



**MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING
MEETING
HELD ON 8TH JULY, 2006, IN THE PAVILION PLUMPTON
GREEN**

PRESENT:

Mr K. Speirs
Mrs. B. Watson
Mrs C Thompson
Mrs. S Angel
Mr. T. Hawthorne
Mr.P Ramsay
Mr. K. Beard

11 Members of the public

1. APOLOGIES

Mr. R. Taylor, Mrs. S. Akers.

2. MINUTES:

None to sign

3.APPLICATIONS

Mr. Speirs and Mrs. Watson both declared an interest and signed the book at the start of the meeting; they left the room when the PC discussed the application LW06/0761.

Mr. K Beard chaired the first part of the meeting as Mr. Speirs, Vice Chairman declared an interest in this application.

Comments were taken from residents. Units 5 and 6 appeared not to have been changed but were slightly taller. Members of the public living in Station Close were concerned about noise problems at the weekends and evenings, as this has not been a problem as the garage only operated Monday to Friday and not in the evenings. These properties are only 12 feet away from 6 Station Close.

There was a query regarding the density per hectare allowed; planning guidelines recommend 48 dwellings per hectare, but recent a government document (PPS 3) suggest 30-40 is acceptable in rural areas. This application exceeds these recent density levels.

Nos 3 and 4 have been lowered but properties of residents in East View Fields are now very close to the proposed new properties.

The parking on the road is increasing and with potentially four cars per house from the development would cause problems, and would possibly use the car park at the Playing Field or East View Fields, when there was nowhere else to park. With the new development in Wivelsfield residents from there are using Plumpton Station and parking their cars in the village. Parking in this area is potentially the worst part of the village with the railway crossing very close; extra car movements (developer has allowed two spaces per unit and this is over the amount required) would be inevitable from the development.

The Parish Council opposes this application on the following grounds.

1. Over intensification of the site. There should only be 7 maximum properties on this site – recent PPS3 government document states that density levels of 30-40 dwellings per

hectare are permitted in rural areas, and the present application exceeds this.

2. The visibility for those going to or leaving the development is poor onto an already busy road, where there are often many cars parked on Station Road. This could also pose a danger to children going to school, and a high proportion of people over sixty live in the village and use the pavements near here to walk to other areas of the village. The development would be in close proximity to the level crossing, causing potential problems with parking. The car parking spaces would increase the amount of traffic passing through the village. Those unable to park near the development may use the car park at the Playing Field, or park in East View Fields which is unacceptable. The recent development in Wivelsfield has increased the usage of Plumpton Station, where residents of that village park their cars around the station area. There are already extra vehicle movements in the village from the Race Meetings, Car Boot Sales and large vehicles which will be going to the Sandpit during the next 10 years.

3. The patios of No 3 and 4 is within 1 ½ and 2 metres of Nos 4 and 6 East View Fields which would cause lack of privacy and an increase in noise.

4. The Velux windows proposed in Nos 3 and 4 would be acceptable if these were made of frosted glass and are non opening, otherwise they would overlook existing properties in East View Fields.

The PC would not like to see any loft conversions permitted in these properties.

A recommendation would be that the garages should be open, without doors, which would encourage owners to use them as garages and not for any other purposes.

5. The PC are concerned about the contamination of the land from petrol tanks which were used here in the past, and would like reassurance that all tests have taken place to prove that this is no longer a hazard. The Council would like to know how these tanks were filled in.

6. The visual impact of Nos. 5 and 6 is unacceptable as it is larger in scale than any buildings on other housing estates in the village.

7. There is a potential increase in noise to particularly, No 6 Station Close, which is only 12 feet away from the proposed development. At present the garage does not operate during weekends and evenings; the occupation of new properties would mean that noise levels to No 6 would increase considerably which would be unacceptable.

LW/06/0779 Bryndon, Station Road, Plumpton Green. Erection of rear conservatory for Mr. Greening.

The Council supports this application.

LW/06/0764 Beetle Garage, Station Road, Plumpton Green. Formation of hardstanding to allow for parking of customers' cars, cars for sale and staff vehicles (resubmission of LW/06/01238) for Beetle Garage.

Mr. Speirs asked for comments on this. A resident had spearheaded a group of local residents and had made several submissions to LDC regarding this application. Previous applications had been turned down, some very recently, and one in 1993 had been refused for several reasons. It was thought a good idea to leave the hedge at the front. Concerns was for the increase of traffic, pollution etc that extra movements would cause since

the inception of Simon Wickins Car Sales had expanded this business. It was thought it was more appropriate for an urban area than a small rural village.

The Parish Council strongly opposes this application, for the following reasons:

1. It is understood that the business has recently expanded which has been due to importing Simon Wickins Car Sales which has traded for years in Bognor Regis. Cars are sold from the website www.simonwickins.co.uk and customers come from all over the country to see cars at the Beetle Garage. This scale of business is not acceptable in a rural village for the following reasons:
 - a. Cars belonging to prospective buyers are stopping in the middle of the village, parking in an already busy area with a single pavement which is very dangerous for pedestrians, children and mothers with prams. It would create additional driving hazards as sight lines are blocked for cars coming out of nearby driveways.
 - b. An increase in noise from the business including car alarms.
 - c. Visiting car repairers working on the highway has been observed by many residents, causing hazards on the highway and pollution issues.
 - d. Testing of cars up and down Station Road, particularly on straight areas of road leading from the village to the Plough, where potentially cars could be driven at speed. The village has a 30 mph limit.
 - e. Low loader vehicles delivering cars.
 - f. Recent evidence of car valeting taking place; environmental pollution due to usage of chemicals used in this activity.
 - g. More movements during the weekends and evenings when people come to view used cars. Sales staff may not be present, so would this contravene existing working hours?
 - h. No extra space for the mobile bodywork repairers who come to repair cars, which would inevitably mean that this activity would take place on the hardstanding or highway.
 - i. Invasion of security lighting to properties around.
 - j. The garage is 40' wide, and is only 87 cm away from the back of a residents property in Station Road.
Up to 20 used cars on the plot next to the garage, which would need to be driven in and out for maintenance and valeting.
 - k. Concern that the existing use of garages in the Paddocks, Plumpton Green will be further utilised to conduct the car sales business, which will inevitably increase due to expansion of business. Riddens Lane (a private road) is in poor repair, and increased movements would only cause further deterioration. Residents living here would experience further noise nuisance.
2. To date there have been two planning applications and one appeal which have been turned down, one very recently.
An application in 1993 was refused, with reasons given: inappropriate development, did not fall within Lewes District Council's rural Local Plan, detrimental to a rural area and the

business being more suitable for an urban area.
Why should this application be allowed when the above comments
in number 2 still stand?

This business is suitable for an urban area, not a small rural
peaceful village.

CHAIRMAN