

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Thursday 30th July 2020 at 10.00am by remote meeting

Present: Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs C Berry, M Falkner

Not present: - Cllr Mrs M Piper, J Harmer, D Watts

No members of public present

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution
	<i>Standing orders suspended</i>
12963	Opportunity for public comment None received via email
12964	Apologies for absence Cllrs J Harmer (illness), Mrs M Piper (personal), D Watts (holiday)
12965	Declarations of interest in any items on the agenda None
12966	Minutes of planning Committee meeting held on 2nd July 2020 <u>It was resolved that the minutes are an accurate representation of the meeting and signed by the chair. VOTE All in favour Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs C Berry, M Falkner</u>
12967	Any other plans received prior to the meeting - notified to the public None
12968	Planning Applications <u>WD/2020/1065/MAJ – LAND NORTH OF SUNFLOWER LANE, POLEGATE BN26 6HT – CONSTRUCTION OF 18 NO. RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, PARKING AND LANDSCAPING.</u> The plans had been circulated to all councillors prior to the meeting. A number of comments were made about the application including: • In the application it refers to the development being on vacant land, but in item 6 it asks if the land is vacant and it states no. this is confusing as it contradicts itself. • The Transport report states there will be 42 car parking spaces but in section 7.3 states that there will be 34 spaces 28 for residents. 7.3 refers to internal parking and servicing arrangements designed to minimise the impact on nearby roads. How will this be achieved? • Under the tree report it states that the trees influence the development. There is a TPO plan and it gives the trees life expectancy of at least 40 years. How will the trees be protected when the building work is happening? • In the biodiversity and geological conservation, the adjacent land has protected species. If this goes ahead, they will be affected. • Foul sewerage – the application says that it will be disposed of using mains sewer, but under the section asking if the applicant proposes to connect to the main sewer it states that this is unknown. It gives the impression that little thought has been put to the ideas on how sewerage will be disposed of. • In the archaeology report (2nd June 2020) it refers to reports written in January 2010 and a letter dated 19th November 2012, and these related to a survey conducted in December 2009. All these reports are very outdated, are they still relevant?

- It was good to see 35% of the housing may be allocated to affordable housing. However, in phase II of the original permission there was reference to commercial sections. This was over 10 years ago and lapsed?
- There is a query over the number of fire hydrants that are suitable for mains water. It is important that there are enough fire hydrants for emergencies.
- Some resident comments have referred to being advised that no further building would take place by the same developer. There is little space on bluebells, it is a very overcrowded development.
- Another comment was made on a resident's comment that their property had been flooded. Council seek to ensure that this is dealt with and reassurance that this would not happen to the new properties.
- Another resident comment referred to the small roundabout entrance/exit and concerns were raised on whether this was dangerous, and it should be assessed prior to more housing being built.

For this reason, a motion was raised to object to the application on the above grounds.

It was resolved to submit the objections with comments as follows:

- **In the application it refers to the development being on vacant land, but in item 6 it asks if the land is vacant and it states no. this is confusing as it contradicts itself.**
- **The Transport report states there will be 42 car parking spaces but in section 7.3 states that there will be 34 spaces 28 for residents. 7.3 refers to internal parking and servicing arrangements designed to minimise the impact on nearby roads. How will this be achieved?**
- **Under the tree report it states that the trees influence the development. There is a TPO plan and it gives the trees life expectancy of at least 40 years. How will the trees be protected when the building work is happening?**
- **In the biodiversity and geological conservation, the adjacent land has protected species. If this goes ahead, they will be affected.**
- **Foul sewerage – the application says that it will be disposed of using mains sewer, but under the section asking if the applicant proposes to connect to the main sewer it states that this is unknown. It gives the impression that little thought has been put to the ideas on how sewerage will be disposed of.**
- **In the archaeology report (2nd June 2020) it refers to reports written in January 2010 and a letter dated 19th November 2012, and these related to a survey conducted in December 2009. All the reports are very outdated, are they still relevant?**
- **It was good to see 35% of the housing may be allocated to affordable housing. However, in phase II of the original permission there was reference to commercial sections. This was over 10 years ago and lapsed?**
- **There is a query over the number of fire hydrants that are suitable for mains water. It is important that there are enough fire hydrants for emergencies.**
- **Some resident comments have referred to being advised that no further building would take place by the same developer. There is little space on bluebells, it is a very overcrowded development.**
- **Another comment was made on a resident's comment that their property had been flooded. Council seek to ensure that this is dealt with and reassurance that this would not happen to the new properties.**
- **Another resident comment referred to the small roundabout entrance/exit and concerns were raised on whether this was dangerous, and it should be assessed prior to more housing being built.**

VOTE All in favour of submitting the above objections Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs C Berry, M Falkner

12969	Delegated Applications – already submitted <u>for information only</u> <u>WD/2020/1074/F</u> – LAND TO THE REAR OF 7 SAYERLAND ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6NU – DEVELOPMENT OF 2 NO CHALET BUNGALOWS WITH ACCESS FROM HONEYCRAG CLOSE. OBJECTIONS - A Councillor noted the proposed dwellings have been reduced in size to two x 3 bedroom chalet bungalows. This is more appropriate with the neighbouring environment. The Councillor would be interested to see any comment from owners in neighbouring properties especially regarding whether they feel this reduction in bedrooms means they are no longer being overlooked. The Councillor said that the design and access statement make some comment around ‘flawed’ policy of Wealden District Council from last year. The Councillor believed this rose from the comment from one senior Inspector. The Councillor assumed this was a reasonable comment from the Inspector and thereby assume Wealden have now a structure in place that is correct and relevant to the current application. The Councillor stated the plans submitted and space for cars and internal driveway looked acceptable. The Councillor assume from looking at the plans that the driveway is shared, which may or may not be problematic The Councillor’s main area of concern was the proposed driveway, which offers a narrow access. The Councillor noted that the dropped kerbs would need to be extended towards the public footpath. Access is diagonal which the Councillor thought inappropriate and may cause problems and it thereby is inadequate and narrow in width. The Councillor noted it also comes out onto a turning area which could be hazardous. In view of the unsuitable access the Councillor could not support the application at this time. A Councillor stated that their view on this resubmission had not changed. The Councillor noted that the access comes out onto a turning point, point, which the Councillor thought was unsuitable and potentially dangerous. The Councillor also thought it inappropriate that the access was so close to a public footpath. For these reasons, the Councillor could not support the application. A Councillor stated that they had looked at the plans and the Design and Access Statement, and there was no indication that the access issues, previously objected to by Councillors, had been changed. For this reason, the Councillor reiterated their previous objection to the application. <u>WD/2020/1062/F</u> – 25 OLD DRIVE, POLEGATE BN26 5ET – EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF ATTACHED GARAGE TO FORM GAMES ROOM WITH W.C., STORE AND LINK CONSERVATORY. REPLACE GARAGE DOOR WITH WALL AND WINDOW. NO OBJECTIONS. These were noted by all present.
12970	Planning decisions by Wealden District Council – for information only <u>WD/2020/0488/F</u> – 5 SHEPHAM LANE, POLEGATE BN26 6LZ – SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 24TH JUNE 2020. <u>WD/2020/0535/F</u> - 23 BRAMLEY ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6JS – ERECT SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 25TH JUNE 2020. <u>WD/2019/1221/F</u> - CHANGE OF USE OF REAR FUNCTION ROOM TO CONTAIN HMO CONTAINING 5 UNITS (C4 USE CLASS) AND CHANGE OF USE OF FIRST AND SECOND FLOOR TO HMO CONTAINING 5 UNITS (C4 USE CLASS). REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS TO THE UPPER PARTS AND REAR ELEVATIONS AND OTHER ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 30TH JUNE 2020.

	<u>WD/2020/0612/F</u> – 16 BRIGHTLING ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 5DB – PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 14TH JULY 2020 <u>WD/2020/0397/F</u> – 3 ST JAMES WALK, POLEGATE BN26 6FQ – REAR CONSERVATORY. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 1ST JULY 2020. <u>WD/2016/2592/F</u> – 2 SHEPHAM LANE, POLEGATE BN26 6LZ – CONSTRUCTION OF 4 NO. FOUR-BEDROOMED DETACHED HOUSES WITH SEPARATE GARAGES. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 3RD JULY 2020. <u>WD/2020/0546/F</u> – 14 BRAMLEY ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6JS – SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 9TH JULY 2020. <u>WD/2020/0650/F</u> – 33 GOLDEN MILLER LANE, POLEGATE BN26 5HW – NEW SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM NEW OPEN PLAN KITCHEN/DINING AREA, UTILITY ROOM AND WC. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 9TH JULY 2020. <u>WD/2020/0749/F</u> – BRAMLEY FARM, BAY TREE LANE, POLEGATE BN26 6QN – RESUBMISSION OF A SCHEME TO CONVERT A FORMER DAIRY BUILDING TO 3 NO. DWELLINGHOUSES. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 10TH JULY. Noted by all present
12971	Other planning items None

The remote meeting ended at 10.11am

Chair of Planning Committee _____ Date