BROAD CHALKE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee

Broad Chalke Parish Council

held at the 6, Stoke Farthing Courtyard, Broad Chalke on

Wednesday 22 February 2023 at 6.30pm

ATTENDANCE

Mr M Pickford (Meeting Chairman)

Mr J Alison

Mr E Fry

Mr C Rothwell, Clerk

**Apologies**

Mr S Dawes

Mr T Cave-Gibbs

Mrs E Richter

Mr S Carter

Mr Martin Altham

Mr C Littlemore and Ashley Truluck had also submitted apologies with their written comments.

Mr T Hitchings had declared a pecuniary interest and consequently was not present.

1. Purpose of the Meeting

To consider planning application PL/2023/00794

Land Adjacent to Knapp Farmhouse, High Lane, Broad Chalke

1. Rationale for the Clerk calling a Planning Sub Committee

The Clerk had called a Planning Sub-Committee for the following reasons

* The planning application had been received too late to be considered at the February 2023 Meeting.
* The deadline for comments is the 9 March 2023, the day after the 8 March meeting.
* The Chairman has declared a pecuniary Interest and cannot take part in the consideration/decision on the application.
* The Vice Chairman will not be present for the March meeting.
* There are likely to be further apologise for the March meeting which may result in the Council meeting not being quorate.
* A decision by the sub committee for report to note at the 8 March Council meeting is considered the appropriate way to ensure full consideration of the application.

1. Information received and considered

The planning application and the applicant’s consultant’s report had been received and circulated.

Ashley Truluck had presented a report on behalf of the Neighbourhood Plan Team that had been circulated.

The Clerk had requested a report on the application from the Council’s Planning Advisor, Mr C Littlemore and this had been circulated.

Councillors not present at the meeting had submitted their views. All Objected to the application.

1. Background

The Clerk reviewed the Council’s consideration of the previous application, PL/2022/08054 that had been a unanimous decision of Objection.

Wiltshire Council had refused the application- Decision Date 17 January 2023.

The new application details presented, are in all respects other than that of the access arrangements, identical to the first application for this development on this site.

1. Discussion.

The only change to the earlier, refused, application is to the access arrangements, which now seeks an access direct onto High Lane through an existing Hedgerow rather than use of a private drive.

The Planning Sub Committee discussed the application and considered the reports received; the views of councillors not present; and the discussion that had taken place at the December 2022 Council meeting.

The access arrangement proposes to now bring a direct access into the site from High Lane. There is no detailed supporting engineering information within the application bundle to prove whether the proposed access is safe. The Parish Council view is that High Lane is a busy road with many points of direct access to and from it and further access proposals should demonstrate the highest level of detail in order to substantiate their safe implementation. This has not been done within the information provided. The proposal also seeks to utilise land not within the site boundary for vision splays and cannot therefore be guaranteed to work for the future. Consequently, the new access arrangements cannot be said to be robust and should therefore be questioned.

1. Decision

The previous objections of the Parish Council, and numerous private individuals within the village, remain all as before.

There was no reason in the revised application to change the unanimous view of the Council and its decision in December 2022.

The Planning sub-Committee agreed unanimously to Object to the application for the following reasons:

If permission was granted on this site, the Neighbourhood Plan and its essential policies would be found to be at least questionable and at worst irrelevant within the first 20 months of its adoption. The NP could therefore be considered to be without foundation and all other potential sites within the village could be considered as being appropriate locations for development with the end result that the special character and environment of Broad Chalke becomes irretrievably and permanently eroded. On this basis, this application, and any future application for development on this site should be considered to be inappropriate and contrary to established planning policy on several grounds as summarised below:

1)  The proposal is contrary to the recently established and adopted Neighbourhood Plan policy defining the settlement boundary. The site lies outside the defined settlement. The settlement boundary should not only be considered in the two-dimensional plan view. This boundary defines areas of land appropriate and not appropriate for development by virtue of their setting, views in and out, other built context and access. There are other properties in the relatively near vicinity, but these are at a much lower level (approx. 5- 8m), and are consequently not visible from High Lane, unlike this site. These two immediately adjacent properties do not fall within the settlement boundary either as they were built long before the advent of this boundary. Due to the height difference, they are not visible, nor do they form part of the immediate setting of the conservation area when viewed from High Lane or Perretts Drove unlike the development site. This is further evidence of the settlement boundary not just being a two-dimensional shape.

2)  The proposal is contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan policy which looks to enhance or improve access or appreciation of the Water Meadows.

3)  Development of the site could potentially harm the protected view across the water meadows. (View 2 in the NP).

4)  Development would cause harm to the soft landscaped and open setting of the conservation area (in Character Area 1) when viewed from along High Lane in either direction and from the public footpath of Perret’s Drove.

5)  Housing provision has been recently assessed within the village in detail and policies have been included within the NP to ensure the village can adequately meet its future housing needs. The result of this survey indicated that 9 houses were felt to be required, (more than that imposed by Wiltshire Council due to the sensitive context of the village conservation area and location within the Cranborne Chase AONB). These 9 houses now have land allocated for affordable and market housing.

6)  The Neighbourhood Plan allows also for appropriate small scale new infill development within the settlement boundary. Since the advent of the Neighbourhood Plan (i.e. within the last 20 months), a total of three new dwellings have been created on land adjacent to Brook House; the development of one chalet bungalow into two dwellings on High Lane and the development of a house in Butlers Yard into two dwellings). Of these – two are self-build homes which are encouraged by Local Authorities.

7)   There is therefore no need for further additional housing on any unallocated sites outside the settlement boundary.

8)  The house proposed is far from being a dwelling to satisfy local needs. It is of approx. 240sqm gross internal area (including garage) which is well over twice the size of a 3Bed 6 Person dwelling of ‘affordable’ criteria.

It is understood that Wiltshire Council already has a near five-year housing land supply and certainly has a three-year land supply for new housing across the county. The proposal is therefore contrary to policy and should be refused.

The NP is less than two years old and therefore there is no strategic need to consider any extraordinary housing provision, especially in a settlement which has already demonstrated a considerable new provision within the Neighbourhood Plan framework, to meet the needs of the community.

There being no further business the Meeting ended at 7.05pm.