



Minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee Meeting of Bury Parish Council (BPC) held on Monday 6th January 2020 at the Bury Village Hall commencing 6:30pm

Mike Simpson, Clerk to Bury Parish Council, Bury Village Hall, The Street, Bury, West Sussex, RH20 1PA
Email – clerkburyparishcouncil@gmail.com

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

Councillors in attendance: Ed Rowsell (Chairman), Chris Daykin and Paul Whyles
Apologies: Councillor Katka Marconi due to a prior engagement
Also in attendance Mike Simpson, Clerk to the Council

2. Public Session (Members of the Public may speak for up to five minutes at the discretion of the Chair).
No members of public wished to speak

3. To Receive Declarations of Interest, Notification of Changes to Members' Interests and consider any requests for a dispensation.

The Chairman informed the Committee that he had moved away recently from the Parish but still owned a property.

4. Minutes from the meeting on 11th December 2019

Members **AGREED** that the minutes from the previous meeting held on 11th December were a fair and accurate record

5. Planning Applications

SDNP/19/05674/TCA: White Webbs Cottage Church Lane Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1PB
Proposal: Notification of intention to fell 1 no. Yew tree.

After consideration members **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application

SDNP/19/05820/TCA: Old Cottage West The Street Bury RH20 1PF

Proposal: Notification of intention to crown lift by 3m by pruning 2 no. lowest limbs on the east side of 1 no. Mature Sycamore tree (T1). Fell 5 no. Leylandi trees

After consideration members **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application

SDNP/19/05853/OHL: The Lodge Bury Common Bury Pulborough West Sussex RH20 1NP

Proposal: Erection of 1 no. free standing wooden electricity pole to serve a single customer.

After consideration members **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application

SDNP/19/05793/FUL: The Farmhouse The Street Bury RH20 1PA

Proposal: Demolition and replacement of dwelling, with extension of garage and construction of garden sheds and landscape design. (Retrospective)

Members **RESOLVED** to object to this application on the following grounds:

The demolition of the historic core of a landmark building within Bury, despite previously granted planning permission (upon appeal) for a redevelopment only on the basis that that historic core was preserved and despite numerous written objections during the course of a long and complicated planning process in which the parish council and local residents pointed out the historic significance of Prattenden's Farmhouse, now lost.

However, inexplicably, the current application seems to make little or no reference to the demolition and certainly offers no explanation as to why it was carried out, without, we can only presume, reference to the planning authorities.

It has long been the parish council's view that during the course of this lengthy planning process, the

application appeared to minimise the historic significance of Prattenden's Farmhouse. Even the renaming of Prattenden's Farmhouse to The Farmhouse in our opinion can be seen to have the effect of distancing the property from its historic importance. However the facts still resonate.

Prattenden's Farmhouse was one of a handful of significant historic homes within the parish named after the families whose contribution to the heritage of the parish should not be obliterated. It is worth noting that Prattenden's Farmhouse (now gone in every sense) is the only private property within the heart of Bury specifically named on Ordnance Survey maps both historically and still today.

The historic farmhouse stood beside The Coffin Trail, one of Bury Parish's Heritage Assets. Indeed, for centuries it would have been the first village landmark encountered by those bringing the deceased for burial from West Burton to Bury church.

In her seminal 1948 work on the history of the village All About Bury, Lillian E. Brown wrote of the Coffin Trail: 'The "right" to carry a corpse across the fields from Westburton and thence via Prattenden's Farm includes use of a stone stile in the north wall of the churchyard.' The stile remains. The Farmhouse has gone.

It is true that unsympathetic 20th Century additions acted to merely mask the architectural merits of the original property (which can be seen in historic photographs provided in the current application), but the building's historic significance remained.

Indeed, Michael Scammell, Conservation Officer, SDNPA, wrote at the past appeal stage: 'I am happy to declare it a non-designated heritage asset.'

He added: The current proposal implies significant change to this appearance but the features likely to be replaced - primarily the fenestration - are not of heritage value. Were they historic features, I would certainly seek to retain them.'

And he qualified his support for the original application to retain the historic part of the building, for which permission was granted on appeal, thus: 'If we receive amendments which respect the position of the principal chimney stack and we can adequately condition retention of historic fabric, I will not raise a conservation objection to this particular application.'

The current retrospective application seeks to 'retain historic fabric' by promising to use demolished materials in the new-build. This is not BPC's interpretation of Mr Scammell's view that non-designated heritage asset features should be retained.

At appeal stage, Bury Parish Council wrote that it was objecting to the development as per its original submission, contending the application was unsuitable for the following reasons: '1 due to its significant increase in size, 2 the adverse impact on views from the ancient PROW known as the Coffin Trail that an extended and wider Eastern elevation would create, 3 our belief that the building is far older than the owner and applicant suggest with a number of features that require further heritage investigation.'

BPC added: 'Additionally, we would point out that section 12 of the application form states that the property cannot be seen from any PROW. This is untrue as a clear view of the Eastern elevation of the existing property can be seen from the Coffin Trail PROW. The LVA document states there are partial views, but we contest the views are greater than merely partial.'

Now that the new building is substantially erected, a visit demonstrates how it does indeed dominate the landscape, both from the Coffin Trail and elsewhere.

In its original objection to the application, BPC wrote: 'Bury Parish Council have concerns that this application has ignored the age of the property.'

And among local comments conveyed by BPC to the planning authority were the following:

'The House is C17th.'

'I am so sad to think that the property will be developed without sensitivity. There was a bread oven. There were 3 inglenooks and 2 fireplaces upstairs. There is a well about 150 ft deep. Beams hold the roof without nails'.

'The house is in the oldest part of the village, being good farming land. Both Roman and Saxon remains have been found in the field adjoining it and onto the Coffin Trail which is the Saxon route from West Burton to the church. We have established, as a fact that, the house is very old. The older Farmhouses in Bury, are mainly 1650 or earlier, and are named after the first family that lived there. (Smiths, Fogdens, Martins, Penfolds, Upperton - these are all local farming names from that period) The record showing the 'Prattenton' (sic) family being in Bury is 1704, but this is as early as the land tax records go. The Rector, Reverend Prattenden was the incumbent in 1725 and the house was used as his rectory.'

It is because of the historical significance pointed out, among others, by BPC that presumably permission was eventually only granted, on appeal, on the condition that its historic core was retained. The fact that this very core was subsequently demolished, despite all of the above concerns, should not be tolerated.

(Incidentally, it should be noted that when considering this case, the public is unable to access the correct appeal verdict for the property as SDNPA as attached the wrong document to the case, namely, 'APPEAL DECISION FOR PROPERTY 5 MIDDLE NEPCOTE'.)

We note from the original application that Phase I and II surveys found a limited bat population at the demolished property. The relevant report stated: 'All works that will be carried out at The Farmhouse will take place under an EPSL obtained from Natural England and under the supervision of a Suitably Qualified Ecologist (SQE). Disturbance of the roost and capture of bats (if required) will need to be carried out under the supervision of a licensed SQE and sensitive methods will also need to be employed during the alterations. All works would be detailed within the EPSL Method Statement required as part of the licence application.'

Was the subsequent unauthorised demolition carried out under the terms of an EPSL licence, as required?

Lastly, on the CIL self-build exemption application, under Regulation 7, the work should not have commenced before approval of a CIL exemption had been secured, therefore as a retrospective application, this exemption should be denied.

6. All other planning matters – to include appeals

Members discussed the housing allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan after it transpired that Jolyons and Robin Hill were no longer available sites. The Committee agreed that they still wished to provide an allocation for new housing and should research other potential sites.

7. Date of next meeting

The date of the next planning meeting is 17th February 2020