

GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING
HELD ON FRIDAY 19 JUNE 2020 AT 3.30pm, VIA ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCING

PRESENT: Cllr. S. Macqueen (Chairman), Cllr. P. Churchward, Cllr. S. Mackie and Cllr. J. Uphill
IN ATTENDANCE: Mr. Duncan Baker-Brown, Director and Architect - BBM Sustainable Designs Ltd.
Mr. Barnaby Weiner, Applicant for both Glasses Barn and Shuttles planning applications.
Ms. Tracy Rowe, Clerk

The Chairman of this meeting, Cllr. Macqueen (Chair of Graffham Parish Council Planning Committee), welcomed all those present.

1. **Apologies**
Apologies been received and accepted from Cllr. H. Charman.
2. **Declarations of Interest**
There were none.
3. **Public Questions.**
There were no members of public present other than the applicant and representative of BBM Sustainable Designs Ltd, noted above.

The Chairman noted that the applications for Glasses Barn (SDNP/20/01430/FUL) and Shuttles (SDNP/20/01431/HOUS) would be discussed separately, but did point out that a WSCC Consultation Document on the Glasses Barn application documents on SDNPA website appeared to assume that both Glasses Barn and Shuttles was one single application and development. No equivalent WSCC Consultation document was on the Shuttles application documents on the SDNPA website. Mr. Baker-Brown would talk to the relevant case officer and clarify this.

4. **SDNP/20/01430/FUL Glasses Barn, Graffham Common Road, Graffham GU28 0PU Replacement of a single dwelling house using existing materials and demolition and rebuilding of a former Craft Barn to be retained as ancillary studio space for the house.**

The same application (number SDNP/20/01431/FUL) was considered by GPC at a planning meeting on 12 May 2020 (minute 10 refers). That application included the barn to the south which was to be deconstructed and rebuilt as ancillary studio space for the house. GPC had submitted an OBJECTION RESPONSE due to the: over development of a limited site; the increase in the number of bedrooms and therefore the possible increase in number of residents; insufficient off-road car parking; unsuitable dormer windows; increase of ancillary space and loss of garaging. GPC had requested as a planning condition a Contractors' Plan relating to off-road lorry deliveries and off-road contractors' car parking and also that a condition be in place, were permission to be granted, no works would be undertaken at the same time as any works were in progress in the adjoining property, Shuttles, or vice versa.

NEW PLANS BEING CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING Subsequently, revised plans of elevations, sections, 1st and ground floors and site plans had been submitted on the SDNP website and it was those which were being considered at this meeting. It appeared that the main difference was the incorporation of a two-car garage at Glasses Barn and two allocated car spaces in the yard. The dormer windows stayed the same.

Cllr. Macqueen noted that previously (minutes of meeting 12 May) GPC had expressed concern re: overdevelopment (changing a property from 3 bedrooms to 5 bedrooms) – this remained the same in the revised drawings now being considered.

Limited car parking – there was now provision for a 2-car garage plus 2 allocated external car spaces in the yard.

Concern had previously been expressed that the proposed Zinc dormer windows on the first floor north facing and south facing elevations were out of keeping to the area. GPC had prior to this meeting been sent

by the architect a 3-D design picture of proposed new dormer windows showing the proposed material pallet for Glasses Barn (and Shuttles) – noting the use of Zinc cladding. Subsequently, a further email had been received from BBM Sustainable Design showing pictures of the dormers at Glasses (the residence of the applicant) and information had been received from BBM Sustainable Design, noting that lead could possibly be used instead of Zinc on the dormers

Contractor's parking: information had been received that the applicant was agreeable to making a Contactor's plan a condition of a planning consent and that all on-road/off-site parking would be prohibited.

The Chairman asked if any member present had any questions on the information received so far and invited comments.

Discussion arose and it was suggested that lead Dormer windows would be an improvement on Zinc dormers. Another member stated that the dormer windows were an improvement on those suggested and seen by GPC in the previous application. Another member noted that whilst the car parking issue had appeared to have improved, the application could still be considered as over development.

The applicant referred to the 3-D picture of the Dormers which had been submitted and noted that the use of lead or zinc were interchangeable in terms of look. It would be the detailing which would ensure that the look was in-keeping. It was noted that the revised statement attached to the application, stated that Zinc was more environmentally friendly than lead. The architect present, stated that the proposed zinc would be pre-weathered so would stay as was from the outset.

It was noted by the Chairman, that whilst the 3-D picture did not probably do the design justice, the style of the proposed dormer windows, looked bulky and cumbersome for a country village.

The Chairman then raised the issue of overdevelopment – i.e. turning a 3-bedroomed house into a 5-bedroom house. He noted that Graffham was becoming more and more popular and that recently a number of traditional bungalows had been knocked down and rebuilt as 4 or 5-bedroom houses. There was no change in the infrastructure of the village and traffic was becoming more and more of an issue.

The applicant noted, that whilst the number of bedrooms would be increased, there would be no change to the size of the footprint or the ridge height, just that the ground floor space was utilized better and the upstairs space was converted. This was acknowledged by the Chairman, but he also noted that the increase in bedrooms could increase the number of residents hence an increase in traffic.

The Chairman then proposed discussing Shuttles, and making a decision on the response to both applications after that discussion.

5. **SDNP/20/01431/HOUS Shuttles, Graffham Common Road, Graffham GU28 0PU**
Extensions and refurbishment of single dwelling house.

It was noted that a previous application had been discussed and responded to at the GPC Planning Meeting on 12th May (minute 11 refers) (as per Glasses Barn above).

NEW PLANS BEING CONSIDERED AT THIS MEETING Subsequently, revised plans of elevations, sections, 1st and ground floors and site plans had been submitted on the SDNP website and it was those which were being considered at this meeting. It appeared that the main difference was the removal of a second staircase at Shuttles and allocated car spaces in the respective yard. The dormer windows stayed the same.

The Chairman noted that it was still proposed that a 2-bedroom property would be converted to 5-bedrooms and that there would still be limited car parking but 3 places had been allocated in the yard. It was noted that the applicant was agreeable to a Contractors' site plan being a planning condition. The Chairman emphasized again that it was essential that all Contractors vehicles must be parked on site and deliveries take place on site – there must not be any obstruction or congestion on the Graffham Common Road and the applicant was agreeable that such should be a condition of the planning consent.

It was noted that it was proposed that development of both Glasses Barn and Shuttles would take place at the same time on economic grounds.

It was queried by a GPC member, that as it was proposed that both sites would be built at the same time, how many contractors/work vans etc. would be on site at the same time? The applicant noted that the contractors would have 3 parking areas on this site, plus those at Glasses Barn, but if that were not sufficient, they would be able to park at his own nearby property Glasses.

It was queried how this would be managed due to the effect of social distancing/Corona. The architect noted that whilst all workmen on building sites taking place now, had to arrive in their own individual van, and not share transport, there were less workmen on site at any one time. This had the knock-on effect of current builds taking longer. This could be the case with Glasses Barn/Shuttles.

The Chairman noted that there was some concern in the village to two 5-bedroomed houses on these sites (having changed from 3 bed and 2 beds). The applicant stated that the number of bedrooms being created were not out of kilter with the size of the properties and they were not overbuilding relative to the site. The Chairman noted that unlike recently granted applications, the applicant was maximizing the accommodation space available and was not increasing the footage notwithstanding there would be a likely increase of residents and traffic.

Discussion ensued about the convoluted planning process which had taken place to get to this stage. The applicant stated that it was likely that he would let the properties after completion.

At this point, the Chairman suggested that the meeting move to a vote. Having been thanked for their attendance, the applicant and architect from BBM Sustainable Design Ltd left the meeting at 15.57pm.

The GPC members present further discussed the issues:

- Contractors vans and deliveries being off-site, at both properties, at all times – it was agreed that the applicant had been strongly forewarned that this was essential and was agreeable to this being a condition of a planning consent;
 - issue of overdevelopment due to the increase in bedrooms in each property, noting the mood of the village that there were too many small properties being re-developed into bigger properties (whilst acknowledging that the actual footprint of these actual properties had not changed)
 - the future long-term use of the houses, noting that the applicant lived at the next-door property so would be as affected as the rest of the village by their usage
 - the style design of the dormers proposed on both properties, not being in keeping with the rural setting.
- It was noted that the picture supplied by the applicant of the dormers at his own property, Glasses, showed dormers which were of a more acceptable style than those in the 3-D picture supplied by the architects which were considered to be too bulky.

Following a recommendation from the Chairman it was **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that the following response be submitted for each of the applications: **SDNP/20/01430/FUL Glasses Barn** and **SDNP/20/01431 Shuttles:**

Graffham Parish Council, whilst appreciating the amended plans and revised Design and Access Statements, submits a **NEUTRAL** response given its remaining concerns: these applications are still overdevelopment of the limited sites, being the increase in the number of bedrooms and therefore the possible increase in the number of residents and their vehicles; further consideration is required to the bulk and style of the dormer windows which are inappropriate in this rural setting; In the event that planning is granted, a Contractors' Site plan relating to off road lorry deliveries and contractors' car parking should be made a condition of consent to avoid undue congestion and obstruction of Graffham Common Road and access to the village.

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

There were none.

The meeting ended at 4.15 pm.

These minutes are an accurate record of the meeting.

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