

BARCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Applications Sub-Committee meeting held at the Sports Pavilion, Barcombe on Thursday 7th January 2010 at 7.00 p.m.

1506. Present: Cllrs C M Arbenz, A J MacGillivray, N C Lear, R Williams, D Skan, J C Cornwell and D J Lloyd.

1507. Apologies for absence: None received

1508. Declarations of Interest: Cllr A J MacGillivray declared a prejudicial interest over LW/09/1288

1509. Urgent Business pursuant to Standing Order No. 16: There was none.

1510. Planning applications received:

LW/09/1288 – Barcombe Cross House, School Hill – Section 73A Retrospective application for the retention of a conservatory and porch to east elevation, three storey extension to north elevation and enlarged attic rooms with roof alterations and erection of carport in grounds for Mr J Gray.

The applicant had objected to the description. It was agreed that the description was misleading. Only the carport was properly described as a “retention”. The other parts of the application are new works.

John Clarke, a neighbour from Grantham Bank, commented. He was concerned about the effect of the works being serviced from Grantham Bank, having experienced severe problems on an earlier occasion. Cllr A J MacGillivray tabled a two page comment and went through the points. He then withdrew while the matter was discussed. It was agreed that the PC’s should object or comment as follows:

- a. A condition should be imposed providing for building materials to be supplied via School Hill, not via Grantham Bank where large vehicles were likely to cause damage.
- b. As to the attic rooms:
 - a. Lewes District Council’s website records a “Second Floor Flat” as well as “Barcombe Cross House”. The application did not acknowledge this distinction. The situation needed clarification.
 - b. The application refers to enlargement of attic rooms but the drawings were unclear as to exactly what was proposed.
 - c. So far as it could be established what was intended, the flat roof treatment did not appear to befit the building. The PC objected unless further details were supplied.
- b. There was no objection to the conservatory proposal.
- c. The car port was wrongly situated in front of the building line and the PC objected to that. It was visible from School Hill. It should be resited further back. The PC noted, but did not agree with, the applicant’s comment about the building line.

1511. Close of meeting: There being no further business to discuss the Chairman closed the meeting at 7.15 p.m.