

Burwash Parish Council Planning Committee

Minutes of the Planning Committee

Held on the 6th July 2020, at 14.30

Due to the coronavirus crisis this meeting was held online using Zoom

Chair Cllr I Rees, Cllr Franklin, Cllr Newson, Cllr Wraight, Cllr Moore, Cllr Chapman, Cllr Caulkin

The meeting was opened at 14:30 by Chair Cllr Rees.

There were 6 members of the public present including Cllr Barnes.

Public Time

1. Public Time (15 minutes).

Public: Ashwood Nursing Home Site, Burwash Common

Mrs Bird who had sent in an email (see Appendix) went through concerns:

- Density of proposed housing
- Parking issues (29 seems inadequate) example of Boundary Close parking issues
- Height of proposed development and impact on neighbours in Stonegate Road
- Social housing figures

Cllrs Franklin and Wraight joined the meeting at 14.38

Cllr N Moore invited resident to explain the parking issues.

Public: Explained parking issues

The Traffic Survey which was previously conducted in Burwash Common had revealed that Vicarage Road is used for parking when it should be an access road. Boundary Edge Close residents park in Vicarage Road as not enough parking allocated for that development.

Parking will only get worse.

Suggested Community Police have a look at the parking issues along Vicarage Road.

Residents in Burwash Common do seem keen to see the property developed but done properly.

Cllr Barnes: Parking provisions in rural areas are inadequate. Could be raised with Core Strategy to ensure adequate parking is provided with new developments.

Public: Member of Save Our Fields Group (SOF) confirmed that 2 parking spaces per house is the central government policy for new developments.

SOF has not yet received documents from the developer but has requested them.

Plans and questionnaire are on a noticeboard at the site for residents to consult.

A selection of residents have been leafleted.

Cllr Rees Confirmed he had also requested plans from the developer but they hadn't arrived yet.
Action: Asst. Clerk to contact developer to request these and for permission to put on the website.

Asst. Clerk update: these were requested on the 7/7/20 and received by email from Mr. Nick Collins-Green on 8/7/20. These have now been distributed to councillors and made available on the Parish website.

Cllr Newson: Questioned whether developer has confirmed if any social housing.

Public: At present 8 semi-detached homes, 4 flats and 2 self-build houses are planned with 29 parking spaces.

Cllr Rees: Developer has indicated that they will be fulfilling obligations for affordable housing. However, as property vacant different rules might apply.

Cllr Moore: An email has been sent to enquire about this.

Public time ended at 14.48

2. Apologies for Absence.

None

3. Disclosures of Interest.

None

4. Minutes from the previous meeting.

a) To confirm the accuracy of the minutes from the previous meeting held on 25.6.20 and approve them to be presented to next Full Council Meeting on 14.7.20.

Action: Asst. Clerk to clarify the resolution about the conservation boundary to make it clearer that decision not made on extending the boundary. Minutes to be re-circulated ready for approval before Full Council Meeting on the 14.7.20.

b) The outstanding action point of contacting the owners of The Bell and other potential sites was discussed. **Action:** It was agreed that the Clerk would write a letter to the owners of The Bell and see if they would like to have an online meeting set up to discuss it with them.

5. Extension of the Conservation Area Boundary.

Mr Banks from Save Our Fields was invited to take part in this Agenda item.

a. Discuss which councillors could be part of the sub-group and make recommendation to Full Council.

Cllr Chapman volunteered to be part of the group and Cllrs Newson and Moore are also available, but noted that they are also involved with Save Our Fields.

It was suggested that additional councillor(s) be recruited at Full Council.

Action: Asst. Clerk to make sure this is on the Full Council Agenda for resolution.

Mr Banks suggested a Chair could be voted in for the sub-group once it was set up.

He also suggested writing to Rother to ask for the date the Conservation Boundary was fixed and whether there are any reviews scheduled. This was agreed by councillors.

Action: Asst Clerk to write to Rother District Council.

Update: Asst Clerk has contacted Rother DC on 7/7/20 but no reply has been received yet.

Further update from Clerk 9/9/20: Following discussions from Save Our Fields on the 8th July 2020, there has been a change in plans regarding the way the working group will be set up. The following resolution from the 25.6.20 is now being put to Full Council on the 14th July as follows:

“Committee recommend that Council RESOLVE to agree the establishment of a separate sub-group to be Chaired by Save Our Fields to work specifically on the potential extension of the conservation boundary. Sub-group to be populated by 3 members of Save our Fields and 3 council representatives. Resolutions of the sub-group to come back to Full Council for agreement.”

6. Planning Applications. (Standing item)

- a. **RR/2020/645/P Glebe House, Etchingham Road, Burwash TN19 7BG** Erection of four stables at the rear of the existing stable block and change of use to horse rescue sanctuary (part retrospective).

Councillors **RESOLVED** to support this application on the condition that the Public Right of Way is protected and maintained, by electric fence or other means.

- b. **RR/2020/1010/P 91 Shrub Lane, Little Abacus, Burwash TN19 7BU**

Proposed single storey side extension.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to support this application.

- c. **RR/2020/649/P Mottynsden Manor, Spring Lane, Burwash TN19 7HX**

Solar Panel Installation on Stables roof.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to support this application

Asst. Clerk update: Comments for the above three application have been put on the planning portal on the 7/7/20. See appendix for copy.

7. Any Planning results received (standing item)

None received.

8. Planning Appeals (standing item)

- a) Verbal update on Appeals Procedure

Asst. Clerk confirmed that she had received a response from the Appeals Department and that the Parish Council are notified of an appeal once it is validated which then leaves 21 days to comment.

Cllr Newson suggested the Appeals should be monitored on the portal more regularly (every 1-2 weeks) so that we can see when a new appeal is lodged before being validated and official notification received by council.

Action: Asst. Clerk to monitor the planning portal Appeals pages at least every 2 weeks.

- b) Red Cross Centre Appeal Ref. 2687 Application: RR/2019/2193/P

There was no update and the appeal has not yet started.

Action: Asst. Clerk to monitor this appeal and keep as standing item.

9. Correspondence to the clerk (standing item)

- a) Update on site visit regarding correspondence received about potential new housing site in Fontridge Lane, Burwash

Cllrs Rees, Chapman and Wraight confirmed their availability for either 13th or 20th July.

Action: Asst. Clerk to write to owners and set up the site visit.

Asst. Clerk Update: Site visit set up and confirmed for 13th July 2020.

Correspondence received from Mrs J Bird about Ashwood site which was discussed

10. Strand Meadow (standing item)

No further news.

15:15 Meeting paused for member of the public to speak.

Question of whether anyone aware of anything happening Rother end.

Cllr Barnes confirmed he is not aware of anything further.

Suggestion of contacting Cllr Kirby-Green for news.

15:17 Meeting resumed

Action: Asst Clerk to write to Cllr Kirby-Green in case she has any further news on whether this application is live and actively being discussed by inspectors.

Update: Asst Clerk has written and had a response on 7/7/20 that Cllr Kirby-Green has received no further information. She has written to the Officer to see whether she is expecting an application but has heard nothing.

Cllr Barnes suggested that the developer might be waiting for more favourable conditions regarding housing figures and targets which might change in the future.

15:20 Meeting was paused for member of the public to speak.

Question regarding the hoardings and whether anything further being done.

Councillors confirmed waiting for enforcement to pick up again before bringing it up again with Rother DC.

15:21 Meeting resumed

11. Glebe House Site (standing item)

- a. Paper prepared by Cllr Moore
- b. Note from Save Our Fields
- c. Discuss best way to proceed and whether council should submit a provisional view to Rother DC on this site.

Mr Banks from Save Our Fields was included in the discussions on this Agenda item.

Discussion was had about the merits of sending in a provisional view on the Glebe House Site to Rother DC or whether it would be better to wait for a formal application to be made and then comment.

15:25 Meeting was paused for Cllr Barnes to speak

Cllr Barnes suggested getting advice from SALC as he thought it might be unwise to take a position.

15:25 Meeting resumed

Further discussion was had.

Mr Banks suggested that the advantage of sending the report in now might discourage a formal application being made. Pre-disposal would not count as the developer has asked for advice.

15:30 Meeting was paused for Cllr Barnes to speak

Cllr Barnes suggested that as the development does not meet Neighbourhood Plan requirements so could be legally safe to comment.

15:31 Meeting resumed

Councillors agreed that the paper written by Cllr Nick Moore should be re-visited and made into more of an advisory note.

Action: Cllr Moore to revise the document before the next meeting where it should be agreed and then send it to Rother District Council.

12. Ashwood House Site and Application (standing item)

- a. Update on site visit attended by councillors on 29.6.20

Cllr Moore read out the update he had emailed round earlier in the day.

(Please see Appendix)

- b. Next steps

A Full application is expected to be lodged early August.

The plans which are on the noticeboard at the site are to be requested (see Item 1) and put on the website.

Discussion was had about parking requirements. It was felt that although valid points had been made regarding parking, it appeared that the government requirement of 2 spaces per home was being met.

15:49 Meeting was paused for Cllr Barnes to speak

Occasionally a developer may include extra carpark spaces as a sort of bonus which can also encourage support for the application. It might be something to consider asking for.

15:50 Meeting resumed

Action: Monitor the website for when the application is lodged. Keep as standing item on the Agenda.

(Cllr Barnes left the meeting and sent apologies as had to leave to attend another meeting.)

13. Information for noting or including on a future agenda.

- Keep Glebe House, Strand Meadow and Ashwood Nursing Home Sites as Standing Items
- Conservation Boundary

- Red Cross Hut Appeal
- Correspondence Burwash Weald received regarding Old Police House

14. Date of next meeting and time to be agreed.

Monday 27th July at 2.30pm

Meeting Closed at 15:56

Appendix: Items 1 and 12
Correspondence from Mrs Bird
Email re. Ashwood Nursing Home

From: Jacqueline Bird
Sent: 01 July 2020 12:02
To: Cllr Robert Franklin <cllr.robert.franklin@burwashpc.org.uk>
Subject: Ashwood Nursing Home Site

Bob,

There has been some feedback regarding the plans for the Ashwood Nursing Home site and the main issues are listed below. You may want to consider these when discussing the proposal at the Planning Meeting.

The density of housing proposed for the site seems excessively high which is not in keeping with the area. Should it be reduced? We do not really want another Boundary Edge Close type development where too many properties have been packed into a small space.

The Boundary Edge development has resulted in some of the occupiers of Boundary Edge routinely and regularly parking in Vicarage Road as there seems to be insufficient parking room within the development.

The allocated parking of just 29 spaces in the plan for the Ashwood site seems inadequate and would almost certainly result in vehicles parking along the Stonegate Road and/or Vicarage Road.

What steps will be taken to minimise problems arising from increased traffic movements arising from the development of the site, especially during morning and evening rush hours when traffic on the Stonegate road backs up at the junction of the A265? In view of likely increased traffic flows, is there a case for reducing the speed limit on the Stonegate road from 40 to 30 mph? Is the access point to the site too close to the A265/Stonegate road junction?

What happened to the social housing that was promised by the developer when he met the RA before these plans were produced?

What can/should be done to reduce the degree by which neighbouring properties on the other side of the Stonegate road are overlooked by properties on that side of the new development, or have their views obstructed? The two self-build homes are low level and integrated into the landscape; the rest of the homes are not. Why not?

Kind regards
Jackie

Appendix: Item 6

Comments put on planning portal on 7/7/20

Your comments relating to Application RR/2020/645/P have been received, your reference is OWPC24660

Name: Rachel Guernier (Assistant Clerk)

Address: Burwash Parish Council Office High Street Burwash

Comments: The Planning Committee met on the 6th July 2020 and resolved to support this application on the condition that the Public Right of Way is protected and maintained, by electric fence or other means.

Your comments relating to Application RR/2020/1010/P have been received, your reference is OWPC24658

Name: Rachel Guernier

Address: Burwash Parish Council Office High Street Burwash

Comments: The Planning Committee met on the 6th July and resolved to support this application.

Your comments relating to Application RR/2020/649/P have been received, your reference is OWPC24659

Name: Rachel Guernier

Address: Burwash Parish Council Office High Street Burwash

Comments: The Planning Committee met on the 6th July and resolved to support this application.

Appendix: Item 12a

Notes on Ashwood Site Visit 29 June 2020

Councillors Ian Rees and Nick Moore

We attended the site visit with the Rother Case Officer Matthew and the Artemis team who were there in strength.

They current plans are posted on a large board on the site on the Stonegate Road. Artemis say they have dropped leaflets locally and called on immediate neighbours. They will copy plans to us shortly. They still intend to meet with Burwash Save Our Fields. They said that they have reworked their plans to take into account the High Weald Design Guide. They hope to submit their plans in early August.

The number of the properties is down to 14. This still includes the two self builds which the partners are building for themselves.

The remaining twelve properties include 4 flats in a block on the Stonegate Road/A 265 corner.

There are 29 parking spaces on site.

The Rother case officer mentioned impact on the AONB as an issue. He also referred to Rother Core Strategy Policy OSS (Overall Spatial Strategy) 1 and in particular (c)

Facilitate the limited growth of villages that contain a range of services and which contributes to supporting vibrant, mixed rural communities, notably in relation to service provision and local housing needs, and is compatible with the character and setting of the village;

The issue is that Burwash Common isn't seen as having the services to sustain housing development. There is no housing target for Burwash Common and the site is outside the very limited development area.

We did point out (while being clear that we weren't commenting on the actual application) that it is a brownfield site that has been empty for some time. The derelict buildings are an eyesore. The local residents' association meeting earlier in the year had been in favour of this site being redeveloped.

Although we are keen to keep commercial sites it seemed unlikely that there would be appropriate commercial development on this site. The care home had closed following a failed Care Quality Commission inspection. No one to date had come forward from the Care sector to our knowledge.

The case officer did acknowledge that Rother did not meet the 5year land supply required to meet their housing target.

We also pointed out that the development was on the ridge, in keeping with history of the villages, rather than as other recent proposals had been getting further and further down the side of the hill.

Artemis said they were committed to providing affordable housing but would be discounted in part because they are redeveloping vacant housing. But when that was taken into account they would fulfil the requirements as they relate to affordable housing.

[Follow up note – to try to follow up on the issue in the last paragraph NM tried to look it up on line but was unable to find the detail on line. NM has emailed the developer but has received no reply as of 06 07 2020]