**HOLCOMBE ROGUS PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee**

**Held on Thursday 9th January 2020**

**At 7.30pm in the Memorial Hall**

**APPROVED**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.1** | **Present:**Councillors: John Butler (Chairman), Nikki Orchard, Adam Pilgrim, Mick Mathews, Tom Critchley and Guy Orchard Leslie Findlay- Parish Clerk One resident  |  |
| **1.2** | **Apologies:** Apologies received from Councillors Rupert Snook and Pete Davis |  |
| **1.3** | **Conflicts of Interest:** None declared |  |
| **1.4****1.4.1****1.4.2****1.5** | The Council discussed the following applications:**19/01995/FULL** Erection of holiday let following demolition of outbuilding at Ford Farm. *Councillors did not object to this application but had the following comments to make:*1. *On the basis that the proposed development is in accordance with current planning policy and the forthcoming local Plan review proposals, HRPC has no objection in principle to the proposed development.*
2. *Given the proximity of the development site to two listed buildings appropriate materials should be used in the development of the new building and in particular it is suggested that slate roof tiles are used as opposed to the material suggested in the planning application.*
3. *A condition should be imposed to ensure that the new building is used only for holiday lettings with a maximum stay period for any letting to a hirer of say four weeks.*
4. *A section 106 contribution to the Holcombe Rogus play area refurbishment should be required as part of this application.*

**19/02013/FULL** Erection of dwelling and demolition of agricultural building at Wardmoor. *Councillors strongly objected to this application and raised the following objections:**1. First HRPC has been informed that local residents, who would be most likely to be concerned about this application, received no notice of the application from MDDC. Moreover, the location of the development site is mis-described as ‘Wardmoor’. The proposed development site is not part of the house and grounds known as ‘Wardmoor’. In the circumstances HRPC suggest that MDDC give written notice to all local residents and give extra time for consideration of the proposals and to seek professional advice, if required.* *2. HRPC has had sight of the objections submitted to MDDC by Andrew Wyatt, Frances Freeman and Dr Caroline Harvey and fully support the views expressed in those objections.**3 The applicant’s Planning Design and Access Statement submitted with this application relies upon the so-called ‘Class Q fallback position’ based upon the Mansell v Tonbidge and Malling BC case in 2017. This case indicates that Class Q permitted development rights may be taken into account as a fallback position on the basis that it is a material planning consideration.**4. This case is not, in HRPC’s opinion, authority for permitting a new dwelling in the open countryside which is, in terms of siting, scale, design and appearance generally, wholly inappropriate to this very special rural setting.**5. The proposed development does not accord with MDDC ‘s Development Plan (in particular Policy DM2) or the Local Plan Review proposals. See in particular further details given in the submitted objections to the proposed development. Moreover, Chapter 12 of the revised NPPF (paragraph 127) referred to in the applicant’s Planning Design and Access Statement says that planning decisions should ensure that developments will add to the overall quality of the area and are sympathetic to the local character and history including surrounding built environment and landscape setting. In HRPC’s opinion the proposed development does not meet these criteria.* *6. HRPC does not agree that the proposed development is an appropriate form of development in this location. The Mansell case does not sanction non-compliance with both national and local planning policy which are the primary material considerations in this case.**7 if the relevant planning officer of MDDC is minded to approve this application, HRPC ask that the application is called in for consideration by the Planning Committee.**8. Without prejudice to the submissions made in this letter if ultimately MDDC determine to grant planning permission, conditions should be imposed or a Section 106 agreement entered into relating to the following matters:** *The removal of the existing barn upon completion of the new development.*
* *The imposition of restrictions on lighting- see the objection letter received from Frances Freeman.*
* *Reservation for subsequent approval external materials.*
* *Imposition of a restriction on the height of the building to an acceptable level.*
* *To the extent permissible impose a restriction on the construction of further barns under permitted development rights on any part of the applicant’s landholding.*
* *Additionally, there would need to be a section 106 Agreement securing a contribution to the Holcombe Rogus play area refurbishment.*

Council were informed that the application 19/01507/OUT Outline for the erection of a dwelling and formation of access at 48 Twitchen was to be discussed by the Planning Committee MDDC on the 15th January 2020. It was agreed that HRPC should be represented by either Councillor Pilgrim or Councillor Butler.In addition, further photographs showing a recent flood on the road beside 48 Twitchen were submitted to HRPC and Clerk requested to forward to MDDC as part of the Councils submission. | **LF** |
|  | There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.00pm. |  |
|  | Signed by:John H ButlerChairman \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |  |