



Update Paper

Northern Area Planning Committee

Date: Thursday 7 March 2019

Time: 5.30 pm

Venue: Conference Room 1, Beech Hurst, Weyhill Road, Andover,
Hampshire, SP10 3AJ

Northern Area Planning Committee

Thursday 7 March 2019

The purpose of the report is to provide information on planning applications which has been received since the agenda was printed.

Report of Head of Planning

1. Background

- 1.1 Reports on planning applications are prepared for printing on the agenda some 10 days before the date of the Committee meeting, but information and representations received after that time are relevant to the decision. This paper contains such information which was received before 10:00 am on the date of the meeting. Any information received after that time is reported verbally.

2. Issues

- 2.1 Information and representations are summarized but the full text is available on the relevant file should Members require more details. The paper may contain an officer comment on the additional information, amended recommendations and amended and/or additional conditions.

7. **TPO.TVBC.1163 (CONFIRMATION) 04.10.2018** **10 – 15**
SITE: Land at St Thomas Church, Tangley,
ANDOVER

CASE OFFICER: Rory Gogan
8. **19/00090/VARN (REFUSE) 15.01.2019** **16 – 42**
SITE: Dingwall, Little Ann Road, Little Ann,
ABBOTTS ANN

CASE OFFICER: Mary Goodwin
9. **18/02477/FULLN (PERMISSION) 25.09.2018** **43 – 61**
SITE: Georgia Farm Buildings, Georgia Lane,
AMPORT

CASE OFFICER: Oliver Woolf

APPLICATION NO.	TPO.TVBC.1163
SITE	Land at St Thomas Church, Tangle, Andover, SP11 0SG
COMMITTEE DATE	7 th March 2019
ITEM NO.	7
PAGE NO.	10 - 15

The objection to the TPO has now been **WITHDRAWN**. The Order will now be confirmed under the Head of Planning and Building's delegated powers.

APPLICATION NO.	19/00090/VARN
SITE	Dingwall , Little Ann Road, Little Ann, SP11 7NW, ABBOTTS ANN
COMMITTEE DATE	7 th March 2019
ITEM NO.	8
PAGE NO.	16 - 42

1.0 VIEWING PANEL

- 1.1 A member viewing panel took place on Wednesday 6th March at 9am. Cllrs Lynn, Cockaday, Budzynski, Neal, Hawke and Flood were in attendance. Apologies were received from Cllrs Preston, Boulton, Brooks, Lovell, Stallard and Borg-Neal.

2.0 CORRECTIONS

- 2.1 At paragraph 2.4, at the 6th line, the paragraph number referenced in the text should be 4.2, not 4.8-4.1.
- 2.2 At paragraph 8.6, the final sentence should continue after “context” with the words “than the approved scheme”.

3.0 REPRESENTATIONS

- 3.1 A petition of objection has been submitted, signed by 30 village residents [Paddock End; Pinewood and Pollyanna, Little Ann Road; 2, 3, 4, 5 Abbots Close; Lower Cottage; Whitecroft; Michaelmas Cottage; 4 and 6 St Marys Meadow; The Manor, Church Road; 4, 6 and 9 Catherines Walk; Pennymarch; Ash Barn; Spring Cottage; Rose Cottage, Dunkirt Lane; Mayfield, Lane Cottage, Pitt House and 53, Duck Street; Littlefield House, Webbs Lane; Pleasant View, Cattle Lane; 7 and 10 Kings Mead, Little Ann; Nether House, Monxton Lane; 73 Farm Road, Little Park].

The petition states that an objection is raised “**due to the adverse impact on the amenity and character of the Abbots Ann Conservation Area due to;**

- **the size and massing of the development an proximity to the road;**
- **removal of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order without replacement with another tree of appropriate size and species”.**

4.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

- 4.1 The applicant has submitted a letter, in support of the application, dated 18 February 2019, with a quote for the supply of additional trees and 3 Computer Generated Images (CGI) showing the completed development with the proposed additional tree planting towards the site boundaries in situ.
- 4.2 The submitted letter includes the following points:
- The current application and the variations undertaken have been with the best of intentions;
 - The proposal continues to be frontage development and is appropriate for the following reasons:
 - The new dwelling (as amended) achieves a more appropriate plot depth and configuration and provides a quality residential environment for the residents of Dingwall, the new dwelling, White

Smocks, The Lodge, Pollyanna Cottage, Pinewood and Paddocks End. It has been designed to overcome overlooking and daylight concerns;

- The old plan on the west elevation had a glazed single storey directly facing towards the neighbours at Pinewood and Paddocks End, opening onto a patio area. The re-siting blocks Dingwall occupants from overlooking towards the neighbours (Pinewood) from the kitchen and vice versa;
 - The patio has been relocated to the rear of the new dwelling, onto the rear garden, limiting overlooking to Pinewood, and leaving only a 'letterbox' eye level window and high level velux to this side. The changes improve privacy for the neighbouring residents;
 - The dwelling was only revised in form and scale once we started to build. The land between the proposed site and Dingwall had a 500mm drop and to get the fall for the drainage and services, a 1m path was necessary between the properties. Building Control signed off the trenches and footings and then work commenced on the walls. The bricklayers pointed out that having moved the location (for the services) the foundations had in fact moved over and extended over the whole build, so that the footings (and dwelling) were mistakenly bigger than the approved plan;
 - I should have reverted to the Council, but with building control checks undertaken, I assumed I could continue with the building work. The new scale respects the local context and scale and density of the existing dwelling at Dingwall and other dwellings fronting the surrounding streets;
 - The revised siting more effectively sub-divides the front of the plot when viewed from the street. The appearance of the revised dwelling relates much better to the existing dwelling at Dingwall;
 - Relocating the patio to the rear and reducing glazing to the side means that the landscaping and tree planting can be improved to the perimeter of the site;
 - The revised design is considered to be more attractive and interesting, minimising visual, functional and physical disruption in the streetscape. Careful consideration has been given to the treatment of form and space, location, curtilage and size to provide a better scale and rhythm, which is sensitive to the adjoining building, spaces and views. The proposal therefore links to the Local Plan;
- The curtilage is similar in size to others in the vicinity;
 - Trees will be planted, in conjunction with the Council, in terms of species, site and size. Trees will be planted by an appropriate expert with an underground watering system and a root containment system, and with leafmould, seaweed and compost. The canopy will develop quickly and it will camouflage the catslide roof and improve privacy for the new dwelling and neighbours. Any trees which die within the first six years will be replanted like for like in the next planting season.

5.0 CONSULTATION ON ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBMITTED

5.1 Tree Officer

The additional information does not address or allay my concerns. The western wall of the house is (as at page 4 of the letter) 4.9m too far to the west. The

house as built is larger and the eastern boundary is proposed further east than originally proposed. The space available for tree planting is significantly reduced within the current scheme, as compared against the approved scheme. Opportunity for conflict between the proposed trees and the boundary, the new building and its garden on completion have all increased as a result.

- 5.2 Trees subject to TPO have been removed in recent years, with consent, and are subject to replanting conditions. Replacement trees of the species required have not been planted. Under the current proposal, there is now not the physical space for the proper growth of these required replacement trees without predictable unreasonable interference with the reasonable use and enjoyment of the new property.
- 5.3 The submitted specification given in the quote provided, allows for species of smaller ultimate size. They are specified to be planted at 4-6m tall. There is space available to physically plant trees of this size, but there is not sufficient space to enable the establishment and proper growth of these trees. The proposal includes provision for new tree planting around the road side perimeter. The juxtapositioning is such as to lead to predictable conflict with the boundary wall fence feature, the new house, its guttering and roof, light to the western windows, and light and air to the garden.
- 5.4 The comment at point “b” (foot of page four of applicant’s letter) which refers to the proposed use of 80 litre root training tubs to ensure that tree roots grow downwards. 80 litre root trainers are the minimum size containers necessary to support the trees at their intended purchase size. The root “trainer” specification of the containers refers to a design that encourages vertical rooting habit (as opposed to spiralling) while in the container. A tree planted whilst still in such a “trainer” could not be expected to remain viable in the landscape.
- 5.5 Building Control have indicated the presence of moisture and that the building is founded on chalk and therefore not at risk to tree root induced subsidence. The presence of chalk and a high water table will act as a barrier to root development, preventing deep growth, increasing the importance in the “area” of the land open for root development.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The additional information and CGI submissions provide an indication of how the site might appear on completion of the development, if the proposed tree planting is successful, towards the western boundary. However, it is considered unlikely that tree planting would thrive at this location, as suggested within the CGI images, given the site constraints and limited space available. Moreover, no methodology is provided to demonstrate the accuracy of the images which can provide only an indication of the finished appearance of the site.
- 6.2 Notwithstanding these concerns, it is considered that additional or enhanced planting could not overcome the overriding and harmful impact that the proposed development would have upon the street scene and character, appearance and spatial qualities of this part of the Abbots Ann Conservation Area, a designated heritage asset, due to the appearance, design, scale, form and proposed siting of the dwelling.

7.0 AMENDED RECOMMENDATION
No change

APPLICATION NO.	18/02477/FULLN
SITE	Georgia Farm Buildings, Georgia Lane, Ampport, SP11 8BN, AMPOR T
COMMITTEE DATE	7th March 2019
ITEM NO.	9
PAGE NO.	43 - 61

1.0 CORRECTIONS

The final paragraph within section 5.2 of the committee report should read:

I confirm acceptance of reopening this access subject to precautions set out in the amended and additional tree information and plan **in the SJ Stephens Associates** report.

- 1.1 In condition 7. '**same**' should be replaced with '**development hereby permitted**'.

2.0 RECOMMENDATION
No change