**COLDWALTHAM PARISH COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING HELD**

**on TUESDAY 5th DECEMBER 2017 at 7.30PM**

**AT FIELD HOUSE, BROCKHURST FARM, WATERSFIELD**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Those Present:** | **Cllr T Burr** |  |
|  | **Cllr J Evans** |  |
|  | **Cllr A Lilley** |  |
|  | **Cllr O Dudman** |  |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **P 17 / 13.00** | **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - to receive comments made by members of the public.** | |
|  | Cllr Burr chaired the meeting as planning lead. | |
| **P 17 / 14.00** | TO RECEIVE AND ACCEPT APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE | |
|  | Apologies received from Cllr Hewer. | |
| **P 17 / 15.00** | **TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS** | |
|  | None received. | |
| **P 17 / 16.00** | **PLANNING** | |
|  | **SDNP/17/05406/HOUS** | **OAKWOOD COTTAGE, COLEBROOK LANE, WATERSFIELD** |
|  | *Proposed erection of a part single storey, part two storey rear extension, and single storey side extension forming attached annexe.* | |
|  | **SDNP/17/05883/HOUS** | **PADDOCK VIEW, COLEBROOK LANE, WATERSFIELD** |
|  | *Removal of existing rear conservatory and erection of oak framed single storey rear extension featuring 3x roof lanterns.* | |
|  | Councilor Burr presented these plans to the meeting. The two applications were not only from the same road, but had similar objectives of greatly increasing the amount of living space in what were already spacious properties. Taken together with ‘Fort Hill’ next door to Oakwood Cottage, where similar expansion had taken place last year (SDNP/16/00377/HOUS), there seemed to be an emerging pattern of enlargement in this neighbourhood.  The Council considered the plans. It was pointed out that the role of the Parish Council was not to grant or refuse planning permission, but rather to draw the attention of the planning authority to local aspects which might otherwise be overlooked in considering applications. These were major extensions, especially for Oakwood Cottage which was almost a reconstruction, doubling the floor area. Their cumulative impact on the character of this rural lane, lying outside the SDNPA’s proposed settlement boundary for Watersfield, should therefore be highlighted in commenting to the authority on both applications.  Specifically, on SDNP/17/05883/HOUS, the extensive glazing of the proposed extension, including three roof lanterns, might be at variance with the Dark Skies policy of the SDNPA, and appropriate mitigation of any extra light spill might be needed. The application also said nothing about the archaeological significance of the site, although the line of the Roman Stane Street ran within a few metres of the proposed extension and would have channelled ancient activity into the site. Both points should also be brought to the attention of the planning authority. | |
|  | **RESOLVED:** | **To raise no objection to the plans, but to put to the planning authority the points raised in discussion.** |
| **P 17 / 17.00** | **OTHER ITEMS** | |
|  | **SDNP/17/05936/FUL** | **THE RIDGE BUNGALOW, BURY GATE, NR. WATERSFIELD** |
|  | *Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement Sussex barn-style dwelling with ancillary detached garage.* | |
|  | Councillor Burr said that this third application had reached the Parish Clerk too late for inclusion in the agenda. He nonetheless proposed that it should be considered at this meeting, first because the deadline for comment was over the holiday period, which shortened the time available for any further meeting, but second because it shared with the applications already considered the theme of creating larger houses by extension or replacement of existing ones.  The Council accordingly considered the plans. The footprint of the proposed house and garage was several times that of the small existing dwelling. Mainly on two storeys, in place of the existing single storey, it also had a superimposed roofline of considerable bulk. Any resemblance to a Sussex barn seemed superficial, and the barn door feature faced away from the open countryside directly overlooked by the house. The design also lacked the architectural distinction to justify a location well outside any settlement boundary in a rural setting within a National Park. | |
|  | **RESOLVED:** | **To object to the plans.** |

**Chairman:……………………….…………………………. Date:………………**