

Draft Minutes of a Planning Meeting of Teffont Parish Council held on 5th February 2019 in the Village Hall.

Present: Cllrs Aspden, Blamey, Cordle, Deane, Fisher and Wood

In attendance: Parish Clerk, 4 members of the public

Apologies: Cllr Worth

There were no questions from any members of the public present.

Cllr Wood opened the meeting at 18:30.

1. **To receive and accept apologies.**
Cllr Worth – unwell
2. **Exclusion of the press and public.**
None required
3. **Declarations of Interest.**
None declared
4. **Chairman's announcements.**
None
5. **Planning – New Applications**
a) 19/00604/FUL Sunrise, Teffont. Demolish existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling.

The Chairman invited any member of the public present to speak in favour of this application.

Mr Bladen, the applicant made several points.

1. He pointed out that there is a Certificate of Lawful Use or Development (CLP) in place which would permit him to build a new single-story rear extension to the property and an increase in roof height under his existing permitted development rights (PDR).
2. He suggested that the proposed rebuild would be an improvement to the village as it would create a thermally efficient family home.
3. He said that he has followed the guidelines with regard to bats and assured TPC there were no bats on the site.
4. He suggested that the proposed building would be a sustainable home built using carefully selected materials designed to blend in with the surrounding properties.
5. He referred to the plans and confirmed that he proposed to completely demolish the existing building without having taken advantage of the PDR to build any extension, and then replace it with a larger building positioned some meters to the east of the existing building.
6. He pointed out that the positioning of the new building lower on the site means the impact on the surrounds is no more than the existing building and is well screened by hedges and planting.

The Chairman then invited any member of the public present to speak against this application.

Mr Homan stated that he had previously lived at the Malt House (adjacent to Sunrise) and drew Councillors attention to the fact that access on and off the site was historically problematic. He subsequently supplied a photograph of a recent traffic accident at precisely the area where Mr Bladen proposes to load and unload lorries.

The Chairman asked for comments and questions from Councillors (Cllrs).

Cllr Aspden asked about the likely visual impact of the proposed new building. Mr Bladen said that there is limited visibility onto the site from Hindon Road, visibility from elsewhere in the village is also limited and the intention is to plant more hedging to further shield the build.

He accepted the ridge height was slightly higher height for which he has PDR (and considerably higher than the existing ridge height) but said the positioning of the house had been lowered on the site and that this will significantly reduce the impact of a higher roof.

Cllr Blamey remarked on the difference in size between the existing dwelling (prior to the PDR expansion) and the proposed building. The original house is approximately 60 sq. mtrs; with the PDR extension the footprint is then 90 sq. mtrs. The proposed build would increase the footprint further to 120 sq. mtrs, roughly twice the size of the existing structure. Mr Bladen said that he didn't have detailed figures for the dimensions but that they could be scaled off the drawings. He accepted that the proposed building was larger than either the existing or the post-PDR dwelling.

Cllr Blamey asked Mr Bladen about the logistics of clearing the site and building a new house with no vehicular access. Mr Bladen told Cllrs that Sunrise was built in sections approximately 4 foot wide which he stated had been delivered by train in around 1930 and had been carried into the site by hand. He suggested these would be lifted out individually down the existing footpath onto the B3089. The footpath would also be used to get new materials on to the site.

Mr Bladen confirmed he has not yet informed Wiltshire Highways of this application nor discussed with them the implications for traffic management during the demolition and build. He confirmed that his current application does not include any vehicular access. He stated that, once built, the occupants' cars would be parked in the village wherever there was space, as he apparently does now.

Mr Bladen reminded Cllrs that a four bedroom house had been agreed under the CLP. The Chairman pointed out that the CLP does not in fact grant permission for a four bedroom house, it merely confirms the lawfulness of building a single storey rear extension and raising the ridge height under PDR.

It was noted there are no dimensions supplied apart from scaled drawings.

Cllr Fisher asked why Mr Bladen was not keeping the original building. Mr Bladen replied that although he could extend and improve the property under the CLP, in his opinion it makes more sense to start again especially from an environmental point of view.

The issue of road safety was discussed in relation to demolishing and re building, Mr Bladen said in his opinion it was safe to park a car or van on Hindon Road and use the footpath for all access. Councillors disagreed.

Cllr Fisher also suggested that the planning permission granted for a new roof was not to make space for three bedrooms but was said to have been simply for storage.

Cllr Deane said he did not accept there would be no future application for vehicular access and requested that Mr Bladen tell Cllrs his future plans. Mr Bladen declined to do so and it was pointed out to councillors by the Chairman that such issues were not strictly speaking relevant to the planning application being considered.

Cllr Wood asked Mr Bladen if there had been any discussion with Wiltshire Council prior to the preparation of the Design and Access statement, in particular with regard to Mr Bladen's claim in that statement that his plans are consistent with Saved Policy H30. Mr Bladen said that he had not. Cllr Wood gave his opinion that, contrary to Mr Bladen's assertion, the proposed build could not be said to be 'not significantly larger' than either the existing building or the post-PDR building, nor could its siting be said to 'closely related to that of the existing' since it was plainly much larger and in a different location.

Mr Bladen disagreed saying that the new build is not substantially bigger in planning terms and is on the same site just a bit lower down. He did not consider it worth discussion with planners before submitting an application.

Some Cllrs considered the building to be two storey. Mr Bladen explained to Cllrs that one and a half storey means rooms are in the roof and there is no roof space.

Cllrs discussion.

Cllr Cordle felt the proposal was impractical and that the access available was woefully inadequate for such a building site. He also thought the proposed building was out of scale for the plot.

Cllr Fisher would like to see the building remain where Sunrise is positioned now, and not lower on the plot.

Cllr Blamey also felt the proposal was too large, that it was taller than was acceptable and access for cars and parking in the village needed to be addressed along with the current access to the site walking along the B3089 which is already very dangerous.

Cllr Aspden liked the design but considered access issues would cause huge disruption in the village.

Cllr Wood assured Mr Bladen that TPC were not opposed to replacing Sunrise with a better property but this proposal envisaged a property that was simply too large and inappropriately positioned. Cllrs were not convinced by Mr Bladen's plans for access.

The Chairman summarized the discussion reminding Cllrs that a new vehicular access was not in the Application and therefore not for TPC to discuss with the Applicant or each other at this time – whatever their own conclusions might be. He proposed objecting to the Application. This was seconded and agreed.

The Clerk will write to Wiltshire Planning objecting to the Application on the grounds that:

The scale of the build is excessive, being very much larger than the existing building (around twice as large) and also considerably larger than the post-PDR building (around 30% larger).

The fact that it is proposed to move the property lower down the site does not adhere to WC planning policy.

Cllrs are gravely concerned about the access arrangements for both the development of the site and, post development, for the use of the proposed three bedroom house. Such a property will have no safe pedestrian access and no vehicle access at all and Cllrs were not reassured by Mr Bladen's apparent indifference to the issues of safety or inconvenience.

In particular, Cllrs felt strongly that the work will cause enormous disruption within the village. The main road (B3089 Hindon Road) is the only point of access to the property and the point adjacent to Sunrise is historically an accident black-spot. The position of the pedestrian entrance onto the B3089 is not visible on the downward approach to the village where traffic is beginning to slow for the corner. Delivery lorries, skips, vans parked on the road at this point will require traffic management to ensure safety for drivers and pedestrians.

Furthermore, Mr Bladen's suggestion that any family living in the building would simply leave their cars scattered around the village (where there is almost no public parking in any case) was met with dismay from Cllrs.

Cllr Wood requested that the Application be called in. Cllrs agreed. The Clerk will write to Cllr Wayman requesting the Call In.

6. Planning – Determined applications.

None

7. Date of next meeting: The next meeting will be on March 12, 2019, in Teffont Village Hall.

Cllr Wood closed the meeting at 19:15