

PLANNING

TWYFORD PARISH COUNCIL MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Held on Thursday 7th October 2021 at 7.30pm

At Twyford Parish Hall

Councillors present	Councillors absent/apologies	In attendance
Cllr. Lawton	Cllr. Hill	J.P. Matthews – Clerk
Cllr. Mitchell (in the Chair)		1 member of public
Cllr. Corcoran		
Cllr. Sellars		
Cllr. Cook		
Cllr. Pullen		

Item	Business Transacted
P27/21	Apologies for Absence Apologies were received from Cllr. Hill
P28/21	Declarations of Interest Cllr. Lawton declared an interest as a nearby neighbour of SDNP/21/02445/FUL and Cllr. Corcoran declared an interest as nearby neighbour of SDNP/21/03344/HOUS.
P29/21	Public Representation A member of the public spoke on SDNP/21/02445/FUL. Whilst they appreciated that some of their previous comments had been taken on board, the amended designs had brought one of the proposed dwellings even closer to their boundary. The current property on the site is between 20 to 30 metres away from the boundary and therefore they have concerns over the impact on their own residential amenity. The design of the proposed dwellings negatively impacts on the character of the lane, which have single buildings in large plots, and results in a cramped site. They also had concerns whether significant excavation of material may be required which would result in a taller building being built than perceived in the plans. The member of the public was asked if the applicant had discussed any of their proposed plans with them and the answer was no.
P30/21	Approval of Minutes It was Resolved that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on the 26 th August 2021 be approved and signed.
P23/21	Update on the minutes of the last meeting, correspondence, and other relevant matters - Cllr. Lawton had received an email from a member of the public regarding a change of condition on the recent 28 Churchfields application. The Parish Council had not been consulted on the change of condition.
P24/21	It was Resolved to submit the following comments to the SDNPA on planning Applications received:

	<p>SDNP/21/03722/HOUS Rosewood Main Road Twyford Moors SO21 1RN</p> <p>No objection</p> <p>SDNP/21/04770/LIS SDNP/21/04769/FUL Volunteer & Purrock Cottage Queen Street Twyford Winchester Hampshire SO21 1QG</p> <p>No objection. The Parish Council appreciate the quality of the application and straightforward, but detailed, heritage statement that the applicant has produced.</p> <p>SDNP/21/04599/HOUS Woodhatch Cottage Coxs Hill Twyford Winchester Hampshire SO21 1PQ</p> <p>No objection</p> <p>SDNP/21/03344/HOUS Honeysuckle Cottage School Road Twyford SO21 1QQ</p> <p>The Parish Council maintains it previous Objection comment. No detailed landscape plan has been submitted with the application, it is therefore not possible to determine the landscape and boundary treatments in this prominent location adjoining the conservation area.</p> <p>SDNP/21/04528/HOUS Starcross Highfield Avenue Twyford Winchester Hampshire SO21 1QP</p> <p>No Objection</p> <p>SDNP/21/02445/FUL Hayfield Bourne Fields Twyford SO21 1NY</p> <p>Cllr. Cook read out some comments she had received from neighbours to the application site. Even with the changes it appears that planning policies do not support the application. The Parish Council comments the LPA are recorded in Appendix A to these minutes.</p> <p>SDNP/21/04363/HOUS Manor Barns, The Hay Barn Hazeley Road Twyford SO21 1QA</p> <p>Objection. The scale of the building intended as a home office appears unnecessarily bulky and inappropriate for its intended purpose. The addition of yet another building, adjacent to the lane has created a linear row of buildings and this detracts from the wider setting of the Manor Barns which is as series of separated building. If the application were to be approved the Parish Council considers that it would be appropriate for a condition to be attached to ensure that the building remains solely for domestic office purposes.</p>
P25/21	<p>Twyford Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>It was Resolved to defer this item to the next meeting.</p>
P26/21	<p>Community Based Renewable Energy Technical Advice Notice</p> <p>Members received the request from the SDNPA for input to this TAN.</p> <p>It was Resolved that the Climate Change working group of the Parish Council should provide its comments.</p>

P27/21	Update on planning decisions The Clerk gave an update on recent planning decisions and highlight that TPO application had recently been refused.
P28/21	Items for inclusion on the agenda of future meetings of the committee - None
	The meeting closed at 9.06pm

Appendix A

SDNP/21/02445/FUL

Hayfield Bourne Fields Twyford SO21 1NY

TPC have reviewed the amended plans and the additional supporting information.

The amended plans show the two houses reconfigured as two very similar but handed L shaped units, repositioned side by side facing the road and closer to it than Hayfield and higher up the slope. The houses appear to be in excess of 300 sq. m.

Both the Design and access statement and the planning statement accept that the Twyford Neighbourhood plan has weight and that the proposal is contrary to it but argue that the policy should not be followed in this case on the grounds of financial need and affordability.

TPC have reviewed their previous comment on both policy and design and impact on character. On policy there have been a number of changes but the substance of its objection on policy grounds still stands, but with added weight. The new design has been reassessed.

TPC's objection on both counts still stands.

Policy:

Since the previous comments the Twyford Neighbourhood Plan has made significant progress to adoption. The Examiners report has been received saying that it can proceed to adoption subject to amendments.

The South Downs National Park has prepared its decision statement with a recommendation to the Planning Committee of 14th October that the Examiners report with all its amendments is accepted and that the plan can then proceed to adoption. The Parish Council will then formally agree the amendments and the TNP will be put forward for referendum on 6th or 13th January.

As far as this application is concerned the key policies although amended retain their same purpose. Both HN 1 limiting house size (except in the case of a replacement house) and HN6 (Housing within the settlement boundary) are endorsed with amended text. Thus, the 150 sq. m limit on any new house imposed by HN1 is agreed by both the Examiner and the South Downs Authority.

It does not appear the proposal should have the benefit of the replacement house exception to house size as it is not a straightforward replacement but a redevelopment of the site as a whole. Both of the houses proposed are contrary to HN1 as being twice the size allowed by policy.

Policy HN 6 (housing within the settlement boundary) This site is in excess of 0.1ha and so is subject to HN 6.3. This requires a mix of houses in line with HN1 and SDLP SD 27. No mention of the HN6.3 policy occurs in the Revised plans and their associated documents. The applicant with his architect and planning advisor needs to explore the options which it gives him if he wishes to redevelop this site. The purpose of this policy is to make best use of these larger sites within the Settlement Boundary and to secure a range of house sizes. The proposals for two large houses are directly contrary to this.

The argument for affordability

The applicant argues that Bournefields is already unaffordable and that the policy cannot achieve its purpose. This misunderstands the justification for the HN1 policy which accepts that house prices in Twyford are above those for comparable property elsewhere. In line with the Housing Needs Study and further evidence submitted to the Examiner the policy seeks to maintain the supply of more modest family houses and housing for the elderly. Very large houses such as those proposed limit supply in the village and are not directed to housing need. The house policy is based on wider issues than the small dwelling policy of SDLP. The price of other houses in Bournefields is irrelevant.

In any case these arguments should have been made to the Examiner in the context of the Neighbourhood plan process and not when the plan is finally settled following extensive publicity and critical examination.

The argument on financial need.

The applicant argues that the house needs substantial refurbishment to the extent that it needs to be demolished and rebuilt. No evidence of the dilapidations is submitted. This is not surprising as the property was acquired only recently and will have been subject to full survey. There is no external evidence of decay. It is also an unusual argument to claim that because of an (unproven) need to demolish and rebuild the site itself should fund the costs by allowing more development on site than is allowed by policy. No public benefit evidence is submitted to outweigh the harm that the breach of policy would cause e.g., landscape benefit; affordable housing small houses; restoration of listed building. However, there is no planning gain claimed, or indeed either "preservation" or "enhancement" of natural beauty or anything else.

Impact on character

The proposal is for two very large, detached dwellings sited close together side by side facing Bournefields. They will be significantly closer to the road than the present house and will be higher up other slope as the apparent size of Hayfield is reduced by its setting into the slop and well back from the road. The larger mature beech trees now felled (see Google Maps Streetview) acted as a foil to the building but since the felling of the trees the current house there is less vegetation to act as a similar foil to the proposed buildings. The two buildings will read from most angles as a single building mass; The two buildings together will occupy 2/3 of the frontage as opposed to Hayfields 40%. They will look even longer because of their closeness to each other. There will now be a continuous ridge running across the main buildings at 7.5 m. Hayfield has an extended catslide roof to the west which significantly reduces its impact.

The elevation drawings of the new buildings are difficult to reconcile with the position of Corners which appears much further away than drawn; the elevation plan appears to exaggerate the impact of Corners on the street scene and so reduces the likely impact of these two buildings. A photomontage or three-dimensional sketches would be much more helpful in visualising the impact from the key vantage points of the road and the public footpath.

The drawings do not explain clearly how the levels are handled. The slopes are significant so terracing will build up one side if the buildings are not sunk to the lowest ground level. But which side? The levels are not clearly explained. The Council considers that the effect of these two new very large houses will be overbearing, will change the character of the area for the worse; so TPC object on that basis.

The fall-back position.

The fall-back position is that Hayfield remains. As our previous objection stated, Hayfield is architect designed house, in the later Arts and Crafts style and distinctive of its period; it enhances its surroundings and helps establish the wider character of Bournefields, by virtue of its location at a focal point of this part of the village and its spacious layout within its own plot. Its demolition would be a loss of character. The fall-back position is the retention of Hayfield; this would be a positive outcome in terms of landscape and village character and would accord with the primary duty of the National Park.