

Greatham Parish Council Planning Committee.

Minutes of meeting held In the Village Hall on Wednesday 22 December, 2010.

1. Open the meeting

The meeting was opened at 7.30pm by Chairman Alan Booton. Also present were Councillors A Bridgman, C Rudd, D Jerrard and Mrs T Whelan (clerk).

2. Apologies for absence

None

3. Announcements

The Chairman pointed out the fire exits.

4. Declarations of interest

The Chairman reminded members of their responsibility to declare any personal or prejudicial interest.

Re Item 6.1. As Mr Larner was recently a parish councillor and still maintained a friendship the following councillors declared a personal and prejudicial interest; Cllr A Booton, Cllr C Rudd, and Cllr D Jerrard. As this meant that there was not quorum It was therefore unanimously agreed that standing orders would be suspended for this item so that there could be a discussion with parish members present. This would allow Mr Larner to hear the opinions of other members.

5. Minutes of 20th August 2010 - matters arising

It was agreed that Cllr Bridgman would circulate a copy of the papers received under item 7 Any other Business and that these would be discussed at the next Parish Council Meeting.

CLERK

6. Planning applications

1. SDNP53066 Bauhinia, Petersfield Road – rear extension

The Chairman suspended Standing Orders for this item. Cllr Bridgman said that he had visited the site and could see no adverse impact on any neighbour and no grounds for anyone to object. This is for a conservatory extension to the dining room and converting the garage to office space. These proposals had been agreed with Mr Larner's next door neighbour. Mr Larner said that his family had now increased to 4 and that as he wished to continue living in the village it seemed logical to extend his existing property to accommodate the family. Mr Walters said he had no issues with the proposed application. Cllr Jerrard commented that there had been several applications to convert garages into office space and as far as he was aware these had all been granted. Standing Orders were re-instated. The clerk asked to inform the district council that it was impossible for the council to discuss this matter and that they were inquorate to do so.

CLERK

2. SDNP53075 6, Woolmer Terrace replace rear extension

Cllr Bridgman reported that this was one of a row of 4. Each neighbour of No 6 has a two storey extension. He sees no reason to object to this 2 storey replacement to the existing single storey. They will be digging proper foundations. This was agreed unanimously.

CLERK

3. SDNP32738/014 Greatham Mill – velux roof window.

For part of the building facing the back garden and not visible anywhere. This is to allow more natural light into the bathroom. After discussion Cllr Booton said he felt there was no objection to this provided it is in keeping with the listed building. This was unanimously agreed. An alternative to velux would be preferred.

CLERK

4. SDNP25542/006 Carylls, Petersfield Road – new dwelling.

This item was heard second as Mr Walters who is affected by this application was present. There was much discussion about the history of the various developments

around this site and use of plan drawings to explain these. In addition the fact that other permissions around this site were granted despite several objections. This site was cleared of all the Oak trees except one, and other trees and shrubs removed and the land levelled in advance of this application for another bungalow. Cllr Jerrard commented that it is needed to look behind the application as part of a scheme as the committee must consider the affect on the village as a whole. Cllr Booton said that this appeared to be creep redevelopment building one bungalow and then another and that this particular application is too near the settlement boundary. A member who lives adjacent to the proposed plot was said that there will be a 1.8m fence and only one window faces his way from the bungalow so this should not affect his privacy. However, he has already lost the scenery and seclusion offered by the various trees and shrubs which has already been removed. Cllr Booton commented that this will harm the open space and character of that part of the village which needs to be considered especially since we are now part of the South Downs National Park. Cllr Jerrard commented that it would be contrary to the current government's policy of no garden grabbing. Aside from these, there was concern about access as this will only be made possible by demolishing part of an existing building. At the end of the discussions Cllr Booton asked 'do we object to this application?' - this was unanimously agreed. The following grounds were given

1. proximity to the settlement boundary
2. open spaces and inappropriate development within a national park
3. Inappropriate garden grabbing against the new stated government policy
4. This development would require demolition of existing buildings
5. Open Spaces Act.
6. The need to protect and maintain the overall appearance and character of the area.

Cllr Bridgman said that he accepted that the applicant had tried to minimise overlooking the next door property but agreed to object on the grounds as outlined by Cllr Booton.

It was agreed to write to the District Council informing them of the objections and ask that in view of the number of objections that there are, that this should be referred to the South Planning committee for their consideration. **CLERK**

5. SDNP27086/028 West Fork appeal re poly tunnel storage

Cllr Bridgman explained the family history and the fact that they are wishing to use existing poly tunnels as storage. This is behind the hedge and not visible from the road. What is stored can only be seen from the entrance. He has been told that he needs planning permission to store in these tunnels and therefore he has done so, in line with his applying for planning in everything he does. Cllr Bridgman said that he is very happy to assist with the appeal for the poly tunnels which have been there for some 25 years. Cllr C Rudd asked what the grounds were for refusal. The case is suspended at the moment. Cllr Bridgman proposed that the Planning committee support an appeal. All agreed. Cllr Jerrard suggested that this was put in writing. **ABR/CLERK**

7. Any Other Business

Mr D Rudd reported that the gate from Fern Farm to Wolfmere Lane was padlocked and not welded. He requested that we ask to DC to ensure this is done as it is a condition of the planning consent. He confirmed that this entrance has been used since 6 December when we were assured by the DC that he had welded the gate. The clerk will contact the District Council. **CLERK**

There being no further business to discuss, the meeting closed at 8.55pm.