

Parish Council's DECISIONS (last night) on Planning Applications... early draft
Barbara Macmurchy <barbmacmail@gmail.com>
Yesterday, 14:35

Dear residents,

Due to the high level of public interest generated by the two planning applications considered at the Parish Council meeting held yesterday evening, the Council has agreed that I release an early draft extract of the Minutes that addresses the particular agenda item. By the very nature and timing of this 'extract' the final 'draft' Minutes are likely to cover the issues discussed in greater detail. With regards the first planning application, in particular, the Council agreed a series of ACTIONS to be taken as soon as possible by the Clerk. These actions centre on the Council sending emails to the Planning Department. Once the emails have been drafted, agreed and sent, they will form part of the final 'draft' Minutes. These Minutes will be circulated to residents in the normal way i.e. through the village email network managed by Barbara MacMurchy, and by posting them on the Hannington Parish Council website.

EXTRACT FROM DRAFT Minutes of the Parish Council meeting 12th December 2017

10. Planning Applications

10.a i. Rose Cottage: alleged breach of planning control 15/02902/FUL

On instructions from the Parish Council, the Clerk submitted in early November an 'alleged breach of planning control', using the Borough Council's online system. On 22nd November the BDBC Compliance and Enforcement Officer contacted the Clerk seeking further information. The Complaint was allocated the following reference number EC/17/00390/BOC3. The original complaint was followed with two further more detailed explanations of the nature of the complaint on 22nd November and 24th November. Whilst the complaint of the Council made specific reference to the ridge height of the new dwelling exceeding what was agreed, **the thrust of the complaint by the Council was that the ridge height of the new dwelling appeared to clearly EXCEED that of Rose Cottage.** This is despite the many statements and the drawings/plans that form part of the planning application etc which are explicitly to the contrary. The Council concluded there had been numerous, substantial and material examples of misleading/erroneous statements. In evidence of this conclusion, the meeting noted the following two 'statements', as examples:-

a. An email from a BDBC Planning Officer to Cllr Jan Hertz dated 10th November states,

"Dear Mr Hertz, with regards 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."

b. 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".

BDBC Enforcement Team's response 6th December

The Clerk has yet to receive a formal, written reply from the Enforcement Team. However, in response to his 'phone call last week, the Clerk was told an officer had visited the property and had measured the ridge height at 6.5m. As this height was in accordance with the approved planning application, he concluded there was no breach.

The Council considered this to be an incomplete answer to their complaint as there is no reference by the Enforcement Officer to the actual ridge height of Rose Cottage, and therefore it is still not possible to compare the two ridge heights and to ascertain if the planning application and subsequent statements were materially incorrect, or not.

ACTION: Clerk to write urgently to BDBC Planning Department seeking an answer to the question of the relative ridge heights of the two dwellings.

The Parish Council will then decide what further action, if any, it proposes to take with regards the various inaccurate statements that have been made as part of the planning application process.

10. a.i. Rose Cottage Planning Application 17/03634/FUL: 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)

The Parish Council had already submitted its Objection to the above planning application 22nd November. This decision was taken in advance of the Council meeting as the initial deadline for response to BDBC was earlier. The Objection is reproduced below:-

- 1. The proposed building is too large for the site and when taken with the existing buildings that comprise Rose Cottage are an over-development of a sensitive site adjacent to the village green.*
- 2. A two-storey development in this location will significantly alter the current rural street scene which surrounds the village green."*

However, since then the Council has been informed the planning application is NOT for a three bedroom dwelling, with a room in the loft space, but for a two bedroom dwelling. The framework and size of the dwelling is not altered by this 'correction' in the planning application. The 'corrected' application is therefore solely for "the inclusion of two dormer windows and three conservation roof-lights".

It was clear from statements made at the Parish Council meeting that many residents were either unaware of this 'correction' or were unsure of its implications. Accordingly, any Comments they had submitted to BDBC Planning Department would have focussed on the 'three bedroom' aspect

(as had the Parish Council originally). and not addressed the substantive planning application that we have been informed is purely for the windows etc.

DECISION: the Parish Council consider the stated 'Proposal' of the planning application is totally misleading, and sufficiently inaccurate so as to make it unacceptable.

ACTION: The Parish Council have instructed the Clerk to write to BDBC Planning Department accordingly, and to require the current planning application, as shown on the BDBC public planning website (and reproduced in the paragraph title above) is withdrawn, and a new. correctly worded planning application applied for and published. This action by BDBC Planning Department would provide the public with the opportunity to consider the real planning application in its proper context.

The Council then considered the planning application as it now understands it should be interpreted i.e. as a proposal for the inclusion of two dormer windows and three conservation roof-lights.

The Council noted there was no representative of the applicant at the meeting, to answer any questions or to put forward the case on behalf of the applicant.

DECISION: the Council unanimously voted to Object to the planning application.

ACTION: the Clerk to inform BDBC Planning Department, accordingly with the reasons for the Objection.

10.a.ii Land between Woodstock and Primrose cottage, White Lane: erection of detached dwelling

The Parish Council had Objected to the previous application that was refused by the BDBC Planning Department and by the Planning Inspectorate, on Appeal.

The Council noted that the latest application was substantively the same as the previous planning application. From comparison of the two applications it had been possible to identify that the latest application proposed to:-

- move the building away from the woodland at the rear of the property and further towards White Lane. The benefit was that this would reduce any damage to the woodland and would enable the stables to be continue to be used as such. However, the disadvantage was that the two storey building with a ridge height of 7.8m would be even more intrusive, and,
- redesignate the site as 'brown field'. Based on the evidence given in the planning application itself, as being used to graze horses, and local knowledge, the Council could not understand this new classification, and discounted it.

The Council noted there was no representative of the applicant at the meeting, to answer any questions or to put forward the case on behalf of the applicant.

DECISION: the Council unanimously voted to Object to the planning application.

ACTION: the Clerk to inform BDBC Planning Department, accordingly with the reasons for the Objection.