



MINUTES OF ADDITIONAL ORDINARY MEETING

**Thursday 9th August 2018 at 7:30pm in the Rathbone Pavilion,
North Waltham**

Councillors Present

Cllr Geoff Chapman (GC) Chair, Cllr Sally Evans (SE), Cllr Judith McGinley (JM) and Rosemary Coulter (Clerk)

**083/FC/
05/18-19** **Apologies for absence Adele & peter**
Cllr Adele Stevenson, Cllr Peter Waggett

**084/FC/
05/18-19** **Declarations of Interest**
None.

**085/FC/
05/18-19** **Meeting open to the Public**
Three members of the public were present.

**086/FC/
05/18-19** **Planning Applications**

The Parish Council considered the following planning application:

18/01425/RET Land at OS ref 456378 145890 Fox Lane, North Waltham

Change of use of land for the siting of a mobile home (retrospective)

Discussion:

The applicant:

- Stated that there was nothing to verbally add to information provided on the planning application paperwork.
- Stated that this application is for 'retention' of a mobile home on the site.
- Presented a plan of the boundary settlement, the conservation area and the original area of Claydown Farm, her parents land.
- Stated that Rebecca Murray, BDBC, came and reviewed the site last week.
- Stated that they want to live in a mobile home on this land. If this gets turned down, the applicant will continue with further applications until she achieves her aim.

The following issues and questions were raised:

- The Council asked if anything has materially changed from the previous application 17/02849/OUT which was refused by BDBC in October 2017 and an appeal dismissed in June 2018? – The applicants' response was 'no'. (Meanwhile, the mobile home has been moved into position.)
- The applicant asked how some farm/agricultural buildings can obtain planning permission to be converted for living accommodation or commercial use, but the applicant cannot obtain permission to live on their land? The Council explained that there are different policies for agricultural buildings and for accommodation for farm workers. These are set nationally and incorporated into local policies of planning authorities. There is also a Change of Use policy, whereby permission can be applied for to change the use of an existing building. This will not involve 'loss of countryside', as countryside is deemed to already be 'gone' if it has been previously developed. A new build would be considered 'loss of countryside'.

- The Council also explained that the Conservation Area has points where the view is protected, which prevents development in those areas.
- The applicant asked if the hairdressing business had continued to the current day, what would be the options now? – The Council responded that it was possible that the application could use the Change of Use policy.
- The applicant asked what would have happened if this planning permission was applied for at the time her mother died? The Council responded that they were unable to answer that question as they are not aware of the policies at the time.
- The Council asked how this application fits with the applicants' submission to the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The applicant responded that she was unsure and her agent is working on that. The applicant asked if the BDBC will consider the NP in relation to this application. The Council responded that they will not consider the NP until it has been approved and adopted. This application will be assessed on its own merit.
- The applicant asked if the NP would change the settlement boundary. The Council advised that this would depend on which sites were accepted in the NP. If development is adjacent to the existing boundary, the boundary may change to include the new development.
- The applicant commented that the village name signs are positioned outside the settlement boundary. The Council responded that the signs are just a token measure to welcome people to the village and also have a 30mph limit attached to them so this may have been decided by Highways.
- The applicant asked about the requirement for the developer to give 25% of the income from development to the Council. The Council explained that BDBC have adopted CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) whereby a calculation is made on the square footage of any substantial development to ensure the developer makes a contribution to local infrastructure. If a NP is in place, the Parish Council will receive 25% of that contribution (15% if a NP is not in place) and the remainder of the contribution goes to BDBC.
- The Council commented that BDBC have policies in place which deems field as countryside. Sufficient evidence is required to obtain an exception to the policies and this application does not contain sufficient evidence to obtain this.
- The Council stated that they could not see any new information from the previous application and, therefore, their previous comments stand.

Parish Councils response to consultation: Objection with comments outlined in appendix 1.

ACTION: Complete online consultation form to BDBC.

Clerk

087/FC/ **Date of Next Meeting** – As and when required
05/18-19

Signed Date

APPENDIX 1

North Waltham Parish Council would like to object to this planning application and would like to make the following comment:

- A previous application was made for this development, ref 17/02849/OUT which was refused by BDBC in October 2017 and a subsequent appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate in 19th June 2018. This application has not demonstrated any new evidence and the Parish Council cannot see any justification to suggest that these decisions should be reversed.

We would like to reiterate some of the comments made to the previous application:

- As the site falls outside the Settlement Policy Boundary the proposed development is classified as 'in the Countryside', thus falls under Policy SS6 of the Basingstoke and Deane Local Plan (2011-2019). The Parish Council believes that the single patch of hardstanding does not sufficiently satisfy the definition of 'previously developed', and therefore the site does not satisfy the requirements of Policy SS6.
- Whilst the previous application was only for outline planning permission, this application is for the retention of a mobile/park home. The Council feel that this is not in keeping with the character of the village as laid out in the Basingstoke and Deane Countryside Design Summary and the North Waltham Conservation Area Appraisal.
- The mobile/park home has been in situ on the site for several months (following refusal of permission of previous application by BDBC but prior to the decision of the Planning Inspectorate) and is subject to investigation by BDBC's Planning Enforcement Team.
- The site of the proposed development is located in an elevated position to the rear of Kyte Abbey on Popham Lane. The potential risk of Kyte Abbey being overlooked and suffering a loss of privacy remains.
- The proposed development is single storey and if permission is given, should remain single storey in order to prevent any further oversight of properties.
- The proposed development would require access/egress from Fox Lane which is a narrow lane with limited visibility at the point in question. Although some clearance of vegetation has occurred around the entrance to the site since the previous application, this application does not contain sufficient evidence that the development will be able to deliver the required 43m stopping sight distance (SSD) for a 30mph carriageway.
- We note that a Biodiversity/Ecology consultation has been completed. The comments made in this consultation should be considered before making a decision.

The Council confirms that we would like the opportunity to address the meeting in the event of the above mentioned application being reported to Committee.