

BARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL
Planning Committee

Page 09/661

Minutes of meeting of the Barkham Parish Council Planning Committee held on 13th January 2009 in Barkham Village Hall at 7.30 p.m.

Present: Mr. F.A. Scott, (in the Chair), Mr. S. Goldring, Mr. L. Heath, Mr. P. King and the Clerk.

Apologies:

09/227 **Minutes** of meeting held on 9th December 2008 were approved and signed as a true record. The planning meeting due to be held on 23rd December did not take place as there were no applications to consider.

09/228 Planning

F/2008/2753	23 Oaklands, Langley Common Road Proposed insertion of 2 solar panels to roof of mobile home.	Proposed No Comment
-------------	--	------------------------

F/2008/2781	Land adjacent to Little Hayes, Hayes Lane Proposed erection of new five bedroom dwelling with attached garage.	Delegated Opposed
-------------	---	----------------------

Clerk to write to WBC opposing this application, the proposed development will be out of keeping with the street scene, Hayes Lane is a country lane, the adjacent properties are chalet bungalows and the property opposite is a bungalow, this proposal will have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring properties. The proposed dwelling is much too large for the size of the plot, with a very bulky roof line which is higher than the chimney. BPC suggest that the roof line is lowered with smaller gables with eaves which are level with the first floor, this would create a dwelling which does not have such an over bearing impact on the street scene.

F/2008/2467	Pickwick, School Road Proposed erection of replacement dwelling plus demolition of existing dwelling.	Refused
-------------	--	---------

Reasons: The proposed development would result in a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the Countryside be reason of:

- a) The significant increase in height, bulk and massing including the two storey span.
- b) The significant increase in volume over the original dwelling and,
- c) The excessive amount of hard standing for which no substantial justification has been put forward.

The proposal would result in insufficient amenity space for the replacement dwelling.

F/2008/2394	329 Barkham Road Proposed erection of two storey front extension to dwelling.	Approved
-------------	--	----------

F/2008/2385	26 The Vines Proposed erection of two storey side extension to dwelling.	Refused
-------------	---	---------

Reason: By reason of the inadequate parking provision on site the proposal is likely to result in on street parking to the detriment of highway safety.

F/2007/3115	Barkham Post Office, 50 Bearwood Road Proposed erection of one retail shop and 3 apartments together with a detached two storey dwelling following demolition of existing building. Appeal A	Dismissed At Appeal
-------------	---	---------------------

F/2008/1290	Barkham Post Office, 50 Bearwood Road Proposed erection of one retail shop and 2 apartments together with a pair of semi detached two storey dwellings following demolition of existing dwelling. Appeal B	Dismissed At Appeal
-------------	---	---------------------

Reasons: The main issues in each appeal are the effect on (i) on the character and appearance of the area and (ii) on the living conditions of future occupiers in terms of amenity space. The combination of the forward siting, the substantial depth of the building and its consequent bulky roofline, and the proximity of the southern side elevation to The Lilacs would result in the building having a scale and prominence that would be entirely out of keeping with the relatively modest development surrounding it. This would be readily apparent in views on the approach from the north along Bearwood Road and, in particular in the vicinity of the junction with The Lilacs. The proposed retail/apartment building would not integrate well with its surroundings.

Appeal A

The proposed new detached dwelling at the rear of the site would relate most closely to the estate development further east. In this context it would be acceptable being similar in scale and design to the adjoining houses on the northern side of The Lilacs and would address the street in a manner not dissimilar to the numerous corner properties in the wider estate. However, the space between the two buildings, much of which would be visible from the street would be dominated by car parking and manoeuvring areas. Most of the properties in the area have hard surfaced off street parking this is small in scale broken up with landscaping. The extent of the area dedicated to parking/manoeuvring and the lack of opportunities within and around it for any significant planting which might soften its appearance, alongside the uncharacteristic bulk of the retail apartment building and its hard surfaced frontage, would give the development a distinct urban feel which would be out of keeping with the more spacious and verdant suburban character of the surrounding area.

The front and side amenity areas would have very limited utility in private amenity terms such that the provision would fall well below the Residential Design SPD expectation in practical terms.

Appeal B

The siting of the proposed retail/apartment building would be similar to that in Appeal A but the scale of the building would be much reduced. Rather than being two storey across the full width, the retail part of the building would be a single storey element abutting The Lilacs with a two storey element on the northern side containing the two apartments. The resulting building would be more in keeping with the surrounding area than Appeal A, it would not appear inappropriate on this corner site. The considerable area between the dwellings and the retail/apartment block would remain predominantly devoted to car parking/manoeuvring. The proposal would therefore fail to overcome this shortcoming of the Appeal A scheme. Despite the more acceptable appearance of the retail/apartment building the extent of the hard surfacing and the lack of opportunity for meaningful landscaping would still create the overall impression of an urban development that was out of keeping with the surrounding area. The proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The amenity space for the two apartments would be laid out similarly to the Appeal A proposal, only the rear area would provide satisfactory private amenity space which would be considerably less than the SPD guideline of 70m², and unacceptable. The dwelling would be of a size capable of housing a family and the amount of such space provided would be well below what would be acceptable for family with children. The proposal would fail to provide satisfactory living conditions for future occupiers.

There has been some local support for the proposals which stems from the need to retain a post office and shop in the village, the premises is in need of updating but no evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the future viability of the post office/shop depends on either of the redevelopment proposals.

Meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.

BARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL
Planning Committee

Page 09/669

Minutes of meeting of the Barkham Parish Council Planning Committee held on 27th January 2009 in Barkham Village Hall at 7.30 p.m.

Present: Mr. F.A. Scott, (in the Chair), Mr. S. Goldring, Mr. P. King and the Clerk.

Apologies: Mr. L. Heath (attending another meeting)

09/239 **Minutes** of meeting held on 13th January 2009 were approved and signed as a true record.

09/240 Planning

F/2009/0003	Land north of Barkham Manor, Barkham Road Proposed erection of manege.	Delegated Opposed
-------------	---	----------------------

Clerk to write to WBC opposing this application, BPC support the refusal decision on the previous application (F/2008/1658) in that the proposed manege will have a harmful impact upon the character and appearance of the surrounding countryside which is located in an area of Special Landscape Importance. Although there have been some amendments to the plans the harm this would create to the countryside has not been addressed, likewise the possible veteran tree has not been responded to. Trees and hedgerows surround the site which would in time suffer from the pollution of the horses. The Parish Council question the need for 7 parking spaces which would seem to be excessive for private use only.

The application cites in support Paragraph 32 of PPS7:-

“Horse riding and other equestrian activities are popular forms of recreation in the countryside that can fit in well with farming activities and help to diversify rural economies. In some parts of the country, horse training and breeding businesses play an important economic role. Local planning authorities should set out in LDDs their policies for supporting equine enterprises that maintain environmental quality and countryside character. These policies should provide for a range of suitably located recreational and leisure facilities and, where appropriate, for the needs of training and breeding businesses. They should also facilitate the re-use of farm buildings for small scale horse enterprises that provide a useful form of farm diversification”.

This paragraph deals with enterprises rather than private use; its citation raises concern that the proposal is not really for private use only but once established would develop into commercial use.

Section 15 of the planning application “Existing use”, “Is the site currently vacant” the applicant has indicated “No”, again this raises concern.

Therefore in the light of WBC’s thorough decision of the previous application the Parish Council recommends that this application is refused.

F/2008/2419	Suncot, School Road Proposed erection of single storey side and rear extension to form annexe.	Approved
-------------	---	----------

F/2008/2553	The Nook, School Road Proposed erection of a single rear extension to dwelling.	Refused
-------------	--	---------

Reason: The proposal would increase the spread of the development across the site and the cumulative effect of a further extension to the dwelling would have a detrimental urbanising impact upon the rural character of the surrounding area.

F/2008/2428	29 Aggisters Lane Proposed erection of two storey front and side extensions plus single storey front extension and raising of roof to create first floor accommodation.	Withdrawn
-------------	--	-----------

F/2008/2753	23 Oaklands Park, Langley Common Road Proposed insertion of 2 solar panels to roof of mobile home.	Withdrawn
-------------	---	-----------

F/2008/0172

Coppid Hill House, Barkham Road
Proposed change of use of land from agricultural to residential
garden, Retrospective.

Appeal by M. Flaherty. WBC advises that the Planning Inspectorate has received two enforcement appeals which will be dealt with by an Informal Hearing. Date and venue are not yet known. The appeals are about the decision of the Council to issue Enforcement Notices relating to:

The Breach of Planning Control alleged:

1. Without planning permission the change of use of land from agricultural to residential.
2. The erection of buildings and structures.

Reasons for issuing the notices:

1. It appears to the Council that the breach of planning control has occurred within the last ten years and that the change of use of the land is inappropriate in principle.
2. It appears to the Council that the breach of planning control has occurred within the last four years. A number of structures have been erected and are inappropriate in principle.

WBC does not consider that planning permission should be given because planning conditions could not overcome these problems.

Grounds on which the appellant is appealing against the notices:

f) That the steps required to comply with the notices are excessive and lesser steps would overcome the objections.

Clerk to write to the Planning Inspector reiterating our previous comments that the Parish Council are opposed to this application for the Change of Use of agricultural land to residential garden. Mr Flaherty should have been aware that the boundary of the garden was not in the correct position when the property was purchased, the developer and his solicitor should have brought this to his attention. The area of land adjacent to the garden is Agricultural Land and is owned by Mr Flaherty who states that it is "overgrown and unsightly", this is due to his failure to maintain the land and should not be treated as an argument for using the land for residential purposes. An area of land would be lost and the function of the green wedge compromised of detriment to the immediate and wider local character. BPC are strongly opposed to this application and recommend that this area of land should be returned to its original state as Agricultural Land and Enforcement should proceed.

Meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.

Next meeting of full Council on 10th February 2009 at 8 p.m.

Next meeting of Planning Committee on 24th February 2009 at 7.30 p.m.