

Signed

Chairman

Horam Parish Council
The Horam Centre
3 Bank Buildings
Horam
TN21 0EH

01435 812151

JACKIE COTTRELL

Jackie Cottrell –Clerk

Email: clerk@horamparishcouncil.gov.uk

**Minutes of Horam Parish Council's Planning and Highways Committee
Held in the Horam Centre on MONDAY 27 JULY 2026 AT 7.30 PM until 9.01 PM**

In Attendance: Councillors Graham Knight, Andy Billings, Virginia Roberts, Ann Sadler, Sue Lane and David Marlow (non-voting member)

Also in Attendance: Administrative Assistant
3 members of the public

PUBLIC SESSION

A member of the public spoke in support of their planning application – WD/2026/1317/F.

661/07/26 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllr Johnson - family commitments

662/07/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Cllr Billings declared a personal interest as a customer of Hidden Spring Vineyard.

663/07/26 MINUTES

RESOLVED the minutes of the meeting of 22 June 2026.

664/07/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

WD/2026/1317/F

HIDDEN SPRING VINEYARD, VINES CROSS ROAD, HORAM, TN21 0HG - Erection of

winery building extension with covered terrace and accessibility ramp

The application was unanimously recommended for **APPROVAL**.

The Committee were pleased that the extension to the winery could lead to more employment and visitors to Horam. It was noted that the building was set back from the road.

The Committee raised the following points:

1. The Committee wanted confirmation that adequate on-site parking can be provided to meet the anticipated demand generated by events as concern was raised that only 11 parking spaces are detailed, while drawing 25219-202-RN-D illustrates seating capacity for 52 people.

The Committee also requested clarification on the parking arrangements within the yard, specifically whether the four parking spaces shown are intended to be designated as accessible (disabled) parking bays

2. Concerns were expressed about the potential appearance of the cedar shingles, which are not a vernacular material, and clarification was sought on the finish, to tone in.

3. While there were concerns about the roof height and form of the extension, on balance, it was accepted that the increase in height was limited and would not impact on the wider landscape.

3 members of the public left the meeting at 7.55 pm.

WD/2026/1264/RM

LAND SOUTH EAST OF CHIDDINGLY ROAD, HORAM, TN21 0JJ - Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to outline application WD/2023/1443/O (construction of 4 no. dwellings, parking and gardens, landscaped area and use of access and roadway approved under WD/2020/2667).

The application was unanimously recommended for **REFUSAL**

The Council's observations in respect of this application are as follows:

Design

The roof height of Plots 2, 3, and 4 are excessive and out of keeping with the established character of Chiddingly Road

When viewed in elevation, houses along Chiddingly Road generally display a proportion where the wall height accounts for approximately two-thirds of the overall building height, with the roof forming the remaining one-third. By contrast, these proposed dwellings have a wall-to-roof ratio of approximately 55% wall and 45% roof, resulting in an overly dominant roof form. Contrary to Horam Design Guide.

DG04.3: d

New development should suggest roof pitches that are in line with the existing style in the parish, around 30 to 35 degrees, and avoid examples of excessively steeply sloped pitches (over 40 degrees). This helps maintain rural character as well as being optimal for solar panels;

DG04.3 e:

The scale of the roof should always be in proportion with the dimensions of the building. Flat roofs for buildings, extensions or garages should be avoided;

Such a dominant roof form is also contrary to National Design Guide B2 para 67 and I1 para 53 Well-designed new development is influenced by:

an appreciation and understanding of vernacular, local or regional character, including existing built form, landscape and local architectural precedents;

This includes considering:

- the height, scale, massing and relationships between buildings;
- roofscapes;
- the scale and proportions of buildings

This issue is particularly evident in the detached dwelling on Plot 4, where the narrow width of the building is especially apparent when viewed from the access road. Furthermore, the roof heights proposed for Plots 2, 3 and 4 do not comply with Horam Design Guide DG.04.3.b. The fact that ground levels on these plots are lower than on Plot 1 does not justify increasing the roof heights. Reducing the roof heights would improve compliance with both DG.04.3.a and DG.04.3.b and would also create greater variation in the roofline when viewed from a distance, resulting in a more natural and visually appealing form of development. It would bring the scheme more closely into line with the prevailing character of the surrounding area achieving a more balanced relationship between the walls and roof forms, consistent with neighbouring properties. It would also allow the roof pitches to be reduced from the proposed 40° to a range of approximately 30°-35° which would better reflect the guidance set out in the Horam Neighbourhood Plan and help the development integrate more successfully with its local context.

The Committee observed that large, flat roofed extensions have been added to plots 2, 3, and 4 since outline. This is contrary to HNP guideline DG043e - *The scale of the roof*

should always be in proportion with the dimensions of the building. Flat roofs for buildings, extensions or garages should be avoided.

Given the site's rural setting and its proximity to woodland habitat used by bats and other nocturnal wildlife the committee felt that the inclusion of roof lanterns was unnecessary, as dwellings already benefit from extensive glazing, including large patio doors and fully glazed end walls. Plot 4, as a detached dwelling, also features glazed elevations on both side walls.

Arboricultural Report

The arboricultural report submitted for the adjoining Two Oaks development (WD/2025/2289/MR), located to the north-northeast of the site, identifies three ash trees (T35, T26 and T27) for removal (Category U). However, according to the plans and supporting documents submitted by Brookworth for the Two Oaks application, only T35 lies within the red line boundary of that development.

In contrast, the plans submitted by the Applicant in support of the current application clearly show T35 as being located within the red line boundary of this site. This presents a clear inconsistency regarding the precise location of the application boundaries.

The position of the boundary is of critical importance, as it will determine whether T35 is retained or felled. The very clear and obvious discrepancy needs to be resolved with the utmost haste before there is any felling-legal or otherwise.

Trees T26 and T27 are situated within the current application (WD/2026/1264/RM) and therefore fall outside the extent of the Two Oaks development.

T26, T27 and T35, are shown as being retained on the Landscape and Site Plan and within the red line area for this application.

The arboricultural report in 2023 (WD/2023/1443/O) stated:

“No trees were considered to be in such a condition that their removal is recommended irrespective of the outcome of the proposal.

This statement conflicts with the identification of T35, T26 and T27 as Category U trees proposed for removal as part of the Two Oaks application.

An up-to-date arboricultural report should be provided to inform the reserved matters proposal together with clarification of the following points:

- The current condition and categorisation of ash trees listed as T26 and T27 in the Two Oaks reserved matters application WD/2025/2289/MR)

- Whether the removal of these trees would be proposed as part of this application.
- The location of the redline boundary between this application and Two Oaks



There is also an inconsistency between the green line site boundary on the Common Parts Maintenance Plan 26011-DR-D-0300-S4-PO4 and the red line site boundary on the Landscape and Site Plan



Gardens

The provision of rear garden space is inadequate for plots 2 and 3 as it fails to accord with Principle 6 of the Wealden Design Guide for establishing landscaping, private amenity and privacy, as set out on page 52 of Section 7. 11.19 An appropriate amount of amenity space (as a general guide the minimum size for a rear garden should be around 100m² for family dwellings).

Foul Drainage Disposal

The Committee requires clarification regarding the proposed foul drainage arrangements. It was noted that the pump is shown within the garden of Plot 1 on the Landscape and Site Plan but is identified as part of the shared area on the Common Parts Maintenance Plan. This discrepancy should be resolved. In addition, clarification is required as to how maintenance access will be achieved and where maintenance vehicles would be able to park when servicing the pump.

Surface Water

Concerns were raised regarding the proposed surface water drainage arrangements and the ultimate discharge point for runoff from the site. The Committee noted that there are approximately 20 ponds within the surrounding area, including a large pond located at the north-eastern corner of the site, which is intended to receive surface water from the adjacent Two Oaks development. This pond is understood to discharge into the same ditch proposed to receive surface water from the current development, raising concerns about the capacity of the drainage network to accommodate flows from both schemes.

Parking

Concerns were raised about whether the turning head provides sufficient space for service and refuse collection vehicles to maneuver safely and efficiently.

The proposal makes no provision for visitor parking.

Bin storage

The Committee noted that the siting of the storage bin for plot 4 is located beyond the recommended maximum drag distance of 30 metres.

665/07/26 PLANNING APPEALS – None

666/07/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS CONSIDERED BY THE WDC MAJORS PLANNING COMMITTEE FOR NOTING

WD/2025/2289/MRM - TWO OAKS, CHIDDINGLY ROAD, HORAM, TN21 0JJ

Reserved matters (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) pursuant to outline application WD/2020/0950/MAO (erection of up to 24 no. dwellings (including 35% affordable), provision of new vehicular accesses, landscaping and other associated infrastructure).

The Committee noted that the application was considered by the WDC Major Planning Committee on 23rd July. Two parish councillors had attended the meeting representing the parish council. Following discussion, it was agreed that a letter would be drafted to Stacy Robbins at WDC setting out Horam Parish Council's concerns.

667/07/26 TPO APPLICATIONS - None

668/07/26 NOTICE OF WORKS UPDATES - None

669/07/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL - None

670/07/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS REFUSED OR WITHDRAWN BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL - None

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Planning & Highways – Wednesday 12th August at 6.45pm

Full Council – Wednesday 12th August at 7.30 pm

Planning & Highways – Monday 24th August at 7.30 pm

TO: MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE: Councillors Billings, Knight, Roberts, Sadler, Lane, Johnston and David Marlow (non-voting member)

REMAINING MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL (for information): Councillors Brockhurst, Howells, Webb, Poole and Trott

DISTRICT WARD MEMBERS: COLLINS & GOULD