

EAST WOODHAY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

5.30 p.m. MONDAY, 29th JUNE 2020

Virtual Meeting held on: 1st June 2020, 17:30 via Zoom.

We apologise that meetings cannot be held in person for the foreseeable future. We are doing our best to keep things going. Please bear with us.

MINUTES

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

2. **Apologies:** None.

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

4. **Matters arising:**

Cllr. Titcomb outlined the current position on the chestnut trees alongside Church Road.

Hampshire County Council, Highways Team have looked at the trees, one is dead and should be felled, the others need professional assessment. The Highways Team will be writing to the landowner. Cllr. Titcomb has requested a copy of the letter to inform any future course of action.

5. **T/00186/20/TPO - 33 Greenacres, Woolton Hill, RG20 9TA.** T154 Maple: prune as proposed tree works.

As there was no documentation online it was agreed to state this in our response, but add that it was unlikely that the Planning Committee would object to an application for pruning.

6. **20/01274/FUL- Rose Cottage, Hollington House, Woolton Hill, RG20 9XR.** Erection of tree house to an existing glampsite.

Object for the following reasons:-

a) The original Planning permission of 2016 granted retrospective permission in relation to a one acre site – not the whole wood. The site plan accompanying the current application shows the proposed tree house as partially outside the boundary of the existing one-acre site. Planning permission should not be granted in terms which expressly or impliedly permit an extension of the 1 acre site area.

The current application refers to seeking planning permission for a tree house “within our 9.98 acre wood”. However, there is no permission to use 9.98 acres, only 1 acre. If the applicants wish to extend the area of the glamping site within the wood they should apply for permission to do so in the proper manner. It is not appropriate to extend the site with piecemeal incursions into the area that have no permission.

b) In 2016 when RETROSPECTIVE permission was sought for the 2 pods, the Parish Council asked that the enterprise be restricted to a max of 2 pods.

Now there are 2 pods and 2 bell tents along with 2 composting toilets and showers but the 2016 planning granted only 1 toilet and shower.

The site’s website: <https://www.hollingtonparkglamping.com/> openly advertises these facilities which are not compliant with the planning granted in 2016.

c) The Committee is surprised by the comments made by the Basingstoke & Deane Landscape Team that “the site does not have any close neighbours”. This is entirely incorrect – the neighbours cannot be seen through the rest of the woodland, but they exist. Approaches have been made to the Planning Committee by residents who are close enough to find the music and other noise, in the evenings, when the site is in use extremely intrusive. An increase in visitor numbers would inevitably lead to more noise, which in a residential area is already at an unacceptable level.

d) It is noted that the Design and Access Statement states that “all the treework is up to date and regularly monitored”. This statement does not coincide with observed reality. A recent walk past the area reveals several trees which have fallen and been left in position and trees which do not appear to be in a safe condition adjacent to the highway.

The Planning Committee also has the following comments to make regarding the original 2016 planning permission, 16/00119/RET.

e) When retrospective planning permission was granted in 2016 for two “pods”, toilet and shower block on a 1 acre site the operation was presented as small and low key. The website for the site, <https://www.hollingtonparkglamping.com/> states, **“We have two sweet little vintage styled pod cabins & beautifully decorated huge 6m bell tents in the summer, set in a magical woodland clearing EACH WITH ITS OWN TOILET SHOWER AND SINK so no sharing facilities!!”**.

This is not compliant with the 2016 retrospective planning permission and suggests that the site is growing in size from the small and low key presentation of 2016. This is not an appropriate site for anything larger or more commercial.

f) The applicants’ supporting statement says that the glamping business was set up to bring in revenue to help manage the woodland. There is no evidence of any such management as the woodland appears to be in a very poor state, with trees regularly shedding branches in windy weather.

The conditions applied to the previous planning included a safety survey of the trees in the vicinity by an arboriculturist – within three months. The Committee does not

know whether this has happened or whether any professional advice has been sought.

g) The applicants' supporting statement also alleges that the trees in the wood are not protected but trees may not be felled without a felling licence from the Forestry Commission. The Committee is not aware that any such licence has been obtained, yet numerous trees have been felled and residents are frequently disturbed by the noise of machinery from the woods.

h) There is no evidence that glamping customers use the village facilities as referred to in the applicants' supporting statement. Indeed, to state that such facilities are within walking distance would refer to remarkably keen walkers.

In summary, the Planning Committee is extremely concerned at the piecemeal approach to what is apparently now a full-on commercial enterprise. The applicants applied retrospectively in 2016 and have installed additional facilities without the planning permission they must now know is required.

To present local residents and the planning authority with a "done deal" in the hope that this means it is more likely to be granted is an unacceptable way forward. The Committee does not feel that the site should be extended beyond the two pods which were granted in 2016, do not support the addition of the two bell tents advertised on the website and do not support the application for a tree house.

7. 20/01232/HSE - Woolton House, Woolton Hill, RG20 9TZ. Reconstruction and extension of fire damaged log store building to form secure garage and storage areas with estate office and staff facilities within the roof space.

No comments or objections.

8. T/00230/20/TCA - Northenby Cottages, North End Road, North End, RG20 0AY. The tree is a giant Holm Oak (A) which overshadows the house. Crown lift lower canopy. Remove large limb over corner of house. Crown reduction by 2 metres. This work is required because the tree totally overshadows the house darkening many rooms. The proximity of the tree to the house makes obtaining insurance difficult, particularly as the branches overhang the house. The tree roots are beginning to cause problems in the nearby culvert.

Decision to be left to the Tree Officer.

9. Matters for the next Agenda:

a) Chestnut trees alongside Church Road.

10. Date of next meeting: 5.30 p.m., Monday, 13th July, via Zoom.