

# STEDHAM WITH IPING PARISH COUNCIL

Chairman: Lucy Petrie  
Clerk: Jane Crawford  
email: [clerk@stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk)  
website: <http://www.stedhamwithiping-pc.gov.uk/>

---

MINUTES: Meeting of Stedham with Iping Parish Council Planning Committee  
No 1/3 (15-19)

Held on: Thursday 22 June 2017 at 6.45 pm  
At: Stedham Memorial Hall

Present: John Wheelhouse (Planning Chairman)  
Debra Chalton Elizabeth Griffiths  
Eddie Lintott Lucy Petrie

In attendance: 13 parishioners

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations are in force, giving a right to members of the public to record (film, photograph and audio-record) and report on proceedings at meeting of the Council and its Committees.

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS:** Eddie Lintott item 4 Land north of Sorrels and 8 Sawmills site.
2. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:** Olia Mitskevich and Martin Perry.
3. **MINUTES OF MEETINGS:** **No 1/3(15-19) held on 17 May 2017** were agreed and signed.

#### 4. APPLICATIONS:

**SDNP/17/02420/HOUS – Russetts The Alley** - Proposed front dormer window. The applicants had asked for guidance from the planners as to what would be acceptable and the current plan was the result of the feedback. The proposed new window matched the size of the other windows and did not protrude beyond the building line. There had been three letters of support from neighbours.

**SIPC: Support.** Proposed by LP, seconded by EL, with all in favour.

**SDNP/17/02494/HOUS and SDNP/17/02495/LIS – Tentworth House** - Proposed rear windows, roof lights, internal works and flue for wood burner.

Two members had made a site visit. The applicant had explained that the changes were for an extra recreational room with small kitchenette. The old garage doors were rotten and being replaced. They were purely decorative covering an internal wall.

The velux windows in the roof would not be seen.

**SIPC: Support.** Proposed by DC, seconded by LP, with all in favour.

**SDNP/17/02601/FUL – Bowley Barn Iping** - Change use of land to domestic curtilage to accommodate the construction of a detached garage and store building, for secure storage of cars and garden machinery.

Site visits had been made by 4 councillors.

SIPC comments:

- The proposed two storey building would have quite an impact.
- It was 5.5m high.
- Did not feel there was a proper explanation of need.

- The planners had been very strict on the previous applications and did not want over-development of the site.
- The second storey was over-development and there was no sufficient reason given for it.
- Permission was not granted for it originally.

A parishioner pointed out that there was a lot of land to maintain.

**SIPC: Objections.** Proposed by JW, seconded by EG, with all against the application.

**SDNP/17/02794/FUL - Land North of The Sorrells School Lane** - Erection of a single detached dwelling together with associated works. EL left the meeting.

The site would be excavated to lower the land and hip ends to the roof would minimise the bulk.

Comments from neighbours:

- The design was more sympathetic.
- The drive of the site would be problematic with poor visibility of the highway.
- The parking area was only 7 x 6 m. How would 3 cars fit? Even if there were 2 parked, there would be no room to manoeuvre and they would either need to back in from the highway or back out of the site onto the highway which was dangerous as people regularly broke the speed limit.
- Describing the land as overgrown scrub was misleading as it had been a well-attended vegetable garden of a neighbour until he was told to quit the land.
- The applicant had omitted to mention in the application form that there was a 67' high willow trees adjacent to the site which might be damaged when the site was excavated.
- The site was too small. The house would be only 10-12' from the highway and 3' from the rear boundary. The applicant said the rear boundary was 7' from the house.
- There were no windows facing south upstairs, but the ground floor windows would over-look the adjacent property. The existing shrubbery would not overcome this.
- The house to the south of the site would no longer be on School Lane because it would be behind the proposed dwelling which would be undesirable.
- The ecological report said there were no badgers on the site or adjacent gardens, but badgers had been causing a nuisance to all neighbouring properties and there was a badger excavation in the corner of the site.
- As the main drain ran to the south of all the houses, it would be difficult to get the house on to the mains. The applicant had been warned about this previously.
- The house would be overbearing and houses on the north side of School Lane would have a lack of privacy.
- The 2 storey house so close to road was causing a lot of concern because of the height.

SIPC comments:

- It would spoil the street scene.
- A major aspect was the privacy of the houses both at the front and back. If it was a bungalow, it would not be so bad.
- The proposal was far too big for the plot.

JW read out the Inspector's decision in an unsuccessful appeal: "In my conclusion the site is too restricted in size and too prominently located to accommodate a development of the type proposed in an acceptable manner without being the cause of material harm to the character and appearance of this attractive semi-rural location and adjoining property."

This was still the case.

**SIPC: Objections:** Proposed by JW, seconded by DC, with all against.

5. **SDNPA DECISIONS:**

**SDNP/17/00962/HOUS – Brook Farm Ingrams Green** – Erection of single storey attached cedar frame greenhouse. **SDNPA: Approved**

6. **DECISIONS AWAITED**

**SDNP/13/06169/ROMP - Minsted Sandpit** - Periodic review of minerals planning permission.

7. **ENFORCEMENT**

**SDNP/16/00628/LB - St Cuthmans site** – Unauthorised partial demolition of the old classroom block. No report.

**SDNP/16/00120/COU Minsted Heath Barn (Poultry Farm)** – Use of land as storage for cars & caravans. The Clerk had contacted CDC enforcement, but the officer was away.

**SDNP/16/00042/OPDEV - St Cuthmans School** - Lighting. No report.

**SDNP/15/00109/OPEV - Land south of Old Stables, Mill Lane** - Without planning permission, formation of a hard-surfaced access track in the approximate position shown on the plan. No report.

8. **MIDHURST COMMUNITY LAND TRUST**

Gordon McAra was invited to explain how SIPC could be involved in the initiative.

The Government was trying to encourage building affordable homes for local people and to this end had given CDC £1.4 million to encourage CLTs to do this.

The CLT could either build the houses or get the housing association to do it on its behalf. It was the CLT's discretion who could live there and the houses could not be sold.

The key was the land and to obtain it at a low price. Agricultural land sold at £8 - £10,000 an acre, but with building consent 10 times more. This was why housing was so expensive with an average price being £420,000 and average salary being £25,000 ie cost was 21 x salary.

The solution was CLTs or council housing. Affordable housing rents were 80% of market rent and social housing 50%.

Midhurst CLT had been set up and was in the process of applying for charitable status. They wanted to work with Easebourne, Stedham, Cocking, Bepton and West Lavington.

They had potentially two plots of land on offer to be purchased at agricultural rates and planned to build sensitively designed houses which would be based on local wood.

SIPC comments:

Problem was funds for start-up as the costs would be high and rents relatively low.

Also a problem with cost of maintaining the properties and the grounds.

GM: The tenants would be carefully chosen with local connections and would have an obligation keep the site tidy themselves. MCLT would have complete control over tenants and could also provide housing for local key workers. The SDNPA was also interested and could use CIL money to for doing the same thing.

The trouble with the housing associations was they tended to act like private companies although they were basically non-profit making. They were also prone to being taken over e.g. the original Hyde Martlet HA after several takeovers was now under the ownership of a London based company which was completely unresponsive to local people.

SIPC could take the lead with its own Trust, but it would take a lot of time and energy. GM expected that if there was interest from SIPC could join with MCLT with a local director, but it would still have to be discussed to see how it could be done. There was flexibility and choice if SIPC wanted to be more involved.

The Chairman thought currently that SIPC would support and endorse MCLT and wished to be kept informed of developments. A report would be made to the next SIPC meeting and the response formalised.

**9. SDNPA LOCAL PLAN – Sawmills site – JW reported on the SDNPA planning meeting.**

There had been support from the Deputy Chairman of the SDNPA Planning Committee for the SIPC view that the site was unsuitable on the grounds that it would be difficult for it to be integrated into the village. Officers were reluctant to withdraw sites because there were no suitable alternatives. The number of units proposed had been reduced from 36 to 18 on a mixed use site.

The Sawmills site was not ideal because of its diagonal division between owners which meant there were points of land that would be unusable.

The Chairman of the SDNPA Planning Committee said that in the absence of any alternative proposals for sites within the parish, the Sawmills site should remain in the settlement list. However, this would not prevent SIPC from putting forward alternatives during the consultation period or to the Public Inquiry. The Director of Planning said that if SIPC wished to press forward with a Neighbourhood Plan, the officers would be pleased to help.

LP: There were quite a few farms and settlements which could be used for small developments. The difficulty was that once the land got published, developers would move in.

It was noted that 50% of live/work units could be successful.

A neighbour of the site expressed concern that the track to her garage which was also a footpath was the only way from the site into the village.

It was pointed out that any flooding on the site came down through the fields to join with the village surface water drainage system.

SIPC was meeting with SDNPA planning officers at the Sawmills site the following day.

**9. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

LP was keen to see if it would be feasible to have a neighbourhood plan which would mean SIPC could make alternative proposals for housing.

The Clerk was asked to contact MD to see if he would be interested in an initial meeting.

- 10. CORRESPONDENCE/emails.** Shona Archer of CDC Enforcement had written an explanation of how enforcement worked. Woolbeding had made two suggestions which seemed sensible. The Clerk was asked to respond to CDC asking them to publish planning enforcement on the SDNPA website.

**11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING: To be arranged when there is an application**

**CONCLUSION: 8.10**

**CHAIRMAN..... DATE.....**