

BRAMBER PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Meeting on Monday, 15 August 2016

in Beeding & Bramber Hall at 6.00.p.m.

Present: Councillors J. Goddard (Chair), N. Stubbs, M. Tilley, M. Croker, Mrs D. Goodall, Mrs L. Edwards, Mrs M. Goddard and the clerk. There were 4 members of the public present.

1. Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillors R. Potter and N. Mills.

2. Declarations of Interest

Councillor Mrs Goodall declared a personal interest in application DC/16/1088 and took no part in the decision.

3. Questions from the Public

Residents concerned with the application on Clays Hill stated that they thought that the amended plans made no significant difference to the noise and privacy that neighbours would suffer. They also felt that the application for change of use of the land opposite should be considered alongside this one but the Chairman said that the planning authority would only consider the applications on their own merit.

Both the applicant for the new house in Castle Lane and a neighbour were present. The neighbour was concerned about the loss of privacy from the proposed front dormer window and also about the design and height of the property.

4. Planning Applications

The council then considered the following applications:

DC/16/1088 New house on Clays Hill

After much discussion the council was unanimous in deciding that it should object to the amended plans on the following grounds:

1. The proposed building remains too large for the site.
2. There were still major concerns about the access on to Clays Hill which is a busy road with much speeding.
3. The plans still did not fully address the lack of adequate visibility splay particularly when turning to the right.
4. The loss of greenery will affect the street scene.

5. Neighbours from several directions will suffer loss of privacy from the rear of the proposed property.

DC/16/1714 Hoppits Castle Lane

There was also much discussion about this application and the council also unanimously agreed to reject the application on the following grounds:

1. The proposal was considered to be over development on a very small site. The proposed property would be very close to the adjoining property and not in keeping with the street scene. In addition the council was concerned about the height of the ridge line and that the building would be in front of the building line.
2. The house would be overlooking the housing opposite with consequent loss of privacy.
3. The boundaries should be validated by HDC and WSCC.

The meeting closed at 7.00 p.m.