
COMMITTEE SITE VISIT

App No. 18/02026/APP

Proposal: Erection of dwelling and associated garage/store outbuilding; with change of use of land to residential amenity
Cane End Farm Hulcott Buckinghamshire HP22 5AX

At the previous Committee Meeting: 15th November 2018
Officers Recommendation: Refusal

Late Items:

The presenting officer drew attention to a correction to the report – the first line of the 'Working with the Applicant/Agent' paragraph should refer to paragraphs 38 and 39 of the revised NPPF.

Public Speakers:

The Committee was addressed by Ruth Powell of the Parish Council, who raised the following issues:

- Supports the officers recommendation of refusal
- The PC appreciates the need to increase housing 20% over 2 decades although this must be in a sympathetic manner
- The conservation area (CA) is small in scale with a contained feel
- Any development in or near the CA needs to be sensitive
- New build fails to meet the criteria required in the CA
- Whilst this site is not in the CA, it is very close by and visible from within
- Additional planting would have an impact
- The surrounding countryside would be changed
- The proposal would have significant negative impact upon the area, including the CA
- Hulcott is too small to form a neighbourhood plan
- In a consultation on development to 2021, 97% agreed development should be respectful, 95% agrees the surrounding countryside is important, and 92% agreed that housing shouldn't impede views.

The applicant, Mr Sheridan and his agent, Mr Ian Mills, raised the following issues in support of the proposal:

- Project of excellence
- It would be a barn style design (U shape)
- Eco features into the next century
- No other houses can oversee the site
- The proposal is sustainable development
- Would make a contribution to housing land supply
- There is no settlement boundary in Hulcott
- Only a short walk to the village
- A travel assessment plan has been provided – there is a bus stop close by, Beirton is a short distance away
- The proposal would be a single storey dwelling, mostly hidden from view amongst trees
- The dwelling would replicate a tradition design – reflective of agricultural/equestrian building

- Reflects the character of the area
- New homes at Cane End Farm, large industrial site close by, and 4,500 dwellings at Kingsbrook
- There would be no harm, no loss of trees, or impact upon ecology
- Hulcott has a dispersed character
- Not an isolated site
- The scheme is off ground breaking design

The Local Member, Cllr Mrs Ward, raised the following issues in support of the proposal:

- Spoke with the case officer during the processing of the application and understood the issues to be in relation to ecology, trees and the design, rather than the principle of development
- The ecological and arboricultural issues could be dealt with by condition
- Design is subjective
- Design is more than the eye can see – it is also what lies beneath
- The proposed dwelling would be almost zero carbon
- There are no other zero carbon dwellings in Hulcott
- The proposed dwelling would raise the standards in the area
- If ground breaking grand design would be something appropriate that would not be wanted here
- The Committee is asked to consider what is pleasing to the eye
- The applicant undertook a pre-application enquiry and the response letter describes the site as being within the village
- The plans shown are misleading as they focus on The Green and dispersal of settlement to the Golf Course
- Cane End Farm is clearly within 350m of the bus stop and is not isolated
- The site would share a driveway with 5 other dwellings
- Need to protect the CA and that is why aesthetic impact is important

Site Visit: 20th November 2018 At: 10am

Those Attending: Members: Cllrs: Bond, Mrs Brandis, Town, Fealey, Adams and Mills

Local Member: Cllr Mrs Ward

Officers: Mrs Claire Bayley and Mrs Nina Hewitt-Jones

Features inspected:

Members met at the entrance to Cane End Road and Members noted the main road in the distance and took note of the distance to the bus stop. The party walked up the access track and viewed the site across the field adjacent to the Cane End Farm access track. Officers described the proposal and indicated to Members where the proposed access would be. The party then walked across the field and stood within the site of the proposed dwelling. Officers pointed out the trees and the approximate location and orientation of the proposed dwelling, garage and driveway. Dwellings were seen beyond the site.

Discussion:

One Member noted the proximity of the access driveway, the nearby farmhouse and barn conversions and was struggling to understand how the site relates to countryside, although is more with the officers recommendation.

One Member expressed that they could see both sides of the debate, the site does not appear to be entirely isolated as there is a dwelling and garden to the side, and barn conversions to the rear. The Member acknowledged that the farmhouse and barn conversions would have been assessed under different policies, but pointed out that they are still dwellings and because of that the site is not isolated, although it is not enclosed on 3 sides by existing built development.

One Member noted that when looking at a map the site appears more isolated than it does when you are on site and see the nearby dwellings. The proposed dwelling would be surrounded by trees and if viewed in the summer would not be seen. This is not an isolated site and therefore the dwelling should be approved. The proposal will not detract from the environment. The site has a clearing in the trees and it feels as if there may have been something there before. The site is not in the village but is part of an off-shoot of 6 houses therefore the site is not isolated and this member would support the proposal.

One Member advised the need for Members (and Officers) to be consistent when considering if we would approve a dwelling in this location. This Member felt the proposal was not acceptable in principle and is in agreement with the officer recommendation of refusal.

Members discussed the principle of development in this location and whether they would consider a small development at this site differently to that of one dwelling.

One Member pointed out that the farmhouse is separated from the village, and just because there are dwellings (farmhouse and barn conversions) in close proximity to the site this does not mean that a new build dwelling can be added in this location. Members were reminded of a similar scheme in North Marston – a new dwelling next to an existing farmhouse, which was refused. This Member explained that they tend to agree with the officers recommendation of refusal, but note that if there were to be an appeal then an Inspector may go the other way.

One Member expressed the view that the site is within the countryside and that policy GP35 does apply, although they did acknowledge there are other buildings about the site, they considered those to be part of the farm. This Member feels they can support the officers recommendation of refusal.

Two Members said that they felt the site visit was worthwhile and helpful to judge the relationship of the site to the nearby buildings and the bus stop.