

Wisborough Green Parish Council

Minutes of The Planning Committee

Date: Tuesday 1st August 2017

Present: Mr A Burbridge (AB), Mr K Charman (KC), Mr A Jackson (Planning Committee Chairman), Mr M Newell (MN), Mrs S Overington (SO), Mr H True (HT), Mr M Watson (MW)

Apologies: Mr N Beresford (NB) and Mr P Drummond (PD)

Held in: The Committee Room, Village Hall

Members of Public: 6

The Chairman opened the meeting at 8.00 pm.

1. Apologies for Absence: Apologies were received and accepted from Mr Beresford and Mr Drummond.

2. Declaration of Members' Interests: No interests were declared.

3. Public Participation: The members of the public attended the meeting in relation to the Land South of Meadowbank application. All were given an opportunity to speak and the following views and concerns were expressed:

- Immediate neighbour expressed concern that the correct boundary line, which was in the centre of the hedge, should be maintained. She was concerned about privacy and impact of large windows, and also of boundary security, expressing the wish to have a dividing wall. Also provided details of a previous ditch along the boundary which had long since disappeared. This ditch was deep and used to carry a large volume of water. Soil erosion in her garden was now evident and she was concerned where water and additional run off would go.
- Concern was expressed that Chichester District Council (CDC) notification of the application had not been received by residents. One resident had noticed the application on the CDC website and therefore contacted CDC. Notifications were subsequently sent. He felt that CDC had been remiss in not sending out but was grateful for an extended response deadline of 14th August.
- There was nothing in the documentation to clarify property management in relation to the public open spaces. Assumed that the owners would not be required to maintain and that a management company would be involved. This did pose the question as to whether the properties might be leasehold. It was also important to ensure that maintenance of these areas was addressed otherwise areas would become unkempt.
- Concerns were expressed over sewage treatment as again if was not clear from the drawings how this would be addressed.
- Although details of boundary treatment along the A272, which included brick pillars at the entrance, had been provided, along with site details, no boundary treatment on the eastern side had been shown apart from mention of natural hedgerow. There were currently posts with barbed wire along the fence line, which was inadequate for both privacy and security. As they adjoining landowner, he would expect close boarded fence.
- The application identified a 2 m pavement to the front of the site. *AJ confirmed that this related to the pavement directly along the site entrance where there was room to increase – it could not be extended to the village shop due to current property boundaries.*
- It was felt that the new home designs offered very little improvement to the previous application, apart from some small cosmetic changes. It was felt that the previous criticism that the properties were not in keeping with the village had not been addressed by this application.
- It was highlighted that the area currently appreciated dark skies. Any street lighting would have a detrimental impact upon the area. *AJ believed that street lighting was not included, but as the Parish Council supported a dark skies policy, this would be highlighted to CDC.*

AJ thanked the members of public for their comments. There were no further comments on the other applications.

4. Planning Applications: The following applications were reviewed.

Application Number	Applicant and Reason for Application
WR/16/02096/REM – Case Officer: Katherine Rawlins	Land South Of Meadowbank Petworth Road Wisborough Green West Sussex Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and the appearance of the buildings and the landscaping of the site.
<p>Details had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting. AJ gave explanation to the approved elements and the details now to be determined. Plans were displayed and the Parish Council’s previous objection discussed in relation to this application. Members acknowledged that the developers appeared to have addressed some of the previous concerns, but after some detailed discussion, it was agreed that the Parish Council would <u>object</u> to this application for the following reasons:</p> <p>Character and Style</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Still concerned that style did not reflect the village’s character. - Brick colour to give variety of at least 4 (not yellow) - Weatherboarding – not to be black – white or pastel green. - Zinc canopies out of keeping – no other canopies of this type in village. - The absence of chimneys was noted, in avillage which was reliant upon electricity and which was known to have power failures. - No street lighting. <p>Renewable Energy Devices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reiterate concern about air source heat pumps and potential for noise disturbance in a quiet rural area. Solar panels on south facing roofs more desirable. <p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increase visitor parking as no parking can be permitted on A272. Need to ensure that sufficient parking is provided to prevent road congestion which was evident on many new estates. Potential to create further parking on grass area at bottom of site. - Move single garages (plot 4 & 11) slightly further back to increase onsite parking. <p>Landscaping and Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fencing – solid walls rather than mix of brick/timber which was considered too urban. Hedge to be in keeping with rural environment. - Object to entrance walls which were out of keeping. Finish with large fence posts more desirable. - A272 hedge must be retained. - 1.8 m panel fence to be provided for security and privacy along east side boundary. <p>Site Drainage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Unconvinced that a proper engineering solution had been achieved to address sewage and surface water disposal. - Evidence required demonstrating that the actuation pond was large enough to accommodate the site water. - Before any permission was approved, engineering details should be provided by the applicant. <p>Site Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Need to establish management of actuation pond and landscaped areas. How was the communal area to be managed. Demonstrate appropriate provisions for communal areas. - Clarification as to whether properties are to be Freehold as opposed to Leasehold. <p>Site Name</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To reiterate that Bluebell Meadow was an inappropriate name. On the Tithe Map Ref 1329 at the WSCC Records office, the field was known as ‘Great Meadow’, owned by George Tripp and occupied by George Tupper. The use of these names was considered more appropriate and in line with historical references being used for other roads in the village. <p>It was agreed that AJ and the Clerk would prepare a draft for circulation and approval prior to submission.</p>	

9.05 pm – SO and the members of public left the meeting room.

Application Number	Applicant and Reason for Application
WR/17/01977/DOM - Case Officer: Paul Hunt - Other Dev - Householder Developments	Mr & Mrs Jon Finn Park Cottage Kirdford Road Wisborough Green RH14 0DF Variation of condition 2 from permission WR/16/01274/DOM- Amendments to plans. <u>No Objection</u>
SDNP/17/03691/LDE – Case Officer: Derek Price	Mockbeggars Horsebridge Hill Bedham RH20 1JP Application for a certificate of lawfulness to establish use of land as residential garden for a continuous period in excess of 10 years. <u>No Objection</u>

5. Chichester District Council Consultations:

- a. Chichester Local Plan Review – Issues and Options Consultation – details of the consultation had been circulated in advance of the meeting. The consultation questionnaire was discussed and responses agreed and noted. Clerk to submit.
- b. Statement of Community Involvement Consultation; agreed, no comments to submit.

6. Any Other Planning Matters to Report: Nothing to report.

7. Date of Next Meeting: Planning Committee Meeting on Tuesday 22nd August 2017 at 8.00 pm,
only if required to meet CDC deadlines.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 10.05 pm.

Signed by the Chairman: Date: