAY, 7th SEPTEMBER 2020

Virtual Meeting held on: Monday, 7th September, 17:30 via Zoom.

MINUTES OF MEETING

1. **Attendance:** Cllr. Susan Cooper, Cllr. Martin Hainge, Cllr. Philip Jarvis, Cllr. Karen Titcomb (Chair), Cllr. Andrew Watson, Mrs. Hilary Hainge.

2. **Apologies:** None.

3. **Minutes of last meeting:** Agreed.

4. **Matters arising:** None.

5. **20/01981/HSE - Black and White Farmhouse, Hollington, RG20 9XN.** Erection of single storey extension, cladding to rear gable, French doors and enlarged window (resubmission of 20/00294/HSE following removal of oak tree).

No comments or objections.

6. **20/01992/FUL - Woolton Hill Sports Club, Woolton Hill, RG20 9TX.** Construction of Floodlit Porous Macadam Mini-Tennis Court with 2.0m high Perimeter Fence including Padel Section.

No comments or objections.

7. **20/02141/FUL - The Old Shop Trade Street, Woolton Hill, RG20 9UJ.** Erection of 2 no. dwellings (three-bed and four-bed) with associated parking, access and landscaping following demolition of outbuildings.

Cllr. Hainge recused himself from voting on this matter; he lives opposite the application site and has a personal interest in the matter. He will be making his own comments regarding the application.

Mrs. Hilary Hainge addressed the Committee on behalf of local residents wishing to object. The application is regarded as an ill-conceived attempt to cram two fairly large properties into a small plot.

The keys points raised were:

- i) Overdevelopment.
- ii) House 1 is too close to a locally listed building and overshadows it.

- iii) The application is contrary to policies contained in the National Planning Policy Framework, Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan and the Village Design Statement for Woolton Hill and the Hamlets.
- iv) The application site is in an AONB and the application does not conserve or enhance the scenic beauty of the area, quite the contrary.
- v) Little heed is paid to the amenity or street scene. For example, firstly the design of House No 1 is not in keeping with surrounding properties and, as mentioned at (ii) above, its position is overbearing. Secondly the boundary line of trees between the plot and parish field to the rear of the plot have already been felled. In addition, the 19th century Old Bakery is scheduled for demolition (thereby allowing the Old Shop to have a garden). Which taken with the recent felling of trees to the rear of the plot, results in House No 2 being clearly visible from both the parish field and church, unlike neighbouring properties.
- vi) There are highway, traffic and parking issues (particularly potential problems relating to traffic being able to leave the property in front gear) resulting from (a) the car parking spaces lying perpendicular to the cul-de-sac drive (b) insufficient space given to the car parking spaces and the 'turning circle' at the end of the drive.

The Committee object:

- a) Cramming two additional properties into a single, irregularly shaped plot would result in over development of the site, with a concomitant adverse impact on the street scene, parking and road safety.
- b) The proposed development does not meet the overarching environmental objective set out in paragraph 8(c) of the NPPF. The village of Woolton Hill is served by one small combined shop and Post Office and an exceedingly limited 'bus service. This would result in future occupants of any new properties relying on cars for the overwhelming majority of their shopping and other travel requirements.
- c) The site falls within the area of the North Wessex Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The NPPF clearly states an AONB is one of the areas having the highest status of protection in relation to issues of conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. The proposed development, particularly House 2 and what is in effect a small car park towards the rear of the site would have a detrimental impact on the visual amenity enjoyed by walkers using the footpath in the field to the rear of The Old Shop and the view across that field from the area of the church.
- d) House 1 'blocks' the street scene – it would be cramped in its plot and present a cramped relationship with neighbouring houses on both sides of the road – all of which sit in more open plots with space on either side. It would therefore increase the density of the street scene by failing to respect the current spatial separation between housing plots. This is an unacceptable form of development because it fails to preserve the character and appearance of this older, more historic part of the village.
- e) House 1 would also be in unacceptable proximity to its neighbours, especially 'Oakleigh' which is included on the Local List for intactness and contribution to the

local street scene. Squeezing in another house between Oakleigh and The Old Shop will greatly detract from the contribution Oakleigh makes to that local street scene.

f) The Heritage Statement forming part of this application states that, “The degree of openness of the frontage enables an additional dwelling, i.e. House 1, to sit comfortably alongside The Old Shop and preserve the ‘breathing space’ around the non-designated heritage asset.” For the reasons stated above, the Planning Committee disagree with this contention: there is absolutely no “breathing space” – indeed a bay window to the side of The Old Shop would have to be removed to facilitate a narrow driveway, which is hardly indicative of “breathing space”. On the contrary, the infilling which this proposed development seeks to achieve would leave the site (and adjacent properties) gasping for air.

g) It is also noted that this type of cul-de sac development is not in keeping with the existing ribbon development typical along Trade Street. The Village Design Statement for Woolton Hill and the Hamlets, states at p.10, Guideline 038, “Cul-de-sac developments should be avoided to maintain existing property layouts and vistas.”

h) Policy EM1 of the Basingstoke & Deane Local Plan states that development will be permitted only where it can be demonstrated that the proposals are sympathetic to the character and visual quality of the area concerned. Development proposals must respect, enhance and not be detrimental to the character or visual amenity of the landscape likely to be affected. The Committee contend that the proposal does not conform to this policy.

i) Policy EM10 requires, amongst other things, that all development proposals positively contribute to the appearance of streets, respect the local environment and amenities of neighbouring properties. The Committee submit that the proposed development does not conform to those aspects of that policy.

j) The application form clearly states at section 16 under Market Housing – Proposed, that if the site were developed as is proposed, there would be two houses with 4+ bedrooms and a three bedroom house. There should, therefore, be at least 8 parking spaces within the plot – and this does not include visitor parking. The proposal allows for 7 parking spaces and there are no unallocated spaces.

k) This is a shared driveway development with no provision for access and loading of delivery vehicles. This is unacceptable, especially on a narrow road with limited pavement provision.

l) There is no provision for visitor/disabled parking, meaning that visitors would be likely to park on Trade Street, adding to the existing problem and increasing the urbanisation of an old country lane. Further there appears to be no provision of electric charging points.

m) It is stated that the proposed driveway between The Old Shop and House 1 would be 5.08 metres wide. However, the Pdf plan document contains mention of a 1:200 scale. Use of this scale indicates that the drive is closer to 4 metres than 5, and whatever the width this will be achieved, in part, by the removal of a bay window on the side of The Old Shop.

Further, if the three parking spaces at the end of the drive (08 on the plan) are occupied, then the turning circle is about 7 metres by 7 metres. Since the average size of a delivery van is 6 metres by 2.5 metres it will be impossible to exit the drive in forward gear, unless of course the vehicle has reversed up the drive in the first place. The result will be delivery vehicles either reversing out onto Trade Street on a 'blind' corner, or making their deliveries from the main road and causing more congestion.

n) Minimum space for parking place should be 5.2m x 2.7m. The application provides for parking spaces that are approximately 5.08 x 2.5 metres but makes no allowance for vehicular access and egress. This is particularly difficult for the last in a row of three, which would be almost impossible to access if the previous two spaces were occupied – rendering it potentially useless and causing further pressure on street parking. In addition, as all the proposed parking bays for both House 1 and House 2 are perpendicular parking bays, there should be 6m between aisles for manoeuvring.

It is well known locally that Trade Street suffers traffic congestion issues, particularly around the Doctors' surgery where patients park on the road, thereby reducing the carriageway to a single lane. In the case of the proposed development, this situation will be replicated. As there is no provision for visitor parking for the three houses and limited access for delivery vehicles, on-street parking will inevitably take place, restricting the width shortly before/after a sharp bend. Indeed, there are added issues here: two 'bus stops are positioned on either side of the road outside The Old Shop (within 25 metres of the proposed drive). It is also at this point that the pavement stops and pedestrians are forced to walk in the road. With the number of school buses, delivery vehicles, residents' cars and additional traffic for the surgery at peak times, the Committee contend that this could produce an extremely dangerous situation for the many adults and children who walk along Trade Street to the shops, sports facilities and other amenities in the village.

To further add to these risks through over development of The Old Shop and adjoining land, with additional resident and visitor cars and delivery vehicles, whilst not adhering to the relevant local and national planning policies, is unacceptable.

8. Planning Committee Terms of Reference. To be carried forward.

9. Items for next Agenda: 19/02956/FUL - Sungrove Farm, East End. Response to various documents recently added to the application.

10. Date of next meeting: 5.30 p.m., Monday, 28th September, via Zoom.