Draft Minutes

A Meeting of the Chailey Planning and Environs Committee was held on Thursday 2\textsuperscript{nd} September 2010 in the Reading Room, Chailey Green, commencing at 7.30pm.

Present: (Chairman) Cllr L. Waller

Public present: 14 (part of meeting)

In attendance: V.Grainger (Clerk)


10/38. Verbal representations by members of the public:

Members of the public present wished to make representations concerning planning application LW10/1010 Gradwell End:

**Mr Robson of Pouchland Farmhouse** explained that his property shared a boundary with the development site. He had objected to the previous application and although there had been some amendments, also objected to this application. Mr Robson wished to focus on the following points: the floor area had only been reduced by approx. 12%, the scale was too large for the site, there were concerns especially relating to the western edge, (a copy of the site plan was circulated), the proposals indicated two gable ends with balconies which would overlook his property and the application was contrary to local policies. In addition the site had been wilfully neglected when it could have been fenced and grazed.

**Mr Webber owner of Drapers Wood** commented that he had objected to the previous plans. He had completed an ecological survey of the site and Drapers Wood was a protected woodland site. Although some provision had been made in the proposals the ecology would be harmed and the development was not for local community need or benefit.

**Mr Trussell resident of The Martlets** stated that the development was outside the planning boundary and the important question to consider was whether there was an overriding need for this development within the community. Mr Trussell explained that three miles away there was a similar development at St Georges which was not fully occupied, 50% of the site there was still under construction and only 25% pf places had been taken up. These figures were provided the last time the application had been considered.

**Mr Kay was a representative of CPRE** (Campaign for Protection of Rural England) an organisation concerned with local development and the protection of the countryside. Mr Kay explained that the proposed complex site was a green field site, outside the planning boundary of South Chailey and was therefore contrary to planning policy RES6 (residential development in the countryside) and policy CT1. None of the possible exceptions to this policy were relevant to this application. The application was also contrary to policy RES12b which requires that residential care, nursing homes and sheltered accommodation should be conveniently located for local shops and services. The site was formerly owned by NHS (Pouchlands Hospital) and did not contain residential buildings and if considered did fall within policy CT5 (redevelopment of redundant institutions) would generate far more traffic for a rural road system than experienced when any previous use was operational. As the site would be lit at night light pollution would result, contrary to policy ST7.
The site had also been unmanaged for a prolonged period and reversion to native woodland was well advanced, with many self-set native trees particularly oak trees. Consequently, a haven for wildlife had been created and notes provided by local residents (Mr & Mrs Thompsett) confirmed the presence of an exceptionally diverse bird population, a number of butterflies and other insects. The ecological survey had noted the presence of protected species, (e.g. great crested newts) and the site was noted as being of exceptional high ecological value. Policies ST3 were also relevant and CPRE was of the opinion that the application was contrary to policies ST3a,c,d,e,g and j. The former Pouchlands Hospital on the site was built in the 1870s and was closed due to its remote location (and other factors). Although originally selected as a site for use as a housework because of its remoteness, attitudes had changed and it was no longer appropriate to segregate infirm elderly from the remainder of society.

Mrs P Rhodes commented that it had been agreed (following consultation with local residents) that any development in South Chailey should be in “small closes” and development in open countryside would not be supported. This proposal was outside the planning boundary and did not contain sufficient parking spaces. The proposed complex included a bowling green which indicated that fit and active residents would be occupying the site and they would therefore have use of cars. There would be delivery vehicles, visitors, doctors, nurses’ etc attending, causing overspill parking onto Mill Lane, which was already congested at school times. There was a lack of infrastructure to support the proposals such as public transport, shops etc. No affordable housing had been included in the scheme.

Mr May commented that there was no need for this facility from within the community. There were already many parked vehicles in Mill Lane causing restricted passage of vehicles along the lane with particular problems being caused by Lorries attempting to negotiate around parked vehicles.

Mr Trussell added that there had already been one serious accident in Mill Lane due to sunlight causing a visual driving hazard.

Mr Carpenter (Enplan) circulated a document for information. Dr McCarthy confirmed that provisionally use of section 106 provisions had been agreed to meet a number of local needs and to tackle the issue of access and affordability. A range of needs had been explored extra care, rehabilitation for return to own homes, respite facilities, out reach and in house facilities and to enable people in the community to make use of facilities. Current census figures indicated that there were 3,400 residents over 65 in 12 villages which this facility would be directed at. Within that population there would be residents with low level dementia, physical disability and severe dementia. The proposed development would enable people with dementia to live with their partners. Section 106 provisions would allow places to be purchased. The Age Well Project (ESCC) had been cancelled. The need for nursing care provision in the rural north of Lewes District is acknowledged and the consequence of no provision would be that local people would be exported to other areas. Comparison had been made to St Georges but the eligibility criteria for the proposed development and St Georges was different. At St Georges residents in need of nursing care were not offered care on site but some distance away.

Mr Carpenter added that with regard to the ecology of the site, a buffer would be provided to Drapers Wood, setting aside several acres of land as agreed by Natural England. Several changes had been made to the design which could be explained by the architect.

Mr Webber added that the developers wanted to build a pond, fence the area to be developed and remove species to an artificially created site.

Mr Wainer (LCE Architects) explained that the proposals were for a predominately two storey development adjacent to woodland, with a three storey element with screening. The Design and Access statement detailed a drawing illustrating the view south toward the development, with visual screening the form is broken up and nestles into the landscape. The feel of the complex will be of court yards which will be created by layering of façades, window boxes and planters. Page 32 of the Design and Access Statement indicated the 3D impression from the main approach from Gradwell End. Lewes District Council Planning Dept. had wished to minimise the impact upon adjoining properties. Land falls away to the North and a bund would be created to reduce light pollution.

Initials: ______________________  Date: ______________________
Councillors commented that they were aware that other sites had been considered but had proved to be unsuitable. There was obviously a depth of feeling from local residents. The traffic issues relating to Mill Lane were appreciated. Residents added concerns about insufficient parking spaces, the activity at the site caused by staff shift patterns, access and affordability and stressed the need to establish over riding need to develop this particular site.

The Chairman proposed that a working group should be formed to study closely the relevant documents and representations from residents in order to report to Council at its meeting on 21st September. Following further discussion at that meeting the Council would agree its response. The proposal was Agreed and it was noted that the Council should take a wider Chailey view and the Village needs as a whole in making its considerations, including section 106 provisions.

It was agreed Cllrs. Waller, Cranfield and Cowan would form the working group.

10/39. Declarations of Interest by Councillors: None.

10/40. Council resolution (No. 10/189/190): To agree and sign as a true record the Minutes of the Planning & Environs Committee Meeting held on Tuesday 6th July 2010 and the Urgent Planning Matters Meetings held on Tuesday 20th July 2010. Council decision: Accepted.

10/41. Items not on the agenda which the Chair of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as a matter of urgency: None

10/42. Matters arising: None.

10/43. To consider LDC planning applications:

The planning applications presented were considered by members and the following responses agreed: Cllr Tillard joined the meeting after discussions relating to planning application LW/10/1010 Gradwell End had been concluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Received date</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
<th>Planning Ref number</th>
<th>Name &amp; Address</th>
<th>Work Requested</th>
<th>CPC Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.8.10</td>
<td>23.9.10</td>
<td>LW/10/1010</td>
<td>Manifold Investments Ltd and Retirement Villages Ltd. Land at Gradwell End</td>
<td>Outline Planning Application – Erection of C2 accommodation comprising six bed specialist nursing unit, 24 elderly mentally infirm (EMI) rooms, 30 nursing home rooms, 55 extra care flats with associated support facilities and on site parking provision.</td>
<td>Extension of response date agreed with LDC from 10.9.10 to 23.9.10 (For Agenda meeting 21.9.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.8.10</td>
<td>10.9.10</td>
<td>LW/10/0989</td>
<td>Mr &amp; Mrs J Prower Marchants, Lower Station Road</td>
<td>Replacement Planning permission – Single Storey building to provide studio and pool house with changing accommodation and pool plant (renewal of planning approval LW/07/1227.</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LW/10/1003</td>
<td>Mr K Fleming. Quince Tree Cottage, Green Lane</td>
<td>Planning Application - Partial demolition of existing extension &amp; construction of two storey extension at</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8.10</td>
<td>3.9.10</td>
<td>LW/10/0956</td>
<td>Mr P Lawrence 3 Roeheath Cinder Hill</td>
<td>Planning Application- Section 73A Retrospective application for the retention of an entrance porch</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LW/10/0970</td>
<td>Taylor Wimpey Ltd The Chapel New Heritage Way North</td>
<td>Listed Building Application- Repairs and renovation to the external fabric together with minor internal alterations and formation of toilet, kitchen areas.</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3852:304/29/07/10 Tree Work application</td>
<td>3 New Heritage Way</td>
<td>Beech Tree T1: Crown lift to secondary growth points to 20ft or above the garage roof, and to dead wood  Beech tree T2: Crown lift to secondary growth points to 20ft or above the garage roof, and to dead wood. Remove the large branch that overhangs the garage back to the trunk.</td>
<td>No objections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10/44. To note Lewes District Council planning decisions and planning appeals and recommendations: A listing of planning application decisions received was circulated to members and noted.

10/45. Confidential Legal Matters
Due to the confidential nature of item 10/45, this item was discussed in 'closed session' in accordance with section 68 of Standing Orders. Minutes for this item appear in Appendix 1 which will be classified as 'CONFIDENTIAL' until the legal matters have been resolved.

10/46. Correspondence for Noting
A listing of recent correspondence received was circulated for member’s attention. Correspondence had been received from Chailey Commons Management Committee and ESCC regarding the proposed fencing of the common adjacent to the allotment site. It was Agreed that the Clerk would clarify with Mr J Smith/ESCC the exact location of the fencing and what access was required.

10/47. Risk Implications to be considered: None.

10/48. Implications to Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Section 17: None

10/49. Exchange of information:
• Cllr Evans requested items for the agenda of the forthcoming meeting with ESCC Highways. It was requested that two items should be added, Warrs Hill footpath and the progress following the two local speed restriction petitions.
• A request had been received that the Councils contractors should park in the meshed parking area at Roeheath whilst completing maintenance. The Clerk would pass on this request.

10/50. **Date of next Planning & Environments Committee Meeting:** Tuesday 5th October 2010.
The meeting closed at 9.15 p.m.

Signed: Date:

Chairman