West Itchenor Parish Council

Minutes of a Planning Meeting of the West Itchenor Parish Council held on Monday 25 April 2016 in The Itchenor Memorial Hall.

Present: Mr G Colbourne, Mr C Mead-Briggs, Mr J Dunn
Mrs A Trevelyan (Chairman)

In attendance: Mrs C Smith (Clerk), 6 members of public.

1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**
   None.

2. **DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.**
   All Councillors declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4.1 as members of the Itchenor Sailing Club. Cllr Trevelyan also declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4.2 as a friend and neighbour of the applicant.

3. **MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING HELD ON 11 April 2016.**
   The Chairman called for the approval of the Minutes of the Planning meeting held on 11 April 2016. These were **APPROVED** and the Chairman duly signed the Minutes as being a true record of the meeting.

4. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

4.1 WI/16/01104/FUL– Itchenor Sailing Club, Pier Point Road, Itchenor
Variation of condition 3 from planning permission WI/13/00867/FUL.

It was noted that this application related to the moving of a date for works already approved to begin early due to the availability of suitable equipment.

AGREED RESPONSE: No objection.

4.2 WI/16/01219/DOM – 16 The Spinney, Itchenor
Single storey side extensions and loft conversion.

The Chairman suspended the meeting to allow members of the public to make comments.

A number of residents raised concerns over the application and had provided photographs of the house in its current setting. These concerns related to:

- The proximity of the extension to neighbouring properties on both sides.
- Difficulties over access to the rear of the property in case of an emergency such as fire.
- The resulting width of the property which would give the impression that it and the next door properties were semi-detached rather than detached dwellings.
- The provision of the Juliet balcony and window at the rear in the roof space which would overlook neighbouring properties.
- The overall impression of the plans was that the house would look oversized on the plot.

The Chairman thanked residents for their comments and resumed the meeting.

It was noted that the block plans were incorrect as they did not show the extent of the neighbour's car port and garage. This gave a false impression that there was space between the two dwellings.

It was felt that this was an overdevelopment of the site with the extensions being too close to the boundaries of the neighbouring properties. Properties in The Spinney were distinct from each other by way of their style and all have pitched and tiled roofs and space around them.

It was felt that the application did not comply with the Village Wide Design Guidelines on page 55 of the Village Design Statement and in particular Guidelines 1, 2 and 4. These relate to infilling, the character of the properties in the road would not be adhered to because they all have pitched roofs rather than flat roofs, and lastly extensions that increase the width of houses. In addition, the Spinney forms part of Character Area 6 and the design does not comply with Guideline 6.1 which requires that any enlargement of houses requires sensitive and careful design.

It was also noted that there would be a Juliet balcony and window at a high level which would result in a loss of amenity for several neighbours. It was noted that the proposed extension would only leave an 80cm gap between the extension wall and the neighbour's boundary fence.

A comment was made about the proposed method for rainwater disposal. There are already problems with rainwater disposal in this area and the application would effectively double the roof area for the house. The only measure being proposed was the use of a soakaway which was known to be ineffective in this low lying area.

Concerns were also raised about the reduction in parking spaces as a result of the development and the number of skylights which would inevitably increase light pollution in the area.

It was suggested that if the Planning Officer had a mind to permit this application then the Planning Committee should request that the District Councillors 'Red Card' the application. This was agreed. For the benefit of residents, the 'Red Card' process was explained.

A question was raised to The Spinney Association about the covenants on properties in the road. It was noted that this was mostly to do with keeping the front gardens open although permission was supposed to be given from the Management Company for any building works. It was noted that this was not enforced.

It was agreed that if the application were to be permitted then the usual conditions regarding building materials and contractor's vehicles to kept within the site boundary and a Contractors Method Statement should be requested.

Five members of the public then left the meeting.

AGREED RESPONSE: West Itchenor Parish Council objects to this application on the following grounds;

- The block plans supplied are incorrect as they do not show the neighbouring property's car port and garage.
- The side extensions would not comply with the West Itchenor Village Design Statement Village Wide Design Guidelines on page 55 and in particular Guidelines 1, 2 and 4 in that the gaps between the neighbouring houses would be lost, the character of the properties in the road would not be adhered to because they all have pitched roofs

rather than flat roofs, and lastly extensions that increase the width of houses. In addition, the Spinney forms part of Character Area 6 and the design does not comply with Guideline 6.1 which requires that any enlargement of houses requires sensitive and careful design
.

- The proposed loft conversion would result in neighbouring properties being overlooked.
- The extensions would result in a loss of parking area for the property which is considered unacceptable.
- The addition of a number of skylights would result in an unacceptable increase in light pollution in an area where there is currently very little light pollution.
- Inadequate plans have been made for the removal of rainwater. This proposal seeks to effectively double the roof space on the property and the provision of just a soakaway is not appropriate for this low lying area.

Should the Planning Authority have a mind to permit this application the Parish Council requests that the following conditions are imposed.
During building operations, arrangements should be made for all materials, contractors' vehicles and visitors' cars to be accommodated within the site boundaries. This is in the interests of road safety and to protect the grass verges.
That a Contractors Method Statement should be provided in the interests of highway safety and the amenity of the area.

5. PLANNING DECISIONS

It had been noted at the previous meeting that the applications at Church Farm had been permitted for the DOM application and refused for the FUL application.

The Chairman suspended the meeting to allow the owner to speak.

The owner commented that although the application within the residential curtilage had been permitted they were of the opinion that the Goose Pen was the most suitable location for the boat/log store. The owners were considering submitting an application to amend the permitted application which would see the boat/log store relocated to the Goose pen and would be smaller in design so that it was less visible from all of the important views and as such they were seeking the support of the Parish Council for this. A written statement on the proposals and a number of photographs from various locations were given to the Planning Committee.

The Chairman thanked the owner for their comments and resumed the meeting.

One member of the public then left the meeting.

It was agreed in the interest of transparency that no comment could be made until there was a planning application to consider.

6. ENFORCEMENT ISSUES

<u>14/00365/CONCOU – Northshore Yacht Ltd, The Street</u>

It was noted that the Enforcement Notice had been issued and that the occupiers had been given six months to comply with the notice which was effective from 20 May 2016. It was agreed that the Clerk should put information relating to this on the website.

Old Haven, The Street, Itchenor

It was noted that the Enforcement Team had looked at the request regarding Old Haven and that they had now closed the file. The Parish Council with the support of the District Councillors was looking to get a review of this decision. The guidance notes on Section 215 notices had been more encouraging than expected and it had been difficult to understand the Enforcement Team's stance on this issue. Councillors also expressed surprise that this issue had not been brought to the attention of the District Council Planning Committee as it was part of their function to look at these issues. It was noted that Mr Barrett (District Councillor) had agreed to seek a review with the Enforcement Manager.

It was agreed that the Planning Committee should seek an urgent meeting with Mr Barrett and Mrs Hamilton (District Councillor) to ask them to challenge the decision and at the very least obtain a proper response to the issues raised from the Enforcement Team.

The issue of compliance with the conditions of planning Permit Notices was raised. It was suggested that the Planning Committee might need to give thought to having a policy for dealing with situations where planning conditions had not been met. Whilst the Planning Committee did not want to be seen as overly intruding into these matters it was felt that in the interests of the local area that residents should comply with all of the planning conditions set.

It was suggested that an article should go into the next newsletter that outlines the Parish Council's views on planning applications and the actions that the Council would take where breaches of planning permission were identified either by members of the public or Councillors. It was suggested that in the first instance a letter should be sent to the householder where a breach of planning permission had been identified that asks them whether they have satisfied all the conditions.

It was noted that a recent development had potential breaches of their planning consent and the Clerk was asked to check whether any information on landscaping had been submitted to the District Council and not yet put onto the planning website. If no plans had been submitted the Clerk was requested to write to the Householder with a copy of the Permit Notice asking for assurances that all of the planning conditions had been properly met.

7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting is scheduled for Monday 16 May 2016.

Signature _____ Date: _____

Chairman, Planning Committee