

Review of previous decision per planning application 22/00764/FULLN.

The Clerk has been contacted by the planning applicant who believed that Councillors had made their previous decision based on incorrect and/or missing information.

The Clerk has decided in line with Standing Order Clause 7a to include the item on the agenda again with information from the applicant.

Councillors should note:

1. The previous meeting was quorate, and the amount of councillors voting is not relevant to a decision review.
2. If Councillors are happy that new information has come to light, then they may proceed to vote on whether the following objections should be removed, altered, or remain:
 - a. Over development
 - b. Character of the Area
 - c. Infill
 - d. Density/Proportion/Landscape
 - e. Size and setting
 - f. Parking and Safety
 - g. Change of Use. Question of garden being residential land / included in new curtilage.
 - h. NHDP

If Councillors believe that no new information has been presented, then the decision cannot be reversed.

Please let the Clerk know in advance if you would like to visit the property so that arrangements can be made to go as one party.

Dear Gail,

I write with reference to planning application 22/00764/FULLN that was reviewed by Nether Wallop Parish Council on 11th April 2022.

The 3 councillors present Objected on the grounds below:

- a) Over development
- b) Character of the Area
- c) Infill
- d) Density/Proportion/Landscape
- e) Size and setting
- f) Parking and Safety
- g) Change of Use. Question of garden being residential land?
- h) NHDP

Agenda item 7B.

Unfortunately there is confusion and questions over the actual site? It is complicated, but the following statement should clarify the issue which the Parish Councillors raised.

The Design Statement Document clearly describes the site as being “part curtilage and part paddock” (2.1).

The building site is within the garden of 2 Piccadilly Cottages. Clearly shown on the site map.

The building site is within the Settlement Boundary.

The paddock is in open countryside. There is no mention or submission for Change of Use of the land. In fact, Change of Use from Agricultural to Equestrian Use was recently approved 20/01446 to enable to keep a horse on the land. It remains and will remain as open countryside.

Previously approved flood mitigation is sited in the paddock hence the need to include this area on the site map for that purpose only.

There is NO proposed development on this land.

I see there was a question over the site and boundaries, and I am now confirming the issue that there is no development on the paddock.

In relation to impact the site already has approval for a two bedroom dwelling 20/00451/FULLN.

The proposed replacement building utilises the footprint of the already approved dwelling (Design Statement 6.6).

‘Infill’ already being accepted for this site.

Nether Wallop PC returned a vote of “no comment” on the previous application, which was withdrawn to address issues raised by Council Consultees. **Improvements to the design** of the dwelling - to reflect the style of the standing permission; ancillary/agricultural in design with materials being identical to the current building - and two extra reports were submitted.

I would hope in the light of this clarification the PC would revise its decision in line with its previous one.

Professional reports submitted:

Landscape (ACLA Ltd) and Conservation/Heritage (Forum Heritage Services) provided independent assessments of the site, building and possible impacts. I hope that the conclusions of these reports are fully considered by the Parish Council.

Bob Edwards of Forum Heritage Services has over 25 years of experience of historical buildings and conservation. He was Head of Conservation for Hampshire County Council before becoming independent. He concluded, “I can find no conflict in the proposed development with the statutory duty in Sections 66 or 72 of the Act, National Policy in the NPPF or Policy E9 of the TVBC Adopted Local Plan 2011-29 and conclude that the application should be approved”.

Both reports ought to be fully read and considered, and the site visited before impartial determination of whether there would be detrimental impact on the area. We would welcome a visit from the Parish Councillors so they can judge the impact for themselves.

The dwelling proposed is commensurate with the prevailing plot sizes in the locality (Design Statement 7.2).

The Parish Council refers to the building as 2 storey but it is only 1.5 storey.

Agenda item 7B.

A neighbouring garage adjacent to the proposed dwelling has recently been granted permission to convert to 1.5 storey with double dormer windows. Pictured within the Heritage Statement. This is a precedent for 1.5 storey height and this is therefore in keeping with the area, as indeed our proposal is.

Throughout our 6 year journey within the planning system we have fully considered our neighbours and their comments. 2 out of 6 immediate neighbours have consistently found reasons for objection. We've been totally considerate of any possible impact and worked hard to remove grounds for concern in each application as they have risen.

Parking and Safety, was listed by the Parish Council as a problem. All requirements of parking and turning have been addressed in the application. Visitor Parking is not required as part of a submission. Parking is based on the number of bedrooms. However, we already have established visitor parking on our land as you enter the track, which is used by visiting clients of Mary Cairns Interiors, friends and other neighbours when the need arises. There is no requirement to park on Station Road.

This is not new development on a new site, but sustainable development providing 3 bedrooms for 4 adults on an existing site holding current approval. TVBC is under pressure to create more sustainable housing and this proposal addresses that issue in a small way.

We have lived in the village for 25 years, we were married and both children christened, in St Andrews. The children attended the village primary school and I have an established business of 20 years servicing the village and surrounding villages. This application provides a home fit for purpose and enables us to continue to live and work in our community, whilst providing integrity of built form and quality.

Nether Wallop Parish Council has previously supported our planning journey and we feel this application has not been able to be considered with all the relevant information. I hope that my clarifications have addressed this.

Because of the lack of understanding of the site and based on only 3 members of the council voting, we would welcome this being looked at again, utilising all the extra facts we have now provided. I am also very happy to welcome the Council to site to judge for themselves any possible impacts on the surrounding area and to answer any questions.

The minutes, listing the points raised, are in the public realm and do not truly reflect the application. We hope that by re-examining the application with the extra clarification that the Parish Council can support it.

Yours truly

Mary Cairns