

Avon Dassett Parish Council

Minutes of Extraordinary Remote Planning Meeting

Tuesday 19th May 2020

The meeting commenced at 6.30pm.

Present: Trevor Gill, Mike Blakeman, Darrell Muffitt, Liz Hirst, Clerk (Helen Hide-Wright).

Members of the public: Peter Biddlestone, Sally Crompton, Michele Gill, John Kegg, Raymond George Randerson, John Rawlings, Sarah Richardson.

At the start of the meeting the Chairman, Trevor Gill read the following information:

- This meeting is being recorded and the record will be retained by the Clerk for 3 weeks to enable the production of the minutes, after which, the recording will be deleted. Trevor Gill asked each member of the public, individually, whether they objected to the recording of the meeting. Each person confirmed that they were happy for the recording to be undertaken.
- The meeting will stay within the agenda which had been circulated beforehand.
- Everyone to remain muted until they wish to speak, when they must raise their hand to notify their request to speak. The Chair and Clerk will be unmuted to manage the proceedings.
- Members of the public were asked if they agreed to their names appearing in the minutes, which they did

Declaration of Member Interests.

The Clerk confirmed that Phil Baxter had declared an interest in the application and that he was not in attendance.

Dispensations: None

Application(s) reference: 20/01136/FUL

Proposed: Erection of 1 no. chalet for residential purposes

At: Land South West of Bitham Hall, Avon Dassett

Resident Comments (Limited to 3 minutes per speaker)

- Peter Biddlestone: No comments.
- Sally Crompton: Had already submitted comments. Happy to answer any questions about Bitham Hall.
- Michele Gill: No comments.
- John Kegg: No comments. Confirmed he had made a submission to the District Council
- Raymond George Randerson: Asked for the opportunity to speak at the end of the proceedings. The Clerk confirmed that members of the public can speak before the PC's deliberations.
- John Rawlings: No response heard.
- Sarah Richardson: No comments: Bitham Hall Ltd can always answer any questions. Sarah Richardson confirmed that she was attending the meeting in a personal capacity as well as a representative of Bitham Hall Ltd.

Applicant

The Applicant was not present at the meeting.

(Liz Hirst joined the meeting at this point, after technical issues).

Parish Council

The Parish Council had reviewed the application and produced a draft report which observed the following:

- Core Strategy: the site is outside of the built-up area of the village. The relevant policy is AS10. The current application does not satisfy any of those conditions.
- The site is within the curtilage of Bitham Hall, which is a listed building. It is surprising that the application has been registered without any listed building consideration.
- Heritage Statement poorly written.
- No detailed site plan provided.
- No details showing the exact location and canopy of the trees.
- No arboreal report.
- No ecology survey.
- Surprised that the applicant can make a statement that the proposed development would not affect any of the existing trees. Difficult to reconcile that with the placement of a 2-storey, 10m x 10m structure on the site.
- Lack of information on soakaways and sewage treatment, including details of ground investigations.
- No issue with the building, the aesthetics are purely a subjective opinion.
- Main concern is impact of dwelling on existing trees and ecology.
- Surprised that the application has been accepted and registered without the details noted by the Parish Council.

Based upon the submission being proposed, the representation is to Object. Proposed: Liz Hirst, Seconded: Darrell Muffitt. Objection comment was unanimous. **Action: Clerk to submit comment along with the Parish Council's report a copy of which is attached in Appendix A**

Sally Crompton: Wondered whether it was worth checking that all the documents have been submitted with the application, uploaded onto the website and made available to consultees.

Sarah Richardson: Application was submitted in October. Detailed surveys have been completed at the request of the Planning Authority. Unsure why the entirety of the information has not been submitted. Accepted that the PC must decide based on the information provided.

Mike Blakeman commented that it is up to the Applicant to contact the Planning Authority and ascertain why the documentation appears to be incomplete. **Action: Clerk to register the objection and also a copy of the report and to contact the planning officer and establish whether the Parish Council has received and been able to access online, all the related documentation submitted to the Planning Authority.**

The meeting closed at 6.53 pm.

Appendix A.

AVON DASSETT PARISH COUNCIL

PLANNING APPLICATION 20/00136/FUL

Proposed Chalet, Bitham Hall Drive, Church Hill, Avon Dassett, CV47 2AN

Summary

- The application is a Full Planning Application for the construction of a timber chalet within the grounds of Bitham Hall for residential use.

The application can be viewed at:

<https://apps.stratford.gov.uk/eplanning/AppDetail.aspx?appkey=Q45J00PMFTJ00>

The Proposal

The application is for a two-storey two-bedroom log “chalet” located within the grounds of Bitham Hall.

Summary

The application is for the construction of a two-storey “chalet”.

- The application includes a very limited and poorly written Heritage Statement complete with the incorrect postcode and numerous spelling mistakes.
- The application site is within the conservation area.
- The application site lies just within the Ironstone Hill Fringe Special Landscape Area included as part of the Local Plan
- The site lies within the curtilage of Bitham Hall is a Grade II Listed Building
- There is no detailed site plan showing the location of all significant trees
- The “chalet” has been sited within the grounds of Bitham Hall off the existing driveway within the wooded area to the south-west of the Hall
- The proposal is described as a “chalet” this is misleading as the plans for the building show a two-storey house.
- There is no Arboricultural report
- There is no Ecological Survey

Observations

1. Core Strategy: The application site is clearly outside the built-up area of the village and Policy AS.10 is relevant and the application does not satisfy any of the parameters for residential development.
2. Listed Building Consent: As stated, the property lies within the curtilage of Bitham Hall. There should be a Listed Building Planning Application a matter which has been raised with the Planning Authority.

Comments

1. The Heritage Statement states, under Assessment of Significance, that the site contains a number of large trees. The statement says that, however, these trees do not appear to be the subject of any TPO. The trees are within the Conservation Area and the removal of any tree above 75mm diameter measured 1500mm above ground will require consent.
2. The statement goes on to say no large trees will be removed by the placement of the property. The validity of this statement is impossible to verify as there is no topographical survey showing the size and location of the trees.
3. The statement confirms that the “Design” has been done so the property can fit within the existing setting with only removing small shrubs. Again, without an accurate site plan showing the location of the property and the location and size of the trees, it is impossible to verify this. It is hard to see how a two-storey dwelling some 10m x 10m could comfortably fit under the canopies of the mature trees without modification and also not impact on the roots of the trees.
4. The design concept statement is rather confusing. The merits or otherwise of the suitability of a cedar log cabin in this location is a subjective, personal viewpoint. The introduction of some “token” areas of Hornton stone does lend a degree of local context.
5. The concern over the privacy of the neighbours seems misplaced when windows from the kitchen, the living room and, more particularly, the master bedroom, are facing the adjacent property.
6. The no-dig driveway may have a minimal effect on the tree roots but the impact of the building

footprint, the patios, the foundations and the drainage runs on the tree roots are likely to have a significant, adverse impact.

7. There appears to have been no ground investigations done, therefore it is difficult to assess whether the soakaways will be effective; nor has the impact of installing the sewage treatment plant and drainage runs been assessed on the tree roots.
8. The statement that the property will “massively improve the woodland and bring improvements to the main hall, the garden, the local environment and the Conservation area,” are both subjective and unsubstantiated.

Conclusions

- The key point in terms of planning policy is concerning the Core Strategy. The application site is clearly outside the built-up area of the village and Policy AS.10 is relevant and the application does not satisfy any of the parameters for residential development. The opinion of CPRE is unequivocal in this regard.
- The questions over the aesthetic quality of the dwelling are purely subjective.
- The impact of the dwelling on the existing trees and the ecology does not appear to have been fully assessed.