

**MINUTES OF EXTRAORDINARY MEETING HELD ON
TUESDAY 29TH APRIL 2008 AT ST MARYS HALL KINGS
WORTHY
TO DISCUSS THE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR A
DWELLING IN THE CURTILAGE OF CARLE END, SCHOOL
LANE, HEADBOURNE WORTHY.**

Present:

Councillor Hatchett - Chairman
Councillor Pearcey
Councillor Hamblin
Councillor Spurling
Councillor Curling
City Councillor Wood

Apologies: Councillor Rutter

Councillor Stephens attended as a member of the public and gave a short presentation on the merits of the planning application.

Councillors Hamblin declared a personal and prejudicial interest as he resides near to the proposed dwelling and resides within the same local gap as the proposed dwelling. Furthermore he feels if planning permission was granted for this dwelling then it is possible that an application would be made for the field behind his property thus devaluing it.

Councillor Pearcey declared a personal interest as he resides in the same local gap albeit further away.

Chairman Hatchett asked those councillors present for their views on the planning application.

Councillor Pearcey emphasised that his views were not personal but he felt strongly that the guidance of the Winchester District Local Plan Review which was adopted in 2006 should be adhered to. Policy CE2 defines the Headbourne Worthy local gap and states that any development which would physically or visually diminish the local gap shall not be permitted. He also stated Policy CE3 controls the erection of structures etc and will only be permitted if they do not diminish the gap or require substantial buildings or structures.

He then stated Policy H4 which deals with limited infill residential development does not justify an exception to Policy 3.

Furthermore the Supplementary Planning Document Criterion 5 states exceptions to Policy CE3 are not likely to be justified.

Councillor Pearcey then went on to say in his opinion current policy does not appear to allow any development in the area of Carle End.

Councillor Hamblin agreed with the points raised by Councillor Pearcey but raised some further points concerning the application.

He stated that the proposed dwelling would be intrusive to the house down the lane from Carle End (Cressfield House) as the proposed dwelling would be above this dwelling and would look down on it. The house would be in the corner of that plot adjacent to the boundary of Carle End and Cressfield House.

School Lane is a single track road and the lane off it to Carle End, which serves 5 properties at present, is very narrow without any public turning circle at the top. There is also no access for large emergency vehicles or delivery vehicles.

There was also concern that this would set a precedent as there are other large plots in the same lane that could be sold for development within their grounds which is contrary to the policies of the local gap.

Some local residents have spoken to Councillor Hamblin or forwarded letters to him which have already been sent to the planning department. Their concerns were about the development of other properties within the lane as there are a number of other properties with large gardens. They were also concerned about privacy of those existing dwellings and removal of trees especially the fact that some mature trees have already been removed. Another concern of the residents was the fact that the narrow lane already serves 5 dwellings and as it is a single track lane causes concern. Other residents expressed concerns about the fact that this development fell within the strategic gap

Discussion took place whether the trustees of the right of way of this lane stipulated how many properties could use this right of way and it was decided this was a legal problem.

Councillor Spurling raised the question as to whether the parish council were there to reflect the views of the parishioners and to interpret the views of the district plans. The chairman explained that the parish council were there to decide whether the planning application was contrary to policies of the council and whether the parish council would object if a planning application was contrary to policy in other circumstances.

Councillor Spurling then stated that he agreed with the reasons already stated and that the application seemed contrary to the local plans.

Councillor Pearcey stated that in the future the policy could well change but at the moment the current policy did not allow for this application.

Councillor Curling queried the interpretation of some of the terminology in the local gap and planning policies. A discussion took place and it was agreed it is not the parish council's remit to interpret the policies but to apply them as a lay person would. Councillor Curling was indecisive as to whether the application should be permitted or not and still thought the wording was ambiguous and each application should be looked at on merit regardless of the strategic/local gap.

Chairman Hatchett read the policies to the parish council and reiterated the main concern was precedent. He also stated that the council had strongly objected to previous applications that were contrary to policy and that the parish council were also involved in the wording of the policy concerning the local gap and therefore the parish council should support those policies.

It was also felt that due to some of the residents concerns that should this application be approved there should be an application for temporary tree preservation orders within the property.

The actual design of the proposed application was discussed and it was felt that the proposed dwelling would be above the adjoining property and the 'dig in' is actually

at the back of the property and not at the front. It was also felt that the building was quite intrusive from School Lane and adjoining properties.

Chairman Hatchett read out the summary of the planning application from the applicant for reasons to allow this application and then the reasons looked at by the parish council of the local gap and policies, precedent and design. Whilst councillor Curling was neither for or against the application the majority of the parish council agreed to object on the grounds of the application being contrary to the policies of the local gap.