

EAST WOODHAY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE

5.30 p.m. TUESDAY, 14th APRIL 2020

Virtual Meeting held on: 14th April 2020, 17:30 via Zoom.

MINUTES

1. **Attendance:** Cllr. Susan Cooper, Cllr. Paul Hurst (from 6p.m. onwards), Cllr. Philip Jarvis, Cllr. Karen Titcomb (Chair), Cllr. Andrew Watson, Mr. Brian Johnson, Mr. Alan C. Griffiths.

2. **Apologies:** None.

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

4. **Matters arising:** None.

5. **T/00126/20TPO – 12 Longmead, Woolton Hill, RG20 9XY**

Management of 2 sycamore and 1 beech tree.

The date for Parish Council response to this application was confirmed as being the 17th April.

Decision left to the expertise of the Tree Officer.

6. **20/00792/PIP - Land Adjoining Knights Farm At OS Ref 442103 163376**

Knights Lane, Ball Hill. Permission in Principle for residential development for up to 9 dwellings with access off Knights Lane.

Mr. Brian Johnson discussed his reasons for objecting to the above application, as set out in his communication with Basingstoke & Deane Borough Council. His reasoning was supported by Mr. Alan Griffiths. It was also noted that many residents of the Ball Hill area had objected to the application, as evidenced by letters and emails appearing on the Basingstoke & Deane planning portal.

The Planning Committee object to this above application for reasons similar to those expressed by Messrs. Johnson & Griffiths:

1. Previous Applications: Whilst it is usual to consider each application in isolation, this application must be considered alongside comments made on two previous applications on land owned by the applicant which were granted, and another which was refused on Appeal. The two applications which were granted will see the provision of an additional 7 houses in the area. As such, the applicant is in our view seeking to circumvent planning restrictions by making applications on a piecemeal basis, which is wholly unacceptable.

2. AONB – The application site sits in the North Wessex Downs AONB. Paragraph 172 of the NPPF states that such areas have the highest status of protection in relation to issue of conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty. The proposed application achieves neither aim, but will only ‘urbanise’ a rural setting, particularly when noting that it will be next to an additional 7 new houses.

3. Sustainability: The application is intrinsically unsustainable. There are no facilities within reasonable, safe walking distance and new residents would inevitably need to make frequent use of cars. Accordingly, this proposed development is contrary to the NPPF.

APP/H1705/W/15/3133493 was refused at Appeal 05/02/2016 by the Planning Inspector. Their report stated that, "Ball Hill has very limited services and facilities." "The nearest town, of any size, is Newbury, some 8.5km from the Appeal site." "I have found that future occupiers would be highly dependent on the use of private motor vehicles." "In consequence I do not consider that the proposed development can be regarded as sustainable."

The situation described in the Planning Inspector's Report remains unchanged and the concerns he expressed are even more pertinent in the context of this application.

4. Major Development: Even if this application is to be considered in isolation (which it should not), it would still constitute a major development for the purposes of the NPPF because it is more than 0.5 hectares in area (see Glossary to Annex 2). It follows that if this application is considered in the light of the other applications referred to in paragraph 1, the proposed development is effectively a constituent part of a broader scheme of development which, when looked at as a whole, constitutes a very major development indeed in the context of the surrounding area. Indeed, government planning guidance states that the PIP application route cannot be used for major development.

5. Change of Use: The previous two applications were granted on land which was either a brownfield site or which was already residential. This proposal will involve a change of use from agricultural land and is not necessary or acceptable. It would also set an unacceptable precedent for similar sites in the area which are fundamental to the rural character, sense of openness and immediacy of the countryside in the hamlet.

6. Scale and Type: Whilst accepting that this is a PIP and we do not have the full details of the development, it is appropriate to say that an additional 9 houses of the size proposed do not meet local housing need. Principle 3.1 of the Housing SPD comments that, "the evidence highlights a borough wide need for small family homes and homes suitable for older people wishing to downsize. Developments should therefore principally focus upon a mix of two and three bedroom dwellings (particularly houses), with only a limited requirement for homes with four bedrooms or more.....". Further, Appendix 3 of the Housing SPD at paragraph A3.3 makes it clear that the parish is well supplied with houses providing four or more bedrooms. It has the highest percentage of such properties of all parishes within the local authority area at 51.1%. Paragraph A3.6 predicts that future demand will be predominantly smaller households: couples, one person households and households with one child.

7. Traffic: Aside from the issues of sustainability which we should all be considering, Knights Lane is a very narrow no-through road. The potential number of cars that would be generated by this application is inappropriate for this type of road. Furthermore, the site lines accessing the main and busy Ball Hill road from the lane are poor. There will be additional traffic generated by the 7 new houses already granted – this is enough. NPPF paragraph 103: says ‘Significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes’ and ‘...which can help reduce congestion and emissions, improve air quality and public health’. These provisions would not be met.

8. Services/Pumping Station: Local residents have serious concerns about the capability of yet more dwellings being served by the present, inadequate pumping station and capacity of the main sewer.

7. **20/00864/HSE - 4 Falcon Coppice, Woolton Hill, RG20 9UE.** Erection of single storey side extension and new garage roof

No comments or objections.

8. **20/00796/LDEO - Woolton House Stud, Burley House, Woolton Hill. RG20 9UA.** Certificate of lawfulness to confirm that the development permitted under 19/01904/ROC, which amends 17/03380/ROC and 17/00121/FUL has been lawfully commenced on site.

No comments or objections.

9. **20/00815/HSE - Conifer Lodge, Woolton Hill, RG20 9UW.** Rendering of existing dwelling.

No comments or objections.

10. **A.O.B:**

(a) **Land at Common Farm, Wash Water.** Identified by Basingstoke & Deane as a Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA) site; noted as potentially suitable for over 400 homes, should any planning permission be granted.

Cllr. Hurst had been invited to discuss this matter, of which he has knowledge as Chair of the Neighbourhood Planning Steering Group.

East Woodhay Parish Council received a letter from Chris Garrett, Chair of Enborne Parish Council asking if the council had a view on the above site, which is partly in the West Berkshire parish of Enborne and partly in the Hampshire parishes of East Woodhay and Highclere. The matter has been passed to the Planning Committee for consideration.

Following advice from Cllr. Hurst it was decided that Cllr. Titcomb would liaise with Highclere Parish Council and compose a joint response.

(b) **The Old Post Office.** Cllr. Watson observed that many trees in the garden land of this recently sold property had been felled and it appeared the land was being prepared for development.

Agreed that Cllr. Cooper would ascertain whether there were any Tree Preservation Orders on trees at the property.

11. **Date of next meeting:** 5.30 p.m., Monday, 27th April, virtual meeting via Zoom.