WHEPSTEAD PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Extraordinary Meeting**

**Of the Parish Council held on**

**Thursday 24th July at 7.30pm**

Attendees: Councillors G O’Dell-GO

M Morris-MM

S Durrant-SD

 R Murray-RM

 N Aitkens-NA

 E Nutt-EN

 Clerk D Rix-DR

 Members of the Public Mr & Mrs C Botting

 Dr J Allen

 Mrs D Stratford

 Mrs J Bradford

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1/125 | **Apologies**Cllr Andrew Maddever (work) |
| 2/1263/1274/128 | **Declarations of Interest**None**Public Forum** *(Cllr GO closed the meeting)*Mr Botting voiced concerns that the plans were only sketches. There were no dimensions of the property’s extension beyond the existing shop footprint into the patio area. He thought the property was very much under the trees and that up to four cars parked in front of the two properties would look bad and detract from the area. There was no precedent for cladding. Other neighbouring properties were of brick or rendered. There was no area identified for the foul treatment plant and it would be higher than neighbouring properties and the pond at the back. The original clause giving planning consent said that any property should be ancillary to No:1 Post Office House. Mrs Botting reiterated what Mr Botting had said. She was also concerned that tree roots would have to be excavated and the protected lime tree was no more than 6m from the new proposed dwelling and the trees had not reached full maturity. Dr Allen agreed with the Botting’s concerns and said overall he didn’t feel the proposed development was appropriate or big enough nor in keeping with the ethos of a conservation area. Mrs Stratford also agreed with previous speakers concerns adding that she felt in the village the density of the building didn’t seem appropriate and it could set a precedent elsewhere. Dr Allen added that his outbuilding was bigger than the proposed dwelling, but it wouldn’t be right to convert that. The applicant, Mrs Bradford, disagreed that the proposed dwelling was smaller than Mr Allen’s outbuilding. Regarding the fabric of the property, she said that all barns locally had boarding on them. She said that the building had been moved back on the advice of the arboriculturalist who also pointed out that none of the lime tree roots were in the sycamore tree stump area. Regarding insurance, she said that the foundations would be piled and she disagreed that the tree overhang and aphid stickiness that would come off it would be a problem. There would also be no windows on that side of the property. She said she was confused why the architect had put it in the application that there would be a foul drainage plant and that the sewage would be on the mains. **Planning Application DC/14/1128/FUL, The Old Post Office, Brockley Road**Cllr GO reopened the meeting. Cllr EN said that she had no problem with the look of the building. But it was an overdevelopment of a site in a conservation area. Cllr RM was very concerned by the trees and the overhang. Cllr NA said the property was most in keeping with what already exists and that any potential difficulties with the trees should be left to the experts. If they say it is acceptable, then Council should accept that. He welcomed new development in the village.Cllr SD said that apart from the trees he felt the site and the parking was inadequate for such a dwelling. Cllr MM agreed with Cllr SD and echoed Cllr NA’s points regarding new development. He also wanted to know more about where the foul sewage system would go, as there seemed no reason for it if the neighbouring properties were on mains sewage.At 7.50pm Cllr GO closed the meeting. Mrs Botting asked that if permission was granted and the plot sold with permission, then what was to stop someone developing the site further. Cllr GO said that an amendment would have to be applied for. Regarding the original planning permission ruling any dwelling should be ancillary to Post Office House, Cllr GO said that the inspectorate had since said it was an ideal infill site.He also said that nowhere in the plans was any mention of what sort of foundations would be laid. Mrs Bradford said they would be piled, but that would only appear in the building regulations.Cllr RM proposed and Cllr NA seconded that the Parish Council agree in broad terms to the application but with conditions regarding the foul drainage, the care of the trees and subject to the building regulations not affecting the trees. Councillors voted five to one in favour to accept the proposal. DR to report decision. The meeting closed at 8.05pmSigned………………………………………………………..Date………………… |