

Swilland and Winesham grouped Parish Council  
Clerk: Mrs.Libby Cotton, The Old Vicarage, Swilland, IP6 9LP  
Email: [old.vic@onetel.net](mailto:old.vic@onetel.net) – tel: 01473 785355  
Website: [www.winesham.org](http://www.winesham.org)

Minutes of Planning meeting held on Monday 30<sup>th</sup> June 2008 at Winesham Baptist Chapel.

Present: Mr.Lightfoot, Mr.Rush, Mr.Laughlin, Mr.Noble, Mrs.Reynolds.  
Mr.Lightfoot opened the meeting by welcoming those members of the public who were attending and outlining the format of the meeting.

1. Apologies: received from Mrs.Shaw.
2. Declarations of interest: Mr.Rush re: CO8/0418, Laurel House, Winesham.
3. Minutes of the previous meeting were approved.
4. Decisions: CO8/0883 – Barley Mow Public House, Winesham.

Permission given for alterations to include a fish and chip take away facility.

5. CO8/1029 – part side garden 1, Mill Lane, Winesham.

Erection of one three-bedroomed dwelling.

Mr.Lightfoot noted that the developer had been in touch with him on a number of occasions, and was also present at the meeting. There have been a number of written objections to the application (15) and Simon Lancaster had agreed to be the spokesperson for those local residents present.

Invited to speak, he stressed a number of issues involved, in particular the siting of the proposed property above the level of the existing gardens adjoining. All the bungalows along the lane are set back from the road with mature frontages. Residents felt that the mature oak in front of 1 Mill Lane should not have been cut down to make space for another dwelling nor the garden stripped. There are difficult access and safety issues. The lane is narrow and totally inadequate for the increase of traffic which this development would involve – heavy vehicles used for the works on number 1 are currently causing severe damage to the sides of the lane, which is also a public ROW and part of the village circular walk. He said that the proposed dwelling is also out of keeping with the other houses on the lane.

On behalf of the planning committee Mr.Rush felt that the removal of the oak tree to allow room for a house set a dangerous precedent. He agreed that the elevation and proximity to the lane was an issue as well as access in general. He also felt that the original house on the property would also be extremely cramped by the new development. The other members of the committee were in agreement with the concerns.

Mr.Birchley the developer spoke and expressed surprise at the number of objections. The building had been designed to be end on so as to avoid overlooking the neighbours and was of a design similar to one in Winesham which has been very successful. He felt that it was entirely in keeping with the village and pointed out that the access had already been widened and will be further widened in the course of the work.

The committee did not support the application.

Mr.Lightfoot said that even though technically this is a resubmission, there were considerable changes to consider and, in effect, these were the third set of plans. Given the set time scale, local residents felt strongly that they had not been given reasonable time to consider the new proposals and prepare letters for SCDC. Mr.Lightfoot agreed to bring this to the attention of the Case Officer along with the other concerns of the Committee.

In summary, the Committee recognised the attempts to respond to the criticisms of the earlier submissions for the plot. The houses were now smaller, moved forward away from Cooper's Close and water harvesting had been introduced to relieve volume on the local drains. Although supporting the application in principle, there remain serious concerns about agreeing to more vehicles emerging at that position on to a difficult bend. Also over the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding drainage systems – problems seem to occur regularly, are currently unresolved and need further discussions.

6. No further applications had been received.
7. Documents: Planning Enforcement Policy Consultation – The Committee discussed the package ( distributed to SWgPC on May 19th 2008). The documentation seems reasonable, clear and there was nothing to add.
8. 8.Affordable Housing. -Nothing further to report.
9. Next meeting – July 28<sup>th</sup> proposed.