

HAM PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of a Planning Meeting of Ham Parish Council held on Tuesday 13 November 2018 at 6.30pm in the Village Hall.

Present: Mr C Dean (Chairman), Lady Walker (Vice Chairman), Mr R Buchanan-Dunlop, Mr J Marriage, Mrs C Garrod (Acting Parish Clerk), The Applicants for 2 Malthouse Cottages and two members of the public.

1. Apologies – Mr David Bicknell
2. Declarations of Interest – Mr R Buchanan-Dunlop for Application Ref: 18/10022/FUL
3. The Minutes of the Planning Meeting held on Thursday 25 October 2018 were agreed and signed by the Chairman.
4. There were no matters arising.
5. a) **Planning Application Ref: 18/07697/FUL**
Application for Full Planning
Applicants: Mr & Mrs Woon
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension, alterations and replacement of existing fenestration and repositioning of entrance.
At: Malthouse Cottages, 2 Spray Lane, Ham, Wiltshire SN8 3RB
Assigned Officer: Jennifer Allen

The Applicants apologized that their architect could not be present but she was available on speaker-phone. They said that in the revised application they had abandoned the off-street parking proposal and also the cutting-down of the dead tree in the garden at the front of the house and had also revised the other designs. Their proposals centred on improving the access of daylight and sunlight to their house and also its warmth in a way which would be sympathetic to the local area. They still proposed creating French windows at the front of the house as they wanted to be able to see their garden and pointed out that the existing pattern of brickwork surrounding the existing windows would be retained. The hedge at the front of the house would be allowed to grow taller and there would be other plantings which would mask the new windows. They also stated that the windows would not be seen from the public road as illustrated in the photographs accompanying the application. Mr Buchanan-Dunlop commented that this was not accurate as the windows were clearly visible from the public road on the north side of the Green, and even more so from the Green itself. The applicants went on to say that the extension at the rear of the property retained its flat roof but had been reduced in depth and height and the fenestration had been altered. In response to a question as to whether the applicants had seen the comments of the Conservation Officer, they said they had but the comments referred to the previous application.

The architect, Ms Woon, who joined the meeting by speaker-phone, agreed that the proposals did not conform to the Conservation Officer's comments, but said that the latter's comments were not consistent with the advice she had received from the Case Officer. The Case Officer advised them to keep the French doors. She said there were plenty of examples of successful fusion of modern flat-roofed, glass-fronted extensions with older buildings, and the Parish Council was shown a selection of photographs to underscore her point. She went on to say that she would have preferred to have proposed an even more modern, contemporary design but had been warned off that by the Case

Officer. She felt that the design in the revised application was appropriate and defined the distinction between the extension and older cottage.

Mr Buchanan-Dunlop commented that despite the reduction in the size of the extension, the design did not address the concerns raised by the Conservation Officer over the materials used and the visual conflict with the traditional architecture of the cottage within the Conservation Area. He also drew attention to the chimney flue of the newly introduced wood-burning stove. It was visually unattractive especially if seen from the neighbouring property, No 1 Porch Cottages, and he queried whether a wood-burning chimney flue at that height was consistent with building regulations in view of the proximity of No 1 Porch Cottages which was thatched. The applicants responded that the chimney flue would not be seen from No 1 Porch Cottages and that it was adjacent to a tiled extension of the latter and not its thatch. There was a suggestion that perhaps brickwork could be incorporated into the cladding. The vice-chairman said that this might be helpful.

The Chairman said that he had been asked by the owner of No 1 Porch Cottages, who was unable to be present, to report his objection to the extension on the grounds that it crowded his property and overlooked it when seen from the garden or rear of the property. It was simply too close to the boundary between the two properties. The applicants responded that because of the boundary hedge the extension would be screened from No 1 Porch Cottages. The Chairman felt they should not object to the extension but he had reservations as to the materials used and concern about the chimney. Mr Marriage said he had no objection to the application. The vice-chairman said that on reflection she felt that the suggestion made about incorporating brickwork was not going to be satisfactory and that she had no objection to the application. She felt that the question of the chimney flue was a matter for building regulations.

After further discussion the Chairman asked for the Councillors to give their opinions. Mr Buchanan-Dunlop said that he was not opposed to a larger extension than the current planning consent provided, but it did require changes in materials and treatment to blend in comfortably with the Conservation Area. Overall he did not think that the revisions went far enough to revise his previous objection to the application. The Chairman felt they should not object to the extension but with reservations as to the materials used and the concern about the chimney.

The Parish Council recorded a majority decision of No Objection.

b) Application Ref: 18/10022/FUL

Application for Full Planning

Applicant: Mr & Mrs R Buchanan-Dunlop

Proposal:- Installation of a detached timber garden room

At: Ham Green Cottage, Ham, SN8 3QR

Assigned Officer: Emma Gillespie

Mr Buchanan-Dunlop left the Committee.

Mr Buchanan-Dunlop said that he wished to erect a detached garden room/shed with a floor plan of approximately 3x2m and a height of just under 2.5m, with a bituminous shingle roof, and feather boarding which would be painted green. His two immediate neighbours had raised no objection, and the shed would not be seen from their properties because of the gable end of Ham Cross and a high wall.

There were no objections to the proposal from the Committee and the Parish Council recorded a decision of No Objection.

6. Any Other Business – none

The meeting closed at 7.30 pm.