

FMPC – Neighbourhood Plan Monitoring Group

Date	30/03/23
Application Details	P/HOU/2023/01648 and P/LBC/2023/01649 - Blackberry Farm, Hannahs Hill, Fontmell Magna SP7 0AT Internal changes to property. Grade II listed.
Planning Working Group Members	JK
Recommendation to Parish Council	SUPPORT this application

Policies	Application details	Policy Compliance	Further Action
Policy FM1. Local Green Spaces p11			
Policy FM2. Local Wildlife Corridors and Protected Species p13			
Policy FM3. Important Views p14			
Policy FM4. The setting of the AONB p15			
Policy FM5. Local Landscape Features p18			
Policy FM6. Dark Skies p19			
Policy FM7. The Conservation Area and Locally Important Features p22			
Policy FM8. Development layout p25			
Policy FM9. Building design p28	Internal changes to building and modifications to windows.	Conforms	
Policy FM10. Creating safer roads and pedestrian routes p31			
Policy FM11. Sustainable drainage p35			
Policy FM12. Development impacting on the sewage treatment works p36			
Policy FM13. Important community facilities p38			
Policy FM14. Social Infrastructure p41			
Policy FM15. Facilitating home working p43			
Policy FM16. Housing Types p48			
Policy FM17. Spatial strategy for new development p50			
Policy FM18. Settlement boundary p52			
Is the Applicant known to members of the Group?	No		

Compliance Notes:

25/03/23 - John Knight

I refer to Application P/HOU/2023/01648

Having read through most of the Heritage Statement, the Statement of Significance prepared by Asset Heritage, and the drawings prepared by the Architects PWCR, I have to say that I am impressed by the amount of historical and architectural information that has been submitted.

The Grade 2 Listing would appear to be attributable primarily to the historic context rather than its architectural interest.

With regard to Building design issues (FM9) the only minor comments that I would make are that the replacement of the stone walls to the 'Lean-to', with timber cladding, does not give me any cause for concern. I am also satisfied that the alterations to the windows and external doors are sensitive and the adoption of Code 5 lead to the cheeks of the dormer windows is a good proposal.

One very tiny niggle is that the subdivision of the glazing in door GD5 is a bit too busy as it has 16 panes, whereas by removing one horizontal glazing bar and reducing the number of panes to 12, like GD2, 3, and 4 the proportions might be better.

I see that it is proposed to replace the existing internal staircase but looking at the photo (plate 12) I doubt that it has any real architectural interest.

At 1st floor it is proposed to remove wardrobes and 'stud partitions' It is also proposed to remove walls at ground level in the Kitchen/Dining area. If any of these walls or partitions include plaster lath work (such as can be seen on Plate 57) then this could be contentious, but I am confident that the Architects will have considered this as should the Conservation officer.

Finally I note that there will be w.c's in the bathrooms serving the Master bedroom and Bedroom 2 There is no indication of the soil stacks on the external elevations which presumably means that the soil pipes will be encased on the internal ground floor wall of the living room and dining room. I just hope the casing will be sound proofed.

Despite my very minor observations I can see no reason why the proposals should not be granted Planning and Listed Building Consent, and incidentally the Architects seem to have taken trouble to meet the obligation of FM2 (Bats)

MH – 30/03/23

08/01/23

Good evening Mike

I have had a look at the application for Mulberry and like Dick cannot see any reason for not approving it. It's a small garden but the proposed 3 garden outhouses are relatively small.

Kind regards

Michael

08/01/23

Hello Mike

I have had a look at this application and I can't see that it is against any of the NP policies. The only thing that will be openly visible from the road is the flue for the wood burning stove and that will be black, not the usual shiny stainless steel. I don't think that any other colour could render it less visible as from the road it will be silhouetted against the sky.

The other buildings are just the usual garden outbuildings which are found in other gardens along West Street and because of their position will not be readily visible from the road.

I see no reason to object to this application.

Regards

Dick

06/01/23

Hello All

This is my first input to a planning application so forgive me if anything I say might be irrelevant.

I assume that the location of the greenhouse, shed and summer house are not contentious as they do not appear to be visible to "the world at large" and would only be an issue to neighbours if there were issues of being "overlooked" - which limits any possible issue principally to the summer house - which reasonably appears to be at the bottom of the garden.

The flue however would have limited visibility from the road - albeit that it will mostly be hidden by the front hedge. It is certainly not to my taste and I do not think it enhances the look of the property. I would be looking to conceal it somehow perhaps in a chimney stack or by some internal means - which I appreciate would add considerably to the cost. Given the economic climate we find ourselves in though - particularly fuel costs - would it be fair or reasonable to request such a change ?

As a point of interest - for my own education - I am assuming that the seeking of planning permission for the greenhouse, shed and summer house is necessary purely because of restrictions in the original planning consent as otherwise, would they not fall into the realm of permitted development ?

Thanks

John