



**MINUTES OF PARISH COUNCIL PLANNING
MEETING
HELD ON 8TH APRIL, 2006, IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM,
VILLAGE HALL, PLUMPTON GREEN**

PRESENT:

Mr R. Taylor
Mrs B Watson
Mrs C Thompson

Mrs. S. Angel
Mr. K. Beard
Mr. P Ramsay
Mr. T. Hawthorne
Mrs. S. Akers
16 Members of the Public
Agent Parker Dann

1. APOLOGIES

Mr. K. Speirs.

2. MINUTES:

None to sign

3. APPLICATIONS

Mrs. Watson declared an interest in the following application and signed the book. Mr. Speirs, who was not present, also has an interest and signed the book.

Clerk was handed two letters of objections.

**LW/06/0353 Plumpton Garage, Station Road, Plumpton Green.
Erection of 2 x 1 bed flats, 2 x 2 bed flats, 6 x three bed houses and 1
x 2 bed house for Battle of Lewes Developments; Ltd.**

The Parish Council opposes this application for the following reasons:

1. Over intensification of the site.
2. No low cost housing.
3. PC do not wish to see existing house demolished, and feel this should be incorporated into the scheme.
4. Loss of hairdresser's business which is well used by local people who have no transport to go elsewhere due to insufficient public transport. Relocation for hairdresser would be very difficult. PC would like hairdressers premises to remain.
5. Several local businesses have disappeared over the last few years. PC encourages local businesses.
6. It is understood that there is a well in the centre of the proposed plot and this needs investigation.
7. It would appear from the plans that there are no frontages to the proposed units. The rest of the village houses have frontages and this would make the proposed houses look out of place.
8. The access to the site is on the edge of the road. Increased traffic movements on a busy road where pedestrians, especially children, going to and from school, could be at risk. There have been two accidents involving children.

9. Inadequate parking, 1.5 per unit. Some parking are garages, and occupants are not necessarily going to use their garages to park their cars. No visitor parking on site.
10. Extra buildings could impact on drainage soak away system.
11. Height of units 4,5,6,7 and 8 is excessive in relation to existing vernacular buildings; (site surrounded by single storey bungalows). 7 and 8 are higher than existing building. Whilst using existing boundary line, units 9, 10 and 11 are too far forward and this could cause visibility problems when leaving the site.
12. PC would like to have building line drawn from Railway Cottage to the front of Candella. Whilst existing building is being used to set the building line precedence on site, it should be noted that this is a small building both in height and stature and does not have an imposing effect on location. Elevations of all proposed units do not have the same visual impact as Railway Cottage and Candella, and different heights would not be in keeping with aforementioned buildings.
13. If low level buildings are built, all units particularly, 4,5 and 6, permitted development rights to place Velux roof windows should be excluded as they would overlook other properties.
14. Nos. 4,6 and 8 East View Fields would suffer lack of privacy, noise nuisance, and would be overlooked by proposed units 4,5, and 6 which have patios close to the aforementioned properties.
15. Proposed white fascia boarding on all buildings is not in keeping with the location. Iron railings round Units 1, 2 and 3 would not be in keeping with the location.
16. A possible planning gain mentioned in application for the provision of extra facilities for children within the village is not relevant.

CHAIRMAN