**KIRDFORD PARISH COUNCIL**

**Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held in the Village Hall, Kirdford on Monday, 8th June, 2015, commencing at 6.00 p.m.**

**Present**: Cllr. Mrs. J. Robertson (Chairman)

Cllr. Mr. I. Campbell

Cllr. Mr. J. Ransley

Cllr. Miss S. Pinder

1. **Apologies for Absence**. There were no apologies for absence.

2. **To Receive Declarations of Interest**. There were no declarations of interest from Members.

3. **To consider and comment upon the following Planning Applications** :-

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Application No.** | **Details of Application** | **Comments** |
| KD/15/01242/  ADV | Mr. Colin Wells, 2 Russett Place, Kirdford – 1 no. Oak totem signage. | There was no objection to this application; in fact the Parish Council supports this. |
| KD/15/01167/  ELD | Mr. Jon Measures, Birchlands, Glasshouse Lane, Kirdford – Dwelling. | The applicant had telephoned the Clerk and claimed that over 30 years ago he made an application to CDC for the building. The Clerk had tried to access the paperwork relating to this, but this is not readily available and the Parish Council await details.  Notes of conversation – ‘Mr. Measures had said that they had been spending time there ever since. The building was fully equipped and recently had had telephone and broadband installed as their intention had been to live there. However, his wife had become seriously ill with cancer. They decided they needed to produce wills and the solicitor suggested that they should regularize the situation with Birchlands. They live in the north of England, but had been coming to Kirdford for 32 years. Sadly they had now come to the decision that they should not move as he wants his wife to stay under the same hospital.  There is a drive to the building – this was built by Nigel Miller – it is clinker so that it drains and the grass has grown over it. They recently had a new metal roof installed (they had been to Norway and seen what they had over there and had the same put on).’  The Council Tax section of CDC had advised that Birchlands was not registered for Council Tax.  CDC Building Regulations section had checked their computer and other records and there had been no applications for building regulations for this property.  This building was now up for sale; therefore contact was made with the agent who advised that Birchlands was a prefab building, 1,400 sq. ft., containing kitchen, 3 bedrooms, bathroom, and utility room. Six photographs had been supplied.  The local postman who has been delivering on that round for 10 years says that he had never delivered anything to that address. Members of Council, including one that has served for 20 odd years and several others that had served for more than 10 years and residents of the parish have no knowledge of this property ever being there let along occupied on a regular basis. Such Members of Council are very aware of their responsibility to be open, honest and truthful.  Please advise whether it is considered that the nature of the development in its location is tantamount to someone purposely seeking to hide or disguise a building with a view to obtaining a planning permission by deceit.  From the evidence obtained by the Clerk (as above) the Council questions the definition of the term ‘continuous use’ as the applicant indicates they have only utilized the property from time to time on an occasional basis. It is acknowledged that evidence has been provided as to when the agricultural building was erected in 1983 and water and electric connected, but seen no evidence of when the supposed residential use commenced.  This Council is very conscious that there have been a number of attempts to attain retrospective use permissions without due process which the local planning authority has vigorously resisted, including such sites as Barkers Farm, Bridgefoot Meadows and Roundwyck Copse and this appears to be yet another similar example which the Council would ask the local planning authority to vigorously resist.  In the untenable circumstance that the District Council is minded to approve this, could this Council please have a conversation with the Officer, as it is considered that the District Council should seek to retrospectively obtain payment of the Council Tax that had not been paid over the period that is claimed the property has been occupied? Also, in the unlikely circumstance that permission is granted could you please advise whether it would be possible to put on a condition that prevents this property being expanded/enlarged which would be contrary to all current local policy?  It is strongly felt that it should be up to the applicant to prove that they have been living in this property for more than ten years rather than CDC trying to prove that they have not done so.  It is wondered whether the address is registered as a postal address. It does not come up in the Post Office postcode finder and the post code used in the application is for Gandersgate Farm.  Could CDC please advise whether it will check that a TV licence is held for this property or is that left to the Parish Council? This question is asked because in the sales pictures there are TVs in the premises.  Could CDC please advise the current provision for sewage disposal as reassurance is required that there is no negative environmental health impacts due to any lack of provision? |
| SDNP/15/  02629/LIS | Little Bignor Farm, A272 Wakestone Lane to Croucham Lane, Kirdford – Internal alterations to master bedroom to enlarge existing en-suite. | Provided that the Listed Building Officer is content that no damage is being caused to any of the historic elements to this property, the Parish Council would have No Objection. |

The Clerk was authorized to contact Birketts and ask for a quotation for reviewing the information on Birchlands and what the likely fee would be for advising the Council on this Certificate of Lawfulness on the basis of whether it was compliant with the legislation. This was **AGREED**.

4. **Update on Crouchlands** – WSCC Enforcement Committee had approved the recommendation that it should be CDC that took Enforcement Action. WSCC could only act on waste whereas CDC could act on waste and all other development so could bring it altogether. There were concerns that this could set a precedent and could happen across the County and the Chairman of the Committee endorsed that concern.

5. **To Note Planning Decisions received from Chichester District Council** :-

(a) SDNP/15/00402/HOUS: Lord Viscount Goschen, Scrubb House Farm, Crimbourne Lane, Kirdford – Erection of a two-storey side extension. **APPROVED**.

(b) KD/15/00526/FUL: Mr. R.J. Lywood, Marshalls Farm, Kirdford – A new cubicle building to accommodate milking dairy cows. **PERMIT**.

(c) KD/14/03541/FUL: Slifehurst Wood Farm, Scratching Lane, Kirdford – Barn extension for seasonal lambing and storage of agricultural machinery. Cllr. Mr. Ransley advised that he had spoken with the Officer in February requesting more information. This application went to Committee where he

had made representations but it was granted permission. Cllr. Mr. Ransley
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spoke with the Planning Officer who said a number of interesting things: Justification for need for barn was to look after sheep, but Cllr. Mr. Ransley had been told by local farmers that the land was only enough for 20 and the existing facilities were already enough, so he asked why they disagreed and why advice from the agricultural expert had not been sought. The answer was that they did not ask because it was going to cost £250. The man making the application did not own the land but says had notified the owner but actually there was no proof this happened. He raised the issue that if he was going to do this activity next to where the owner lived there was an environmental health risk so contrary to CDC policy. Cllr. Mr. Ransley challenged this decision through a solicitor in the gap between the decision being made and the decision notice being served. Two weeks later a letter was received advising they were going to re-visit the report and the decision notice was not being sent out. The matter was being referred back to Committee. There was a need for a Landscape Appraisal and one had not been done.

6. **Appeals and Decisions** : There were no Appeals.

7. **Enforcement**. There were no enforcement matters.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.10 p.m.

-4-