

Planning application **23/02319/FUL**

## **Land at Camp Lane**

Application to build a substantial dwelling on land previous and variously used as garden Land /paddock

### **Background**

This site adjoins a modest dwelling known as Meadow Bank constructed in the 1950's as a caretakers/employees house by Severn Trent Water who own and control the adjacent water pumping station. This property has a substantial garden and was permitted the use of the site under consideration as additional garden and prior to that a grazing paddock for horses. The site is accessed along with Meadow Bank and the pumping station by a private driveway approximately 3m wide from Camp Lane and is presently maintained by STW.

Camp Lane is accessed off the A3400 and over a weak bridge at the cross roads with Tanworth Lane around which there are some half dozen cottages and Bridge House a substantial dwelling. Thereafter Camp Lane serves a number of scattered houses and farms. The road is to all intents and purposes a single track with informal passing places.

This hamlet has grown over time in the rural parish of Beaudesert approximately one mile from the northern extremity of the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of Henley and sits in the West Midlands Green Belt

The Planning Group recommend the Parish Council **Refuse** this application on the following grounds:

1 it is inappropriate development affecting the openness of the Green Belt and does not meet the criteria set out in the NPPF in that there are no very special circumstances relating to the application and development of the site

2 the development of the site is not in accordance with policy CS10 of the Stratford upon Avon Core Strategy 2011 to 2031; Neither is it in accordance with policy AS10 of that document.

3 it does not accord with Policy H1 para2 of the emerging Neighbourhood Development Plan for Beaudesert and Henley in Arden which does not encourage development in the Green Belt unless there are very special circumstances, and its openness is not affected.

4 Camp Lane is effectively a single-track road with random passing places and the proposed access to the site has extremely poor vision splays. Traffic accessing to and from the A3400 has to cross a narrow and weak bridge restricted to 10 tonnes Construction traffic would severely impact on the use of Camp Lane by the residents of this Hamlet and any emergency vehicles.

5 The position size and massing of the proposed dwelling overshadows the adjoining property; and the potential number of traffic movements, if developed, will exacerbate the already congested flow along Camp Lane.

6 The Planning Officers attention is drawn to the reasons for refusal of development on this site (copy attached) Notwithstanding the date of this refusal the Parish Council do not believe that the circumstances have in any way altered.

7 There does not appear to be an ecological report submitted and the impact on wildlife flora and fauna does not appear to have been considered. Two mature trees have already been removed to facilitate development and in mitigation two whips (species unknown) have been

random planted. The site is protected from Camp Lane by mature and significant hedging which for the protection of adjacent property should remain if SDC consent is forthcoming.

Planning application **23/02533/FUL**

**Brook Furlong Birmingham Road Henley in Arden**

Application to build a substantial extension across the rear of the house on ground and part first floor.

The construction has been partially completed from ground to first floor level and is now held pending this application. SDC planners and Building Control are aware of the position and the enforcement officer has been involved. This is not a retrospective application and has to be considered afresh.

Recommendation to **support** or **no objection**

The proposal does not overlook or impact on adjoining property to either side. The gardens are substantial and mature.

A very similar extension was approved on this row of houses by SDC not long ago, and the owners of Brook Furlong have largely plagiarised the plans.

The PC objected to the first one because of the roof line of the extension being at the same height as the main house (subsidiarity). In addition it did not have detailed drawings to take off measurements and determine the gross increase in floor space/volume( up to 30% has been previously allowed)

The present case has taken all this into account, and the fact that there is precedent means that SDC consent is very likely to happen. Added to which logic dictates that what they are doing is a good idea for modern day living. We need to pick our battles!