



Meeting by 'Zoom' video conferencing due to ongoing Covid-19 pandemic.

Councillors in attendance: Chairman: Zoe Maclehose (ZM), Laura Craven (LC), Elena McCloskey (EM), Gerard McCloskey (GM) and Mairi Rennie (MR).

Clerk: Debbie Harknett

There were nine members of the public in attendance.

Meeting started at 6.30pm.

Chairman: Zoe Maclehose

www.rogateparishcouncil.gov.uk

Clerk: Debbie Harknett

zoemaclehose@rogateparishcouncil.gov.uk

clerk@rogateparishcouncil.gov.uk

- 1) **It was noted the meeting would not be recorded.**
- 2) **There were no apologies for absence received from councillors.**
- 3) **There were no declarations of interest.**
- 4) **The minutes of the last meeting held on 9th March 2021 were approved as a true record for signing.**
- 5) **Representations from the public:** to be heard in association with the relevant application.

6) Planning applications –

Case No:	SDNP/21/01385/FUL	Comments closing:	13 April 2021
Officer:	Charlotte Cranmer	Applicant:	Mr K. Burke
Location:	Parrotts, Fyning Lane, Rogate GU31 5DJ		
Proposal:	Replacement dwelling after demolition of existing structures & including associated site works.		

Representation from the public

- a) A MOP noted that whilst there is a reduction in the overall height of the proposed building the new application does little to appease the visual impact of it. There has been extensive tree cutting and the site overlooks adjacent properties, the scale exceeds the existing and is not in compliance with SDNP planning policy. Proposed platforms and extensive glazing are unnecessary and will both overlook and be seen.
- b) The MOP noted he was disappointed 4 PC members went around the property with the architect able to sell the plan while the neighbours were not afforded an equal opportunity to provide a balance view.
- c) ZM noted three members attended the site visit to better understand what was there and the plot while understanding the plans which would not normally involve neighbours.
- d) Another MOP echoed the previous comments and invited the PC to see the site from their property. He considered the application to have eco/green washing which was against the trees/shrubs that have been cut down. He was concerned about the balcony and large amount of glass which would result in the southern boundary being overlooked and interlooked resulting in a loss of privacy in their garden and on their second floor. He noted the height of the property was equivalent to the 6th floor of a block of flats and the amount of internal lighting from the vast array of doors/windows would look like a lighthouse and lose their view of the northern night sky. The position has been moved towards the southern boundary, approx. 7m from the old sandpit cliff edge (which is slowly moving) and he was concerned about water seepage through the sand making fundamental changes to the water table causing problems to existing building structures so called for an independent survey prior to any permission being granted.
- e) Another MOP added the view from east/west orientation is fabulous whereas the southern view is overlooked. If the property orientation was amended to make better use of these views it would also reduce the overlooking/loss of privacy.

Council discussion

- f) ZM noted the site is going to be developed with a property built in place of the old bungalow and the applicant has said they will not be removing any more trees.
- g) After much discussion and in consideration of the comments raised it was agreed to arrange a further site visit to consider the new application and neighbours' concerns.

3 members of the public left with thanks.

Comments submitted following site visit:

The Council understand the site needs to be redeveloped and the garden managed. While the original design/concept was liked they understood the problems with the height of the proposed building.

- *The new design incorporates many large windows on two floors which are likely to be a source of light pollution contra to SDNP dark skies policy SD8.*
- *These windows, together with the addition of balconies, overlook the neighbouring properties which is an intrusion resulting in a loss of privacy.*
- *Because of the conversion from bungalow to a two-storey dwelling the visual intrusion into the landscape is greater, especially as any owner would wish to clear parts of the garden that have become overgrown.*
- *An obvious compromise, endorsed by all the neighbours, would be to re-orientate the house so that it faces west over the top of the access drive and towards Butser Hill. This would deal with most of the overlooking problems, especially if the south facing side had fewer windows.*
- *Some large trees should be retained for screening and to help absorb rainwater runoff.*
- *Appropriate drainage should be installed at the north side of the property to allow any dispersal well above the slope on the southern side. The slop and any further erosion is of its of particular concern to the houses that sit below it.*
- *We note the paved area/drive are to be constructed with porous materials to help with drainage.*

The council would object to this application based on the current plans for the reasons given above but hope to see revised plans to take into account ours and neighbours comments.

Case No:	SDNP/21/00910/FUL	Comments closing:	6 April 2021
Officer:	Rebecca Perris	Applicant:	Tickle
Location:	Land to North West of London Road, Hill Brow GU33 7PB		
Proposal:	1 no. dwelling with associated work and extension of driveway.		

Representation from the public

- h) A MOP noted permission has been sought before without success. The area was originally woodland with a nice hedge separating the plot from the road, visiting wildlife and a hedgerow along the driveway access road which feeds 4 houses. The site was cleared prior to permission being sought and a fence (firstly metal then boarded) erected which prevents two cars passing in the lane. With trees being chopped down properties are now exposed. He considered the site to be an eyesore and that the applicant hasn't consulted with neighbours. He felt the design was not unique and that the land is not building land but a woodland that is outside the development plan.
- i) Another MOP addressed the meeting on behalf of three properties in the vicinity who all strongly object to the application which he felt was at odds to the policies of the SDNP and an over-urbanisation and eyesore in the area. It is not a place for development; there is no existing building on site, the proposal is not an 'exceptional house' and the green roof does not make it eco. He noted pre-application advice strongly discouraged an application. The roof terraces would have an impact on neighbouring properties and expressed concern solar panels would require the removal of further trees to ensure they are able to operate properly.
- j) The applicant explained he has been in discussion with the Tree Officer who has no concerns. The land was neglected and the bramble/shrubs removed (laurel and rhododendron) are considered non-native, invasive species. He has re-planted the front hedge with native hornbeam and plans to plant a second hedge to soften the fence line. The driveway is part of their property and he replaced the Harris metal fencing with boarded fencing at the request of a neighbour. There has been a full ecological survey of the site which found no animal welfare issues and no special trees. The proposal is for a sustainable/passive house with a very low carbon footprint. The green roof will be planted, not just with sedum. He hopes to build a sustainable property to fit the need of his family that meets the SDNP ethos of sustainability/ecology/carbon neutral development and to show what can be built without destroying the future.
- k) The architect explained the fall of the site which allows the building to be built with one storey below the road line. The planting would flow from the existing landscape onto the dwelling which would be built within the hidden triangle of the land. They have given the proposal a lot of consideration to produce a building with the environment/landscape led approach that the SDNP seek. Glazing has been kept to a minimum in respect of the SDNP dark skies.

Council discussion

- l) There was much discussion and comments about the limitations of a greenfield site, purchase of a site without planning permission and taking a chance of obtaining; being outside of our NP; whether or not the property could be considered 'exceptional'.
- m) It was agreed to hold a site visit to look at the site and how proposals fit within the landscape and consider the effect on neighbouring properties.

6 members of the public left with thanks.

<i>The council have visited the site and met separately with the applicant and neighbours. Having considered the application the council are undecided about this development.</i>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>The proposed site is not an allocated development site within Rogate & Rake Neighbourhood Plan so could only be considered for approval as an 'exceptional' property under policy H2: Residential Development in the open countryside.</i> ▪ <i>There is concern about overdevelopment of the area and loss of green space.</i> ▪ <i>If permission were to be granted there is concern about setting a precedent with further infill in the locality which the council would not support.</i> ▪ <i>However, the site appears to be an obvious plot for development with properties and recent development changes around it.</i> ▪ <i>The council can see the merits of the applicant's intention to build a passive house and appreciate the flow of the proposed building down from the road.</i> ▪ <i>The second floor/roof balcony at the rear of the property was considered an intrusive addition that shouldn't be permitted.</i> ▪ <i>While the use of solar panels is applauded there is concern they may be unable to gain enough strength from the sun without the removal of additional trees, now or in the future.</i> ▪ <i>There is also concern about the maintenance of the 'grass roof' and how it will be looked after to ensure it grows and remains as shown in the plans.</i> ▪ <i>Should permission be granted it is important materials used are high quality and sustainable (where possible) to reflect an 'exceptional passive/ecological' house with high regard for nature and the woodland environment of the site.</i> ▪ <i>The parking area should not be constructed of concrete, tarmac or any other solid surface.</i> 	

Case No:	SDNP/21/01024/CND	Comments closing:	30 March 2021
Officer:	Rebecca Perris	Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Jobson
Location:	Drover Cottage, Rogate, Road Hill Brow GU33 7QP		
Proposal:	Erection of oak framed garage to replace existing garage and shed. Variation of condition 2 to permission SDNP/20/04970/HOUS - Replace plans.		
Comments:	<i>The Council had no objections to new design and understand the need for home working due to the Covid-19 pandemic. They note the addition of a 'conservation Velux' and wish to ensure it is considered in regards to the SDNP Dark Skies policy SD8.</i>		

Case No:	SDNP/21/01073/TCA	Comments closing:	6 April 2021
Officer:	Henry Whitby	Applicant:	Mr R. Grey
Location:	Pond House, North Street, Rogate GU31 5HG		
Proposal:	Notification of intention to pollard at the previous reduction points 1 no. Weeping Willow tree (T1). Reduce lateral branches on the northern and southern sector by up to 2.5m and crown raise by up to 6m on 1 no. Beech tree (T2). To fell 1 no. Conifer tree (T3) and to crown thin by 20% on 1 no. Apple tree (T4).		
Comments:	<i>The Council had no objections to this application.</i>		

Case No:	SDNP/21/01353/LIS	Comments closing:	14 April 2021
Officer:	Rebecca Perris	Applicant:	Dr. C. Sinclair
Location:	Laundry Cottage, Nyewood Road, Rogate GU31 5HS		
Proposal:	Installation of an air source heat pump to replace old oil central heating boiler, along with all necessary related plumbing changes (new ASHP matched hot water cylinder and radiators) to complete the works		
Comments:	<i>The Council had no objections to this application.</i>		

Case No:	SDNP/21/01199/HOUS	Comments closing:	16 April 2021
Officer:	Rebecca Perris	Applicant:	Strike
Location:	2 Terwick Cottage, Terwick Lane, Rogate GU31 5EG		
Proposal:	Replacement of existing outbuildings with a garden office/gym/bike store.		
Comments:	<i>The Council had no objections to this application.</i>		

Case No:	SDNP/21/00981/FUL	Comments closing:	16 April 2021
Officer:	Derek Price	Applicant:	Mr N Heather
Location:	Fir Trees (previously Zurs), London Road, Hill Brow GU33 7PB		
Proposal:	Conversion of 3 no. outbuildings to form separate dwellings; main building to be retained as a dwelling, all for adults with learning disabilities (Class C3(b)).		
Discussion:	There was much discussion about the application and difference in the class categories and how they may affect future development and management of the site. It was felt the application didn't provide reason or rationale for the wanting to change and the committee were unclear of the impact. Agreed to seek clarification from the applicant of their reasons and investigate the difference between the classes.		
Comments submitted:	The council are concerned about the long-term impacts a change of class category will have to the site. Therefore, without clear and simple justification for the change they are unable to support this application.		

7) The next **Planning Committee Meeting** is scheduled to be held at **6.00pm on Tuesday 13th April 2021** via 'Zoom' video conferencing.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.14pm.

.....
Chairman

.....
Date