**Parham Parish Council**

**Minutes**

**Planning committee site visit of Woodsyard, Rackham Road, West Sussex**

**Date:** Saturday 5th April 2025

**Present:** Heather Cartwright (Chairman), Catherine Dugdale (Councillor)

Councillors contacted for their views:

Will Rydon (Vice Chairman), Paul Slimming (Councillor), Philippa Trumper (Councillor), Claudia Fisher (Councillor)

**Note:** The visit could only be carried out from the road as at the time of the visit we had not received a reply from the landowner to our request for a site visit.

**HC** walked the length of the property but due to the hedging and a large amount of wood stacked up against the fence she was unable to see the land fully.

**HC** and **CD** stood by the entrance gate and compared the current building with the plans. CD stated that in the past the building was larger as there was a barn attached to the end of the building. This explained the plans use of original footings in order to extend the property.

**HC** and **CD** talked at length, going over the plans, comparing the current and proposed building.

**HC** had reservations about the combusting toilet as this would need a vent and waste tank fitted to an outside wall and neither were shown on the plans, and as the toilet is shown to be on the front of the property, this would be an eyesore. There appears to be an outside door on the front of the property which goes directly into the bathroom, this is not explained in the documentation. She also felt that the rainwater harvesting to provide all of the water to the property was not viable.

She does not support the application as it stands.

**CD** does not oppose the repurposing of the redundant building however she felt the plans were lacking in information that would support the ‘off grid’ use of the property. She questioned where the rainwater collection tanks were to be sited as this had not been stated on the planning documents.

She could not support the plans as submitted.

We both felt that the proposed building would look better than the current building but we had reservations about the viability of the proposed ‘off grid’ usage of electricity, water and use of the toilet.

**HC** put all of these points to the other members of the planning committee and asked for their views.
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**PS** felt that the unsightly look of the property was due in part to the number and nature of vehicles parked there.

He could not support the application in its current form.

**CF** felt strongly that the. Application was a thoughtful and sustainable development.

She supported the application.

**WR** felt that a new development was positive but that the plans are incomplete.

He could not support the application as it stands.

**PT** commentated that ‘This “eco” vision appears to lack the infrastructure, resilience, and evidence to make that vision work in practice. It proposes off-grid living with no demonstrated backup, in a setting where reliability matters to both residents and the local community.’

This application should be deferred until:

• Full technical documentation is provided for waste and water systems,

• Long-term maintenance and health compliance are demonstrated.

She would not support this application in its current form.

5 Councillors were against and 1 Councillor for, therefore due to the majority, the Council put in its objection to the planning application.
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