

COLDWALTHAM PARISH COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE PLANNING MEETING HELD on THURSDAY 2ND AUGUST 2018 at 7.30PM AT FIELD HOUSE, BROCKHURST FARM, WATERSFIELD

Those Present: Cllr T Burr Vice Chairman
Cllr S Hewer
Cllr O Dudman

P 18 / 11.00 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION - to receive comments made by members of the public.

There were none.

P 18 / 12.00 TO RECEIVE AND ACCEPT APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies received from Cllrs Nelson, & Hewitt.

P 18 / 13.00 TO RECEIVE ANY DECLARATION OF DISCLOSABLE PECUNIARY INTERESTS

None received.

P 18 / 14.00 PLANNING

P 18 / 14.01 SDNP/18/03754/FUL RIDGE BUNGALOW, BURY GATE, BURY

Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a replacement single storey dwelling with detached double garage. Diversion of footpath number 2444 to run along the front and side boundaries of the site.

Councillor Burr presented these plans to the meeting. This new proposal was incorrectly described as a single storey dwelling, and while not as large as the grand six-bedroom edifice originally proposed and rejected both by the Planning Authority and on appeal, it was still around three times larger than the existing bungalow. As such it was contrary to the applicable policy of Horsham District Council on replacement dwellings (DC28), as informed by the proposed policy (SD30) in the South Downs National Park Authority's Local Plan (currently under examination pending adoption), which set a limit of 30% for the increase in area compared with the existing dwelling. It was also perverse to demolish an affordable dwelling to make way for an upmarket replacement, when the chief unmet requirement within both the National Park and the Parish was for affordable homes.

In discussion it was agreed that the Parish Council should continue to oppose the scale of dwelling proposed, as contrary to planning policy while also entailing the loss of an affordable home. The location was moreover just 200 metres from a Dark Sky Site in course of designation, and the applicant's assertion that their much larger dwelling would emit no more light than the existing bungalow would need to be challenged.

RESOLVED: That the Council object to these revised proposals.

P 18 / 15.00 OTHER ITEMS

None.

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