

MINUTES OF LOCKERLEY PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING Held on Monday 2nd August 2021 at 7.00 p.m in the Village Hall

Present: Parish Cllrs Jane Waller (Vice Chair) Sue Kent (note taker in clerks absence), Maurice Hillier, Peter Funnell

Apologies: Cllrs Coomer and Woodfield,

Clerk Eveline Attwood covid isolation as per government rules.

7 Members of the public were also in attendance.

21/034 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST (agenda items only): None.

21/035 OPEN FORUM - Local residents spoke against the proposed development at Erlcombe Butts Green Lockerley SO51 OJG

Another member of the public stated that the parking plan was woefully inadequate with not enough provision. What about visitors and overspill never mind delivery drivers who will undoubtedly have to reverse onto the road next to a dangerous junction. Very unsafe.

Comments were made about further changed plans being submitted to TVBC planning that neighbours were not alerted to before refusal was given.

21/036 - PLANNING

Planning application 21/02071/FULLS Erlcombe , Butts Green, Lockerley, SO51 OJG
Erection of a 4 bedroom dwelling with sewage treatment plant and associated soft and hard landscaping.

To summarise: Under the provisions of the local plan objections were raised namely; this is backfill and for backfill to be acceptable, it needs to cater for the amenity and outlook of existing properties as well as of the proposed dwelling, and to have suitable access; further the site is not suitable on grounds of the proposed large footprint and position in relation to the existing house, Erlcombe; the poor access to the rear around the side; the tapering shape of the site to the rear; the proximity of existing properties to the western boundary of the site, so that any development would adversely impact on their amenity and outlook; the primary school on the eastern boundary.

The privacy and amenity of occupants of the proposed dwelling may be considered, that of the existing dwellings on the western boundary has not; the proposed dwelling has a large footprint and comprises an extensive single storey part plus a two storey part; that single storey part would lie just beyond the rear boundary of Bowmans and at 3m tall, would project 1.2m higher than the boundary fence; it

would extend halfway along the rear boundary of Bowmans and a considerable way along that of Crispins; that the single storey part of the proposed dwelling would then extend away to the two storey blank side wall and gable end of the rest of the house; the chimney would project above the gable line at the further end; the outlook of all the properties and all neighbours would be reduced to a blank single side wall above the rear boundary showing an extensive flat roof; a blank side wall and gable end; a parking cum vehicle turning area; a side door; both just over the rear fence; compounding the loss of amenity.

The loss of amenity due to negative impact on outlook; noise and light from vehicle movements; moving bins; smell from bins; loss of light to the garden are all unacceptable. The proposed development is overbearing, constitutes over development, and in no way reflects the character of the area.

The proposed access arrangements for vehicles are entirely unsatisfactory and unsafe. Two 90 degree dog legs are proposed to get around the existing dwelling. The front garden would be reduced to accommodate the drive, with inadequate parking for the 6 vehicles already kept on site. The proposed widening of the driveway from the road would impinge on the white safety line from the junction, and it is surprising that Highways have no adverse comment to make on the proposed arrangements.

We consider the proposal to be highly detrimental to the surrounding area and its landscape character, and is not in keeping with several provisions of the local plan. We strongly object to it and we urge the parish council to do the same.

The Cllrs commented that:

No one they have consulted in the village speaks in favour of the plans.

A vote was called and all the Cllrs voted to OBJECT to the application.

The grounds above were agreed with in particular:

COM2 - Settlement Hierarchy that retaining the existing property severely compromises any backland/backfill development and is not in accordance with the Local Plan namely:

E1 - High Quality Development. The proposal is overdevelopment when compared with the immediate area and does not respect the character of the immediate hinterland.

E2 - Protect, Conserve and enhance landscape character. The proposal does nothing to enhance the site or provide any amenity in fact it is detrimental due to the high proportion of hard landscaping for the driveway and turning space. The position of the proposed dwelling is detrimental to the occupants and to neighbours.

LHW4 - No consideration of the negative impact for neighbours making this backfill unsuitable.

Lastly, there is no need for this kind of open market housing in the village. TVBC has met the requirements of its core strategy and Lockerley has enough big houses. The identified need from the village survey is for affordable housing for residents who work locally or smaller bungalows for residents to downsize to. We therefore object to the application.

If this application is to be decided by councillors please take this as notice that we would like to speak at the meeting (or a representative from the PC) of the committee at which this application is expected to be decided. Please let us know the date of the meeting as soon as possible.

The meeting ended at 8.00pm