

**DRAFT GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE GRAFFHAM PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING**  
**HELD ON FRIDAY 16<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2020 AT 5.00pm, EMPIRE HALL, GRAFFHAM.**

**PRESENT:** Cllr. S. Macqueen (Chairman), Cllr. H. Charman, Cllr. P. Churchward and Cllr. S. Mackie  
**IN ATTENDANCE:** Three members of the public.  
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. J. Uphill.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were none.

3. **Public Questions.**

There were two members of public present, from the beginning of the meeting, one of whom was present for general interest and one of whom was present for Agenda Item 8, SDNP/20/04248/HOUS Apple Trees, Graffham Street, Graffham GUY28 ONS.

A third member of the public arrived at 5.12 also for Agenda Item 8, SDNP/20/04248/HOUS Apple Trees, Graffham Street, Graffham GUY28 ONS.

The Chairman, Cllr. Macqueen, re-ordered the agenda so that SDNP/20/04248/HOUS could be considered first.

4. **SDNP/20/04248/HOUS Apple Trees, Graffham Street, Graffham GU28 ONS**  
**Two single storey extensions, replacement of roof and cladding of property.**

The Chairman, Cllr. Macqueen, explained that a previous application for Apple Trees (SDNP/20/01860/HOUS) was considered at a GPC planning meeting held on 18 August (minute 4). GPC had submitted a Support response with no further comments but noted that the application had subsequently been withdrawn.

The Chairman explained that the application being considered today (SDNP/20/04248/HOUS) was a new proposal which stated that the already existing garage would remain in its current position (top right-hand corner of the drive) and would not be demolished and rebuilt in the bottom left hand side of the drive, closer to the road and on the northern boundary as was proposed in the previous application SDNP/20/01860/HOUS subsequently withdrawn. The Chairman noted that there would be some slight alterations to the internal lay out of the house. Given that the only significant alterations to the revised application were internal and that the garage was to remain in situ as per now, the Chairman stated that he felt the proposal was reasonable.

The Chairman noted that whilst GPC had supported the previous application, it had not fully considered the effect of the proposal on the immediate neighbours at Pound Cottage, who had subsequently raised a concern that the ridge height was to be raised some 1.6 metres in height. (GPC Meeting 18.09.20, minute 34). The neighbours' house was already built at a lower level, so any increase in height next door would be significant.

One of the members of public present, who lived in Pound Cottage next door, noted that the proposed ridge height in this proposal (20/04248/HOUS) was still the same as that in the previous proposal (20/01860/HOUS) and so would still affect them. The neighbour felt that the suggested internal alterations could be made, without the ridge line being raised 1.6 metres. Concern was raised that it might mean that in future, rooms in the roof might be built, with dormer windows which could overlook them. The Chairman pointed out that if the proposals in the current draft Planning White Paper were adopted by the Government, then it was likely that from next year, all single storey buildings could be allowed to build another storey, without a planning application being necessary but subject to building regulations.

The member of public was concerned that if the height of the property next door was increased, it would be overbearing, there would be a loss of light, and they might be overlooked. Also, there would be an increased roof surface area, leading to issues with water overflowing into their own land.

A third member of the public arrived at 5.12pm.

Discussion ensued with various points being raised: concern about having so much space above the ground floor, which could possibly be filled with rooms in the future; possible dormer windows in future; the proposed ridge height for a bungalow is "not in keeping"; one member pointing out that if a room were built in the space in the future it would be very small; one GPC Member noting two potential negatives: the possible detrimental effect on the neighbours and the view of the house from the road (perceived negatively) with the proposed increase in the ridge height, not actually giving any demonstrable benefit to the application.

Following robust debate, the Chairman announced as he had been involved with the previous Support response he would stand down from the response to this application, stating that Councillors Charman, Churchward and Mackie would decide the response.

It was decided by Cllrs. Charman, Churchward and Mackie that the Clerk be instructed to issue the following response: "The majority of Graffham Parish Council members support this application but strictly on the basis that the height of the existing ridge line is maintained and is not increased in line with this proposal"

**Action: Clerk**

The three members of the public remained for the rest of the meeting.

The meeting was re-ordered to consider the remaining applications.

5. **SDNP/20/04173/TPO Brook Cottage, Graffham Common Road, Graffham GU28 0PY**  
**Remove 3 no. lowest branches on south sector and reduce width by approx. 2m on east/south-east sector on 1 no. Oak tree T1, subject to G/84/00542/TPO.**

The Chairman noted that a site visit had not taken place but that the trees were within the curtilage of the property.

Following a recommendation from the Chairman, it was **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that **NO RESPONSE** would be submitted.

6. **SDNP/20/02990/TPO Gallows Hill House, Graffham Common Road, GU28 0PT**  
**Reduce north sector by 2m and reduce (fade) east and west sectors by 1m on 1 no. Beech tree (quoted as T4) within Group, G1, subject to G/91/00544/TPO. Reduce north to north east sectors by up to 2m and deadwood on 3 no. Sweet Chestnut trees (TPOd no. T17, T15, and T12 and 1 no. Beech tree (TPOd no. T14) quoted as G1 subject to G/91/00544/TPO.**

The Chairman noted that a site visit had not taken place but the trees were within the curtilage of the property.

Following a recommendation from the Chairman, it was **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that **NO RESPONSE** would be submitted.

7. **SDNP/20/03869/FUL Tagents Barn, Dirty Lane, Graffham GU28 0NL**  
**Use of Tagents Barn as an unrestricted dwelling house.**

The Chairman explained that there was a current restriction on the property for use as holiday lets. The applicant had requested, and had seen, the Chairman to explain the application. It was noted that some minor profit had been made in holiday lets over the past 12 years, but not a substantial amount. The property had an extraordinary internal lay out, having two open mezzanine style bedrooms, one at each end of an open central core, full height living room. The applicant now wished for the house to have an unrestricted use as a dwelling house.

Following a recommendation from the Chairman, it was **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that the Clerk be instructed to issue a **SUPPORT** response with no further comments.

Continues....

8. **SDNP/20/03689/LIS Minne Cottage, Graffham Street, Graffham GU28 0NL**  
**Proposed enlargement of existing first floor extension and alteration to its windows. Replacement of an existing conservatory with flat roof and rooflight. New pitched roof over existing flat roof entrance porch. Re-cladding existing dorms and gables. Replacement of existing roof terrace balustrade.**

The Chairman noted that this was a Listed application and not a Full application and was actually only listed as it adjoins a listed property. It was noted that there were some issues with the property, in that, works completed by a previous owner had contravened planning rules relating to listed properties.

Following a recommendation from the Chairman, it was **UNANIMOUSLY RESOLVED** that the Clerk be instructed to issue a **SUPPORT** response with no further comments.

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

There were none.

These minutes are an accurate record of the meeting.

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