

Amendment Sheet

8 06/2004/020

PARISH COUNCIL a majority of the Council members do not support this application by reason of visual intrusion to street scene, inadequate car parking provision and interference with service access to rear of existing and redeveloped hospital buildings.

9 14/2004/013

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY as the application site is accessed off a private road it is unlikely to be subject to the advance payment code. No objection subject to conditions on parking, visibility splays. WESSEX WATER confirm the site is within a foul sewered area and has mains water in the vicinity of the site. A public foul sewer crosses the site and Wessex Water usually require a 3 m easement either side of its apparatus. Diversion or protection works may need to be agreed. The current application has included the new drive (to serve the Crown Inn approved parking spaces) within the red site area.

PARISH COUNCIL this application is strongly opposed. A previous application was refused (ref. 14/2003/043) because "The proposal is considered to constitute an overdevelopment of the site in that it prevents the provision of car parking for the adjacent listed building. Crown Inn, as required in accordance with condition 08 of planning permission 14.2002/045 and would be likely to result in car parking that would be located in a position that would have a detrimental impact ... " In this fresh application is the Crown Inn is encroached on every more - the buildings are some 10'-12' closer to the Crown Inn and indeed incorporate some of the land which previously formed part of application no. 14/2002/045 above - change of use of the Crown Inn to residential use. It is our unanimous vote that this application represents gross overdevelopment of the site which would impact upon the dwellings of Crown Lane and Heathfield Close." In addition, this Parish Council would wish you to take into account objections to the previous application for two dwellings on this site, which also apply to the present application. These objections are:- "14/2003/043. It was proposed, seconded and unanimously agreed that this application is opposed for the following reasons: (1) negative impact on The Crown, which is a listed building. (2) overdevelopment - given that the area consists of bungalows and the site is cramped for 2 houses, it was felt that it should be used for 1 bungalow only. The building of houses would allow surrounding bungalows & their gardens to be overlooked from upstairs windows. (3) the 2 houses proposed have a roofline and upstairs windows which are taller than the Crown's. (4). the lane which

runs alongside the site is a public footpath and it is felt that inevitably vehicles would be parked in this lane, causing obstruction. 5) this is a re-submission of a previous scheme which was rejected. (6) it is noted that the hedge & ditch to the west of the site has been removed; these should be reinstated in their original positions, to mark the car park boundary and return the lane to its original width. Carried unanimously. E Webb returned to the room."

4 LETTERS OF OBJECTION received raising the following points:- out of keeping with the bungalows in the area; additional use of access; no reinstatement of hedge removed for previous permission; existing new dwellings show that houses are inappropriate in this area of bungalows , the proposal will overlook the existing bungalows; the access is unsuitable for construction vehicles which operate late at night/early in the morning (2 pm); Crown Lane is unsuitable for additional traffic; new bungalows would be more in keeping , have less impact on the setting of the adjacent listed building and allow for parking and garaging.

1 PETITION (23 signatures) have been received raising objection to the application.

Planning permission was granted in April 2003 for the conversion of the Crown Inn to a dwelling. The site area for this permission overlaps with the current application site area. The Crown Inn (with the smaller site area) has been sold to a separate owner and the applicant has retained the application site area. Planning permission was refused for a similar scheme for the erection of two dwellings earlier this year as it did not establish a parking area for the Crown Inn as required by the planning permission (for the conversion into a dwelling) and the applicant has now appealed against this decision. A parking plan has since been agreed to serve the Crown Inn and this matter has been resolved. The proposed dwellings have a vernacular design in keeping with the older properties in the area and the proposal would reinforce the traditional character of the area; the increased use of the access is a private matter; a new "hedge" has been planted to the front of the two new properties and should grow to replace the lost hedge and a condition is recommended to ensure this is continued to the front of the proposed dwellings. It is considered essential that the parking for the adjacent listed building can be provided in the agreed location and the new drive shown on the plans would be required to access these spaces. I am awaiting confirmation that the owner of the Crown Inn has access rights over the new drive and a commitment that the drive will be constructed.

Additional Conditions re visibility splays, construction hours Monday - Friday 0800 - 1800, Saturday 0800 - 1300,. all other times, including public holidays no noisy working.

Additional Note re public sewer crosses the site.

N/A 21/2004/007

COUNTY ARCHAEOLOGIST there are limited or no archaeological implications to the proposal, therefore no objections on archaeological grounds.

LANDSCAPE OFFICER (observations on amended plans) the proposed relocation of the position of the village hall building should help to soften the wider landscape impact of development, but will still require substantial remodelling of the existing levels and landscape proposals to mitigate any impact. RIGHTS OF WAY OFFICER (observations on amended plans) we must be consulted over any proposed alterations to the surface of the footpath and also over what must be done with the footpath while the building works is in progress.

3 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION AND 3 IN FAVOUR.

10 FURTHER LETTERS FROM EXISTING OBJECTORS reiterating their previous objections. Additional points raised with regard to amended plan:- visual impact on the village and surrounding countryside will be detrimental; does not overcome previous concerns; could be stability problems; makes the drainage situation worse due to increased water run-off from car park and hall roof and there would be insufficient money to rectify; increased privacy problems; increased level of noise pollution; not infilling.

N/A 21/2004/011

COUNTY HIGHWAY AUTHORITY no objections in principle however suggest various amendments including that the carriageway width at the access should be widened to 7.3 m. If planning permission is granted recommends conditions re access to be constructed in accordance with submitted details, first 10 m of access to be hard surfaced, gradient no steeper than 1 in 10, disposal of surface water. Note re contacting Highway Service Manager.

LEISURE DEVELOPMENT MANAGER support the village hall proposal in principal but without any plans of the hall, cannot comment on its suitability for the purpose.

PARISH COUNCIL against the proposal.

3 FURTHER LETTERS OF OBJECTION additional points raised:- footpath crosses third party land and there has been no consultation/discussion by applicant; concerns about the local bat population; the planned site is on a steep hill and the amount of excavation to provide a flat area for the car park and hall would be vast; would require large ramps to allow disabled access; does not allow for playing fields and there is no flat land for this.

3 FURTHER LETTERS OF SUPPORT.

11 23/2004/011

In proposal there is naturally lit space above the garage but not a room as such. The amended plans increase space between the garages, include a roadside parking bay and clarify the levels, such that the drive will use the natural gradient in the ground level to establish the floor level of the dwellings, the raised bank will be removed and re-profiled to allow for soft landscaping and visibility strips.

DRAINAGE OFFICER please note the concerns of Wessex Water regarding close proximity of the proposal to the sewer.

Amended recommendation:- Subject to ... layby, and no further representations raising new issues on the amended plans by 25th May, 2004 the Chief Planning Officer ... (as printed)

15 43/2004/038

TOWN COUNCIL object to the proposal as the site is outside the settlement limits.

FORWARD PLAN (comments on previous application) against the acceptability of this proposal in terms of policy. Whilst the applicant has sought to address the policy concerns, these remain largely commercial rather than planning considerations and it is the latter which should be given greater weight. Policy ECl is of limited relevance in this instance. There is a clear demarcation between the industrial area and the agricultural/horticultural uses to the north. Whilst policy ECl may be relevant if the estate is fully developed, it is not considered that intrusion into this area is necessary with approximately 3 ha of undeveloped land already adjoining the employment estate. The fact that the available land does not adjoin the existing tenant is not necessarily a valid planning reason to allow additional employment land release. Firms expand and sometimes outgrow their existing site. Relocation can release the smaller units for additional business start up. Expansion on the application site may only be temporary if they need to grow again in the future. The existing available land is larger and better suited. Land is a finite resource and sustainable development requires greenfield loss to be considered prudently. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OFFICER I have visited this site recently and am aware of the business carried on by the applicant. Although I understand that the proposed building would be marginally outside of the area allocated for employment use in the Local Plan and that there is land at Bagley Green allocated for employment use which is currently undeveloped and available, the proposed building is well related to the premises currently occupied by the applicant. Any requirement for the building to be constructed on the allocated land would have the effect of either separating the production area from the storage facility in a way that

would impact on the operational efficiency of the business or would require the comprehensive relocation of the business to the allocated land with additional cost and other implications. Although I would not normally support the construction of an industrial building in what is, technically, open countryside, in this particular case, it seems to me that the situation is much more finely balanced with the proposed building being located immediately adjoining the applicants existing production facility and bordering an area allocated for employment use. On balance, I would support the application in order to facilitate the growth of an existing and successful local business.

COMMENT OF CHIEF PLANNING OFFICER:- the current application site is smaller than the earlier one. Based on the needs of the business and the additional information submitted by the applicant on the current application, I consider that Policy EC1A is applicable to the current application.

In reason for recommendation - Policy EC5 should read EC4.

16 **45/2004/004**

WITHDRAWN

Copies to:
CHAIR/NTN/TB/JM/CDW/AG/DA/JH/KM/JLH/IC/TAB/CJW/HM/H&L/RWF/
Planning Reception/JJ/RB/17 Committee Members/15 Public