

## NEWICK PARISH COUNCIL

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the Planning Committee of Newick Parish Council on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> October 2021, 7.00 p.m. at Newick Sports Pavilion, King George V Playing Field, Allington Road, Newick

**Present:** Councillors: B Hodge (Chairman of this committee), A. Sippetts, V Marchant, M. Thew, B Whitlock, T Whitlock & C. Wickens

**In Attendance** Mrs Emma Reece (Clerk)  
Four members of the public

An audio recording was made of the meeting

1. **Apologies for Absence** – Apologies had been received from Cllr. C. Armitage
2. **Disclosure by Members of personal interest in matters on the agenda, the nature of any interest and whether the Member regards the interest as prejudicial under the terms of the Code of Conduct.** – Cllr. Thew declared an interest in application LW/21/068 - 5 Woodbine Lane, as she lives next door to the property.
3. **Questions or Statements by Members of the Public** –

Member of the public one (MOP1) spoke against the application LW/21/0700 (Land At The Telephone Exchange) and on behalf of residents backing onto the site. He stated that the new application still does not use the whole site and the application is 36 (greater than the Neighbourhood plan). He noted that the design statement contained 13 points that likely came from the Planning Officer report from the previous application. He stated the application refers to a planning statement which has not been included online and that 3 storey flats are still included in application.

Cllr. Thew asked MOP1 about a Police report on the previous application on the footpath linking the site to Church Road.

MOP1 replied that a 3-page document from Sussex police was online from the previous application and it deemed the footpath unacceptable.

Member of the public two (MOP2) – Spoke against the Land At The Telephone Exchange application. He said he hoped the Parish Council would give due regard to the neighbours objections. He said he would have expected the developer to be more mindful of the impact on existing properties perhaps with the use of bungalows next to existing properties. He stated he has asked the developer if he would consider selling residents a strip of land to mitigate the development. He stated that existing residents are not trying to object at any cost but felt this new application offers a poorer design and impacts on neighbouring properties even more than the previous one.

Cllr. Sippetts stated that it would be interesting to know if the full application was with Lewes District Council due to the omissions in the online portal.

4. **4.1 Planning Applications** (If plans available on LDC website)

*LW/21/0700 was brought forward*

LW/21/0700	Land At The Telephone Exchange Goldbridge Road	Erection of 36 dwellings (including 40 % affordable), access, landscaping and associated infrastructure (re-submission)  It was unanimously agreed to <b>object</b> to the application for the following reasons;
------------	---	---

		<p>The applicant has applied to build 36 homes, an uplift of 20% specified in HO3.3. Furthermore the full extent of the site has not been used despite this significant percentile increase. This may be seen in the 2 diagrams of the relevant sites in the paragraph above referring to Policy HO3. The most westerly section of HO.3 being unused in the application with the obvious potential for subsequent development at a later date:</p> <p>There are no bungalows, either detached or semi-detached included in the application and contrary to Policy HO3.4. This provision was also recommended by the Lewes Planning Officer and acknowledged in the applicants Design and Access statement page 12. This is also contrary to Policy HO1.4 with regard to the provision of accommodation with larger rooms for older people downsizing but requiring homes with larger rooms. For many of these persons bungalows are the most suitable form of housing. Policy HO1.4 clearly indicates the desire to provide for both this elderly category of person as well as for those seeking starter homes on site HO3:</p> <p>The provision for car parking contravenes Policy HO1.5 in that virtually all allocated spaces are located in front of the houses in conspicuous locations and not inconspicuously towards the rear. This provides for an urban appearance in an area adjacent to a Conservation area with no green demarcation between housing and paved areas:</p> <p>It contravenes Policy HO1.3 by building homes of a greater height than 2 storeys. The applicant has attempted to circumvent this by referring to them as having the second storey “partially enclosed within the roof space” and by locating them next to houses with a higher roofline than normal for a typical two storey house. A comparison between type 1 houses and other houses illustrated within the D &amp; A statement (pages 30/31) clearly shows this attempt; and</p> <p>Policy HO3.5 requires the private footway between the site and Church Road to be made suitable and available for public use. It does not.</p> <p>This site was allocated 30 homes in the carefully considered NNP in order to provide adequate space for it to be developed in accordance with the provisions of the Plan. The NNP was adopted by LDC within its Local Plan. It is only by ignoring the provisions of these Plans that the applicant could seek to increase the housing numbers by 20% and simultaneously use less than the full area available to him.</p> <p>It was agreed that for the old telephone exchange,</p>
--	--	--

		a draft response to LDC had been circulated for comment back to Cllr. Hodge, would be used to register NPC's objection to the development. Members of the Committee were asked to respond back to Cllr. Hodge with suggested additions or changes by Saturday evening.
--	--	--

Three members of the public left the meeting at 7.29pm

LW/21/0336	Ashgrove Goldbridge Road	Conversion of existing garage into separate living space with loft conversion  It was unanimously agreed to <b>object</b> due to insufficient information including No CIL statement and no design and access statement.
LW/21/0685	5 Woodbine Lane	Loft conversion and associated internal works  It was unanimously agreed to make <b>no comment</b> on the basis that the Velux windows are positioned as such that they do not overlook neighbouring properties in a detrimental manner.  Cllr. Thew did not vote on this matter.
LW/21/0700	Land At The Telephone Exchange Goldbridge Road	Erection of 36 dwellings (including 40 % affordable), access, landscaping and associated infrastructure (re-submission)  This application was discussed earlier in the meeting
LW/21/0752	5 Vernons Road	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of single-storey rear  It was unanimously agreed to make <b>no comment</b>

#### 4.2 Approvals/Refusals etc. –

It was noted that the following applications had been **approved** by Lewes District Council;

LW/21/0583 12 High Hurst Close - creation of first floor on host property facilitated by a raise in ridge height

LW/21/0674 Strawberry Cottage - tennis court with 3m high fence

#### 4.3 Tree works applications – There were no tree works applications.

#### 4.4 Chagley Corner proposed development – The response to this consultation was noted.

#### 4.5 To consider response to appeal for site at Coldharbour Lane, Chailey APP/P1425/APP/P1425/W/21/3273883 – a draft document was circulated and this was agreed to send unchanged.

#### 4.6 To consider letter to Maria Caulfield MP regarding housing figures for Lewes District Council – a draft document was circulated, and this was agreed to send unchanged.

*The Meeting Closed at 7.59 p.m.*

**Signed:** .....**Dated:**.....

The Clerk: Mrs E. Reece  
Tel. 07521511643    Email [newickpc@newick.net](mailto:newickpc@newick.net)