



**MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING MEETING
HELD 3 MAY, 2018 AT PLUMPTON VILLAGE HALL**

ATTENDED

Councillors

Catherine Jackson (Chair)
Gail Murphy
Paul Stevens

NOTES OF MEETING / ADVISORY NOTES TO LDC

Reference: LW/18/0259

Location: Site adjoining 4 Strawlands, Plumpton Green, East Sussex

Proposal: Development of 12 dwellings (6 two bedroom Bungalow, 4 two bedroom flats and 2 one bedroom flats) for occupation by older people over 55

There were no declarations of interest

Decision: In view of the inclusion of this site in the recently made Plumpton Parish Neighbourhood Plan (site 5.2 in the Plan), the Planning Committee **supports** this outline planning application.

However, it notes a number of major concerns about the proposed development raised by statutory bodies in their formal responses, and by residents of neighbouring properties in Wells Close and Strawlands.

1. Surface water flooding. This is raised by ESCC in its response regarding the proposed SUDS in the application. Residents reported frequent surface water flooding and stressed the high risk in this area, with essential drainage ditches serving the neighbouring Woodgate Meadow estate as well as the site itself. We are concerned by the lack of detail in the outline application. The addition of a pond at the highest point on the land seems inappropriate. It was also raised that this was the wettest area in the village. Any solution for surface water and sewage management should take an aggregated view of all the developments to the east of Station Road (including those on the Glebe land and the land to the rear of Oakfield (policies 5.3 and 5.4 in the PPNP), recently granted planning permission by LDC.

2. Foul water drainage. The application makes no mention of how the development of the site will impact on existing major sewage management problems in the north of Plumpton Green. It is noted that the developers of the land to the rear of Oakfield have made provision to link the site to the main sewer south of what is known to be a 'pinchpoint' at the centre of the village, which is a source of frequent problems leading to sewage backflow into residents' homes and gardens in Wells Close and properties along Station Road. These problems can only be exacerbated by the addition of 12 new homes.

3. Access to the site via Wells Clos. Residents of Wells Close pointed to a previous planning application that had been turned down as the access road was considered unsuitable. They also expressed concerns about the safety of children playing in the road, due to increased traffic that would be generated by the 12 new dwellings. However, the committee notes that ESCC has adopted the spur linking Wells Close to the site with a view to creating an access road.

4. Density. Residents expressed concern that the density of the site was disproportionate to neighbouring properties. There was concern that the bulk, scale and positioning of the block of flats is disproportionate in relation to neighbouring properties and inappropriate for a rural development, and will overlook 9 Wells Close and neighbouring bungalows.

5. Biodiversity. Concerns were expressed about the loss of habitats as creation of the SUDS pond would require removal of mature trees, which of themselves are an essential feature in water management as they absorb ground water and hold together the soil structure. There was also concern that development might result in the accidental or otherwise loss of mature trees, and/or damage to roots. It is noted that some of the trees are on land belonging to Woodgate Meadow.

6. Public right of way. The proposed plan repositions the public right of way that passes along the north boundary of the site.

The planning committee notes that a developer has yet to be engaged, and hopes that any developer will consult constructively with residents, as had been the case with the application for development on the land at the rear of Oakfield.

Reference: LW/18/0246

Location: 4 Strawlands, Plumpton Green, East Sussex

Proposal: Erection of one x three-bedroom detached dwelling

There were no declarations of interest

Decision: The Planning Committee **does not support** this planning application, on the following grounds:

1. Parking and access. The proposal makes provision for two parking spaces in front of the proposed dwelling. However, the house itself will be built on land that formerly provided garage and parking space for the existing property at No 4 Strawlands, which is currently being extended into another 3-bed house by the same developer. Therefore, 4 Strawlands will not have parking provision. This contravenes ESCC parking policy for new developments, which requires a minimum of two parking spaces per 3-bed property.

The application wrongly states that there is 'street parking' along Strawlands. This is not the case. Strawlands is a single-track, privately owned, unadopted road. Existing properties have permission to use the road to access their properties but all have off-road parking. Parking along Strawlands is not permitted by the owner.

Unobstructed 24-hour access to Strawlands is essential for South East Water to service the pumping station on the south side of the road, and for access for emergency, refuse collection, domestic fuel oil and other delivery vehicles.

The application also states: 'At the far end of Strawlands is a typical residential hammerhead that as well as servicing emergency vehicles also acts as a turning space'. Again this is incorrect. That area of land is privately owned and there is no right to use it for parking or turning, by any vehicle. It is mostly blocked from access by cones, although this has been suspended while the building

work is undertaken at No4. Moreover, that piece of land is part of another planning application (0259 above) for the development of 12 homes.

Given the Strawlands is a single-track road, vehicles parking in front of the new house will not have room to turn and may need to back out of Strawlands.

The application illustrations seem to suggest that residents of the existing No 4 could park in front of their home. The depth of this area is 10 feet, which is insufficient to accommodate the length of most cars without blocking access to the proposed new dwelling.

2. Design and materials. The appearance of the new house is incompatible with the neighbouring properties. The roof pitch is higher than the immediately adjacent Nos 3 and 4 and the house is set further back, making it still more incongruous. The rear dormer does not match that of No4, even though the property is being built by the same developer.

3. Density. The new property is extremely close to No4 and to the nearest dwelling in the proposed development on the neighbouring site. This density is inappropriate to the rural setting.

4. Privacy. The top floor dormer window overlooks the properties at Nos 3 & 4 Strawlands and properties in the adjoining Woodgate Meadow.