

**BARKHAM PARISH COUNCIL**  
Planning Committee

Page 09/671

**Minutes** of meeting of the Barkham Parish Council Planning Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> February 2009 in Barkham Village Hall at 7.30 p.m.

**Present:** Mr. F.A. Scott, (in the Chair), Mr. L. Heath, Mr. P. King and the Clerk.

**Apologies:** Mr. S. Goldring (work commitments)

09/241 **Minutes** of meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> January 2009 were approved and signed as a true record.

**09/242 Planning**

F/2009/0104	Meadowcroft, Wood Lane	Delegated
	Proposed change of use of barn to stables.	Opposed

Clerk to write to WBC opposing this application. The application states that the proposed three stables, grooming area and tack room will be used for full liveryes and will produce very limited traffic movements limited to occasional visits by owners. As in the previous application (F/2008/2159) the liveryes will generate more traffic in Wood Lane which is a by-way and unsuitable for the additional traffic from owners tending to their horses.

Paragraph 15 Existing Use "Land which is known to be contaminated", the applicant has ticked "No" when clearly this land is located next to Woodlands Farm, where scrap cars have been dismantled over many years and this land has been contaminated and is currently being investigated.

The site of Meadowcroft originally housed a mobile home, this was replaced with a large house when the applicant wished to keep ostriches, this business soon proved not to be viable. At the time of that application, the Parish Council questioned the viability of the enterprise and drew the planners' attention to the disparity between the size of the proposed house and the scale of the proposed business and it opposed that application on those grounds. Now the applicant wishes to keep liveryes. The Parish Council sees this as a continuation of the creeping development and is opposed to it on these grounds too.

The area adjoins The Coombes which is an Area of Special Landscape importance and any increase in development is unsuitable in this area.

F/2009/0132	26 The Vines	Delegated
	Proposed erection of two storey side extension and single storey rear extension to dwelling.	Opposed

This application is very similar to the earlier application (Proposed two storey side extension F/2008/2385).

Clerk to again write to WBC to suggest that the north elevation wall is lacking in any punctuation or ornament to break up the vast expanse of brickwork. The Parish Council feel that if this could be addressed it would visually improve the appearance of the property. Our previous comments have not been taken into account and the refusal reason on the previous application (F/2008/2385) would appear to be inappropriate, "By reason of the inadequate parking provision on site, the proposal is likely to result in on street parking to the detriment of highway safety". The existing parking arrangements of a driveway and garage have not been altered.

F/2009/0199	Pickwick, School Road	Proposed
	Proposed erection of detached single garage to rear of dwelling.	No Comment

Clerk to write to WBC pointing out these plans were not posted on the web site, hence making it difficult for councillors to view the application before attending the planning meeting.

F/2008/1156

8 Langley Common Road  
Proposed erection of two storey side extension  
and front rear and side extensions to roof space  
with dormer windows.

Granted At  
Appeal

Reason: The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the neighbouring residents at No. 6 with reference to visual intrusion and daylight levels. The proposed raising in height of the building would increase the length of the shadow cast towards No 6 during part of the afternoon. However, even in the earlier and later parts of the year when the sun is lower this would affect only a limited part of the garden and only one of a number of sources of natural light to one habitable room of No 6. The proposal would not appear overbearing from the rear of No 6 and the living conditions of the residents of No 6 would not be unacceptably diminished by the proposal.

Meeting closed at 8.00 p.m.