

# Kingston Parish Council

## Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting held at 8.00pm on 7 June 2012

### Present:

Simon Draper, Chairman (SD)

Tim Fitzjohn (TF)

Julie Conder (JCo)

James Clear (JCI)

Katherine Stalham (KS)

Peter Stokes – Clerk

Members of the public: Mr and Mrs P Owers (applicants), Mr M Warren (neighbour and resident of Netscroft), Mr Don Proctor (RPS Planning and Development, agent for the applicants).

### 1. Apologies

None

### 2. Planning application S/1074/12/FL: demolition of existing dwelling at Summerhill, Tinker's Lane and replacement with 2 new dwellings – revised design.

- 2.1. **SD** stated that Mr Proctor and Mr Warren would both be permitted to make statements, following which the parish council would discuss and resolve on the matter.

The discussion then proceeded as follows:

- 2.1.1. **Mr Proctor** explained that the revised application differed from the original in the following particulars:

2.1.1.1. The roofline of the garage of Plot 1 (which adjoins Netscroft) has been lowered by 1 m.

2.1.1.2. A planting scheme has been designed for the boundaries, particularly the frontage of the site.

- 2.1.2. **Mr Warren** said that the lowering of the garage of Plot 1 did little to resolve the previous objection of loss of amenity to Netscroft. He produced a diagram showing that the view from the first floor window of Netscroft looking in the direction of Plot 1 was almost directly onto the gable end wall of the house, which has not changed in the revised design. At a slight angle the view was onto the lowered garage roof.

- 2.1.3. **JCo** said that in her view most of the objections made by Kingston Parish Council to the original proposal still applied to the current proposal.

- 2.1.4. **KS** said that she thought the proposed houses were too large. It might be more acceptable if the garage of plot 1 was removed as it had an intrusive presence close to the road.

- 2.1.5. **TF** commented that the changes were very minor.

- 2.1.6. **JCI** commented that two houses on the site would be more acceptable if they were not so large – for example, they could be semi-detached to reduce the impression of over-crowding of the site.

- 2.1.7. **JCo** stated that although the village had not yet completed its Community Plan, the initial survey confirmed that residents wanted to retain the open, rural feel to the village and its architecture with widely-spaced houses. Closely-spaced houses or garages were more appropriate to an urban environment where space is at a premium, and residents do not want this in Kingston.

- 2.1.8. **SD** commented that there were closely-spaced houses or garages elsewhere in the village, although they are the exception.

2.2. It was **agreed** that the parish council objected to the revised proposal for the same reasons that they objected to the original proposal. The Clerk was instructed to draft a suitable letter to SCDC and circulate it amongst parish councillors for approval.

Meeting ended at 8.45 pm

Signed.....

Date.....