

**Objection to Planning Application 17/03634/FUL dated 17th November and amended 23rd November:**

**Rose Cottage erection of three bedroom dwelling with two dormer windows and three conservation roof-lights**

Dear Planning Department, Fiona Tebbutt, Emma Chaplin, Anne Wilkinson

Apologies for having to write to you again, on behalf of Hannington Parish Council, with regards to the above planning application. However, I and members of the Parish Council are becoming increasingly confused with the process as we are having to deal with and comment on three interrelated elements at the same time:-

- i. complaint regarding breach of planning application 15/02902/FUL... your reference EC/17/00390/BOC3
- ii planning application 17/03634/FUL dated 17th November, and
- iii. planning application 17/03634/FUL dated 23rd November which is submitted as an amendment to 15/02902/FUL, on which the Parish Council has lodged a complaint regarding alleged breach (see i. above).

I have attached a further explanatory note (see below) detailing the concerns and the rationale behind the Parish Council's assertion of the alleged breach of planning (15/02902/FUL) and the objection to the latest application for the three bedroom dwelling (17/03634/FUL) in which I provide direct extracts and quotes.

I also appreciate that the issues have/are being considered by a variety of planning officers, and have therefore taken the liberty to copy this email and attachments to you directly.

Yours sincerely,

Chris Pottinger,

Clerk, Hannington Parish Council

24<sup>th</sup> November 2017

---

**Subject: 17/03634/FUL Hannington CP**

**Address:** Rose Cottage Summer Down Lane Hannington RG26 5TX

**Description:** Erection of three bedroom dwelling with garage and store on land adjacent to Rose Cottage using existing access (Amended scheme to that already approved under 15/02902/FUL to allow the inclusion of two dormer windows and three conservation roof-lights)

**Case Officer:** Fiona Tebbutt

**LETTER of OBJECTION** - Planning Application 17/03634/FUL Consultation expiry date 14<sup>th</sup> December 2017

The objection interrelates with the already approved 15/02902/FUL which is considered by the Parish Council (see earlier correspondence) to be in 'Breach' of the approval. That Breach is now considered to be deliberate to facilitate the 17/03634/FUL application proposal.

**Objections:**

1. The roof ridge height is higher in this development than Rose Cottage itself, contrary to the basis of planning approval for 15/02902/FUL by the 'Committee' detailed in the '*Applications Officers Report – Committee Report*'. See notes below.

Source: <http://pad.basingstoke.gov.uk/documents/4753/01/08/01/01080124.PDF>

2. The email from Anne Wilkinson, Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council dated 10<sup>th</sup> November 2015, confirms the expectation of a lower ridge height of the development to that of Rose Cottage,

**From:** Anne Wilkinson [<mailto:Anne.Wilkinson@basingstoke.gov.uk>]

**Sent:** 10 November 2015 14:30

**To:** Janusz 'Jan' Hertz

**Subject:** RE: AMENDMENTS: Planning Reference 15/02902/FUL Rose Cottage, Hannington

*Dear Mr Hertz, with regard to ridge heights, the street scene from The Green clearly shows the proposed new dwelling and Rose Cottage and that the proposed dwellings would be slightly lower. The proposed dwelling would have a ridge height of approximately 6.5/6.6m to the ridge."*

**Comparative observation from the Village Green blatantly shows this not to be the case.** See formal notification by the Hannington Parish Council to the BDBC Planning Department with regard to the 'Breach' of 15/02902/FUL.

3. Application 17/03634/FUL proposes the addition of a 1<sup>st</sup> floor, i.e. 3<sup>rd</sup> bedroom, box / study and bath room.

**Planning History:** The initial two storey planning application proposed dormer windows on the 1<sup>st</sup> Floor overlooking the Village Green which was refused,

*"Planning permission was refused for a detached two storey dwelling under the ref: 15/01329/FUL in June 2015. The dwelling was two storeys with the first floor being served by dormer windows in the roof and containing a maximum ridge height of approximately 7.3 metres. The proposal was considered unacceptable as it would cause harm to the character and visual amenities of the area the North Wessex AONB; the setting of the group of non-designated heritage assets and would fail to have special regard for the character and appearance of the Conservation Area."*

Source: <http://pad.basingstoke.gov.uk/documents/4753/01/08/01/01080124.PDF>

**This application reinstates those very features**, e.g. two storey build etc., that were refused originally in the planning application 15/01329/FUL.

4. In the event application 17/03634/FUL is approved, then the Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Planning Authority ***create a clear precedent whereby agreed and approved planning applications are seen to be deliberately ignored***, the roof height in this case is higher (than agreed) to facilitate a subsequent planning amendment to reinstate those features that impact on the character of the Village Green and *"fail to have special regard for the character and appearance of the Conservation Area"* – those features which were rejected in the initial planning application in the first place.

#### Notes:

Extracts from the 'Applications Officers Report – Committee Report'

Source: <http://pad.basingstoke.gov.uk/documents/4753/01/08/01/01080124.PDF>

#### Impact on the character of area / design

*"... The current proposal is for a single storey dwelling and seeks to overcome the reasons for refusal of the previous planning application ref: 15/01329/FUL. ... the proposed dwelling would have a lower ridge and eaves height than the neighbouring dwelling at Rose Cottage which would help to overcome previous concerns raised in relation to hierarchy and relationship with Rose Cottage."*

And,

*"... loosely mimics the roof shape of the outshot and the side of Rose Cottage. The proposed ridge height, whilst slightly higher than the design originally submitted, would continue to be lower than the ridge of Rose Cottage"*