

GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL

DRAFT DRAFT MINUTES OF THE GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING HELD ON FRIDAY 3RD MAY 2019 AT 7.00pm, PAVILION, GRAFFHAM RECREATION GROUND.

- PRESENT:** Cllr. S. Macqueen (Chairman of Graffham Parish Council Planning Committee),
Cllr. C. Ainley, Cllr. H. Charman and Cllr. J. Uphill
- IN ATTENDANCE:** Ms. Tracy Rowe, Clerk
6 Parishioners and a Member of the Public

The Chairman of this meeting, Cllr. Macqueen welcomed all those present.

1. **Apologies**

Apologies had been received and accepted from Cllr. S. Lydiard-Wilson, Cllr. T. Richardson and Cllr. S. Mackie.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

At this point the Chairman noted that there were two applications on the agenda to consider: SDNP/19/01272/HOUS 15 Guillods Cottages and SDNP/18/00938/FUL Calloways. Having established that all those members of the public present were interested in the discussions on Calloways, the Chairman altered the agenda to consider that first.

3. **Public Questions.**

The seven members of public were present to hear, and comment on, Agenda Item 5: SDNP/18/00938/FUL Calloways, Graffham Street, Graffham GU28 0NJ.

There were no questions or comments from any of the parishioners at this point.

4. **SDNP/18/SDNP/18/00938/FUL Calloways, Graffham Street, Graffham GU28 0NJ**

The Chairman noted that a Parish Meeting had been held on 4 May 2018 and a Planning meeting had been held on 21 May 2018, which each considered this proposed application. Subsequently, on 29 May 2018, GPC had submitted a 5-page response.

The Chairman noted that at that time, there had been some 80 documents related to this application on the SDNPA website. Now there were some 147 documents and evidence of a significant communication between the applicant and SDNPA. The applicant had not taken part in a pre-application submission – the work involved in that could not have been greater, than the subsequent ongoing communication with SDNPA.

Despite some 12 months lapsing, there had been no dramatic change in the information available. The number of proposed houses had been reduced by one and the car parking available had been increased by a small amount.

Cllr. Macqueen stated that he thought the following areas were those most pertinent for discussion:

Affordable Housing; traffic generation; the public right of way; sewerage and any other items the public present may wish to discuss.

Affordable Housing (AH). It was noted that Genesis Town Planning in a letter to SDNPA (14.02.19) had stated that they had looked at the provision of affordable units on the site, and had taken into account the advice from CDC's Housing Officer. Having contacted 9 Registered Providers of AH, an overwhelming response from 5 organisations who had responded had been that the scheme was too small for them to take on and manage. Therefore, the developers intended to contribute £520,000 in lieu of AH. It was noted that a S106 agreement was being drafted. It would appear then that this issue had been agreed and was a "done-deal".

It was noted that the £520k would be given to CDC for disbursement as it wished in its area, and Graffham Parish would not benefit at all from these funds. The Chairman noted that whilst there was not a great demand for AH in this parish (although some might feel differently), it was not right to ignore that AH was an issue. The Chairman stated that some of the £520k should benefit Graffham Parish (GP) directly.

A parishioner stated that self-serving conclusions by the developer had been presented to the parish. He queried whether there were any small companies who would deal with small developments of AH? He also queried whether this parish was caught between SDNPA (planning authority) and CDC who had responsibility for provision of AH. Was it possible that SDNPA were declining AH in its rural areas? The member of public felt this needed testing?

Cllr. Uphill noted that the SDNPA was working on its Local Plan which was likely to be adopted very soon. He noted that key workers needed for rural activities needed homes in the Park so they could live near their work. AH should mean homes which somebody could actually afford. He noted that SDNPA wanted a mix of houses within private developments. He also stated that there had been no allocation of AH conferred upon GP, AH requirements within the Park were focused on Petworth and Midhurst.

The Chairman noted that GPC would raise this issue, but that it did seem like a deal had been struck by Genesis Town Planner with SDNPA/CDC. The possibility of raising awareness of this by notifying the local press was raised.

It was also noted that who the actual developer would be was not known, but that it was possible that the planning consent could be sold on, once planning permission had been granted.

A parishioner stated that he was surprised that SDNPA had been prepared to agree with CDC that no AH was allowable as part of this development as this would appear to be against its own policies.

A member of the public stated the SDNPA is not a housing authority, it is a planning authority. He continued by stating that If the Park is to remain alive, then by not having any AH, it is removing a section of its residents from the community. The Parish Council should suggest another way forward. The Lavington Stud (Stud) has been removing its own AH by closing the AH it currently owns for its own workers. The parishioner stated that the parish does not want a gated community

Cllr. Charman queried whether there had been a procedural issue underlying this? He noted that GPC had not been consulted over the last year about the issue of AH provision within this development.

The Chairman queried whether GPC should just focus on securing AH within the development i.e. on site, or consider another option. He notified the meeting that Rolls Royce Motor Cars had recently gained planning permission for a new large car park for its own staff, and as part of the planning agreement, a section of that car park had been allocated for users of the nearby primary school. It was suggested that part of the field adjacent to the school could be given to the parish and could then be used to alleviate car parking problems at the school and the Church.

A parishioner stated that one of the houses within the Calloways development should be AH. The £520 contribution should go on that one house, within the development. The parish council should not be fobbed off with another option e.g. a car park.

Cllr. Uphill stated that 1 or 2 houses within the development i.e. on site, worth £520k, should be given to the parish, who could manage the properties. GPC, or another village organization, could look after the management of the properties.

It was suggested that GPC talk to the Trustees of the All Saints Chapel Trust, who manage the Almshouses near the shop.

Discussion ensued and it was agreed that actually, the parish does not want the Calloways development at all. The Chairman noted that a great majority of the 50 plus parishioners who were present at the parish meeting a year ago were against the development.

A parishioner stated again that she was personally in favour of the Calloways development, but with 1 AH unit on site. If this were really not possible, then the £520k, should be spent on updating the playground. Traffic generation. The Chairman noted that the number of houses had been reduced by 1, but that the car parking had been increased by 3 spaces. The issue of traffic generation was still present but the developers were still stating that any traffic generated by new housing would only be a small increase over and above the current traffic caused by stud workers.

The Chairman noted that there was only one document showing access – there was no formal plan explaining the access provision or how the access would meet The Street. The access appeared to be up the single lane from the Street, and with a passing space about a 1/3 way along. This was extraordinary, given the amount of traffic that could be attempting to leave/enter the development at the same time.

It was noted that the intention was to keep the automatic gate near The Street.

Right of Way. The Chairman noted that the plans state that the “proposed” footpath would go through the development The change of position of the footpath was approved two years ago – instead of going between the stud buildings and the field on the West side, the footpath was moved to go between the stud buildings.

Cllr. Uphill queried how the current residents would access their own properties during the build process?

Sewerage. The Chairman noted that there was no reference to this in the planning documents. A member of the public present stated that all current properties were on mains drainage and Seaford water.

The Chairman clarified that there were no other comments from those present and stated that as GPC had to submit its response by Tuesday 7th, it would now draft its response.

A member of the public stated that the application stresses that Calloways is part of a stud, not a farm, and that that section which it is intending to develop is redundant. The application makes no explanation of how, if one big section of the operation were removed, how it could not make a difference to its operation. The stud is a major area of land within the Park, and provides employment within the Park. Why does the Park not address this and query the possible loss of employment?

Cllr. Uphill stated that GPC has pointed out that the buildings are not redundant and that the courtyard of stables are used currently as part of the business, yet the application was dependent on the buildings being redundant.

The Chairman stated that how the Stud runs its business is not the affair of GPC, but that GPC had offered to attempt to find a way to manage AH on site within the Calloways development.

5. **SDNP/19/01272/HOUS 15 Guillods Cottages, Graffham Street, Graffham GU28 0NJ**

This application had previously been on the agenda for a planning meeting held on 17 April 2019, at which the Chairman noted that it had not been possible to conduct an inspection of the site, although contact had finally been made with the architect. The item had been deferred to a future planning meeting, to ensure that a site visit could be conducted prior to discussion.

The Chairman explained that it had still not been possible to conduct a site visit. The application was to reconstruct a ground floor extension that provides a dining area which is attached to the existing kitchen and to extend an existing first floor structure to provide an additional bedroom, the existing structure at present houses a bathroom which will be relocated into an existing bedroom.

As GPC had been unable to conduct a site visit, the Clerk was UNANIMOUSLY instructed to submit the following response:

Due to the unavailability of a site visit, GPC is unable to comment on this application. However, it notes that it SUPPORTED a previous similar application, SDNP/16/00527/HOUS, No 17 Guillods Cottages, which was subsequently withdrawn due to lack of officer support. **Action: Clerk**

6. **To include any late or amended planning applications received.**

There were none.

The meeting ended at 7.48 pm.

These minutes are an accurate record of the meeting.

Cllr. Sandy Macqueen, Chairman, GPC Planning Committee Date.....