

Comments for Submission	3 rd June 2020 Planning Applications	Address	Details	Comments
The Parish Council would like to express its support for this application which it considers to be a significant improvement on the initial application, to which the Parish Council provided a 'no objection' consultee comment. It is the view of the Parish Council that the proposed development will sit well within the environment, and will also be of benefit to the local economy.	SDNP/20/01693/FUL	Cowdray Park A272 Easebourne Street to Heath End Lane, Easebourne	Construction of 12 treehouses to provide tourism accommodation across 2 woodland sites within the estate (5 x 1bedroom units at Lodge Wood and 7 x 1 units at High Field Copse), access and parking, cycle storage, drainage, and biodiversity enhancements and woodland management.	A Keeling (Chairman): No objection, strongly support this application.
				D Pack: Supportive.
				C Cantlon: I am supportive of the proposed developments which I believe have responded to the feedback given by SDNPA previously. These will be beneficial to the local economy and in tune with the environment.
				M Noble: Fully supportive of this application, a positive development for the area, bringing in tourists and revenue for local businesses and potential employment.
				C Sanderson: No objections. I supported the previous application and feel the revisions are helpful in meeting the concerns raised by the SDNP. Hopefully, this scheme will enhance the local economy and lead to further provision of cycling amenities.
				T Baker: Supportive of the application.
The Parish Council has no objection in principle to this planning application.	SDNP/20/01561/FUL	13 Canada Grove, Easebourne	Conversion of garage to provide additional accommodation including extension to the East at lower ground floor and a ground floor extension to South West	A Keeling (Chairman): No objection
				D Pack: No objection
				C Cantlon: No objection
				M Noble: No objection, similar projects already present on the same street
				C Sanderson: No objection.
				T Baker: No objection

<p>The Parish Council appreciate that this proposed planning application will improve the facilities for the residents, which is considered of upmost importance.</p> <p>However, the Parish Council has significant concerns with regards to the location for the extension to house this lift, which is not an aesthetically pleasing as addition to the building. The Parish Council is currently in the process of creating a Parish Design Statement to encourage sympathetic development, and this application is not considered in harmony with the building which is appreciated as not in itself in-keeping with other surrounding dwellings. To conclude, the Parish Council object to this application, and request another more appropriate position is identified, but support the addition of a lift for residents.</p>	SDNP/20/01473/FUL	Egmont House, Egmont Road, Easebourne	New external lift shaft providing a Part-M compliant left serving 7 no. 1 st floor flats	<p>A Keeling (Chairman): Not a good location for the lift at the front of the building, another position would be preferred.</p> <p>D Pack: Egmont House being so close I have to declare an interest. The lift shaft in the front of house will look an eyesore. Placing the lift shaft to one of the two sides would be a better option.</p> <p>C Cantlon: No objections. Proposed new lift will enhance residents experience and has no material site impact.</p> <p>M Noble: It's a shame it has to be on the front of the building, in what will look like a fairly ugly addition. Can we ask if other less visible places have been considered?</p> <p>C Sanderson: No objection</p> <p>T Baker: No objection</p>
<p>The Parish Council has no objection to the intention to reduce height by 4m (to no less than 4m) and reduce overall group</p>	SDNP/20/01770/TCA	Ramshill, Easebourne Street, Easebourne	Notification of intention to reduce height by 4m (to no less than 4m) and reduce overall	<p>A Keeling (Chairman): No objection, to all work with the exception of the felling the Holly trees.</p>

spread on the East and West sectors by 2m on 1 no. Holly trees (G3). However, the Parish Council does not support the felling of 2 no. Holly trees (T1 and T2) which do not appear diseased or obstructive. Any work carried out to the trees should also not negatively impact on nesting birds.			group spread on the East and West sectors by 2m on 1 no. Holly trees (G3). Fell 2 no. Holly trees (T1 and T2).	<table><tr><td>D Pack: No comment provided.</td></tr><tr><td>C Cantlon: no objections subject to no active nests.</td></tr><tr><td>M Noble: No objection.</td></tr><tr><td>C Sanderson: No objection to pruning of tree G3 but question the need to cut down T1 and T2 which do not seem to be diseased or obstructive.</td></tr><tr><td>T Baker: No objection.</td></tr></table>	D Pack: No comment provided.	C Cantlon: no objections subject to no active nests.	M Noble: No objection.	C Sanderson: No objection to pruning of tree G3 but question the need to cut down T1 and T2 which do not seem to be diseased or obstructive.	T Baker: No objection.
D Pack: No comment provided.									
C Cantlon: no objections subject to no active nests.									
M Noble: No objection.									
C Sanderson: No objection to pruning of tree G3 but question the need to cut down T1 and T2 which do not seem to be diseased or obstructive.									
T Baker: No objection.									