

## **MINUTES OF THE KINGSDON PLANNING MEETING HELD ON Thursday 28<sup>th</sup> July 2016 IN THE VALLAGE HALL, 7.30pm**

**Present:** Mr B.Paine (Vice-Chairman), Mr Wally Elliott, Mr. Ian Dibben, Mr P. Waters, Mr. G Osborne and Mrs S Mackay (Parish Councillors), Mrs K Hatt and 5 parishioners.

**1. Apologies:** Mr D.Beswick

**2. Declarations of Interest:** None received of any difference to those already submitted.

### **3. Previous minutes**

The minutes of the last planning meeting were read, approved and signed. This was proposed by W.Elliott, seconded by G.Osbourne, all were in favour.

### **4. Planning approvals**

The following planning permissions were received:  
None

### **5. Planning applications**

Mr B.Paine commented to set the context that it is neither helpful to the parish council, nor conducive to community spirit to find applications have been formally submitted to SSDC, without prior consultation, with neighbours.

Likewise although drawings may have elements not subject to specific planning consent, undue artistic license can create unnecessary concern to neighbours about the scope, noise and dust that the work will involve. Also inaccuracies and missing dimensions undermine the integrity of the application and can cause unnecessary confusion and distress to the neighbours.

To consider the application: 16/02877/Ful, proposed summerhouse and garden store, Lattice Cottage, Mr and Mrs Lockhart.

Kingsdon Parish Council have received some correspondence regarding this application:

A received a letter of support, which has been read by councillors.

A letter from a parishioner stated that they will be objecting. The suggested scale and position is inconsiderate to them as neighbours, their garden will lose its open countryside feel due to size and height of structure, which could also devalue property. It will visually overcrowd the house and give an appearance that it is no longer detached.

There has been inconsistent information on what the new building will be used for – summer house, writers annex, office.

The proposed outbuilding crosses over their boundary wall. They have received documentation from their solicitor which shows themselves as the boundary wall owner. They also built the wall themselves.

Also, having looked at a property development website, they have downloaded a document that says that any building which is over two and a half meters high should be at least two meters away from the boundary wall. There seems to be a lack of understanding about what can be done, either from the applicant or the architect.

A further letter has been received objecting. It's hard to see on the plans but the out building looks to be going to be attached to her barn wall; surely permission needs to be asked for this. She would also need to be able to get to that side for maintenance, if it is damaged who will be responsible.

Another parishioner has submitted his objections directly to the planning officer. It appears the architect has done a tardy job.

His property sits immediately behind the garden, the summer house is not in keeping with the local appearance, and will generally increase the overall building structures,

Is it going to be used as a place of work rather than a summerhouse?

Anything built there at all would have immense impact upon the tiny garden that they have.

Councillor comments:

Who owns the wall is missing from the plans, the height is not on the drawing which the councillors have seen, which creates a problem.

There is ambiguity about what we are reviewing on the build.

The applicant will also need separate planning permission to remove branches from the tree as it is in a conservation area.

The whole thing seems to need to go back to the drawing board. It needs clear dimensions, the items which the applicant is no longer considering need to be removed from the plans, the guidance on distance from boundary wall needs to be looked at, and the issue of the boundary wall needs to be resolved.

The plans as they currently are presented are not acceptable.

If a listed building cannot have buildings added which are more than 50% of the original building floor plan; there is already a sizable extension here so does adding a summerhouse take this over 50%?

Another email has been received today from Mr Lockhart today talking about different pitches that the summerhouse may be which will of course affect the height.

The planning officer will be making the final decision, we can only give our advice and comments and we will be asking for clarifications. Parishioners objections must be written directly to SSDC as well.

As proposed at the moment KPC will not sanction it.

**ACTION: K Hatt to email the planning inspector the decision, after circulating to councillors.**

**Meeting closed at 8.02pm.**