



c/o 8 Saville Gardens, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9RR.

Clerk: Mrs. I. Marshall, BA(Hons), FILCM.

Tel: 01403 783477 e-mail: kirdfordpc@gmail.com

You are hereby summoned to attend a Planning Committee Meeting which will be held in Wren Cottage, Kirdford, on Thursday, 14th January, 2016 commencing at **5.00 p.m.**, when the following business will be considered and transacted.

Date: 11th January, 2016.

I. Marshall.
Mrs. I. Marshall
Clerk to the Council

A G E N D A

1. Apologies for Absence – to receive both apologies and reasons for absence.
2. To Receive Declarations of Interest.
3. To consider and comment upon the following Planning Applications :-
KD/15/03367/FUL: Cala Homes application – to comment on the Additional Information. (Appendix I)
4. To Note Planning Decisions received from Chichester District Council :-
5. Enforcement.
6. Think Villages – to discuss the Council's strategy.

PRESS AND PUBLIC WELCOME TO ATTEND

APPENDIX I

CALA HOMES APPLICATION
KD/15/03367/FUL

Cllr. Mr. Campbell had looked at the new/updated documents but not compared to originals so some points will no doubt be repeated :-

1. General

- Whilst I agree that we should continue to focus on the key issue – phasing to meet local need – I think we must ensure all matters of concern are clearly documented as this is a full detailed application and if it were to be approved we would be stuck with the submitted designs, etc.
- Numbers – the PC has now agreed to 54 – we must ensure we do not over deliver on this site given other sites/numbers in the NP.
- We should continue to press for the HNS as this is unlikely to support the applicant's numbers.
- In line with the process that CDC have asked us to adopt we should request a meeting with the Officer before the officer's recommendation and report is prepared, if he is minded to approve. This is, of course separate to any representation to the Planning Committee.
- Given that one of the applicant's main arguments against phasing is viability we should continue to press for sight of the viability appraisal (if we can't get this officially, we should ask appropriate questions).

2. Design Statement

- There is reference to discussions with the PC and an implication that we are happy with the layout, etc. – is the submitted site layout/design in line with what the PC has seen- and were reasonably happy with – previously – we need to raise any concerns if it is not.
- Affordable housing all in one area.
- New footpath is still shown but this is across private land and I don't think there is agreement with the landowner I think this is very relevant as the applicant uses the existence of the new footpath to position the devt as close to amenities and also if it is not put in place it will surely affect the transport statement as there will be increased car journeys.
- Access is said to be via existing but I think is not wide enough and widening (or perhaps even the existing entrance) is over Common Land – Common Land swap(with Leconfield not PC)
- There is reference to some properties being colour washed to 1st floor level – I think we need to be careful to avoid the look we have in Bramley Close.
- Refers to design to code 3 rather than code 5 in our NP
- Refers to solar panels – good but need to ensure appearance is acceptable – no point having red clay tiles then covering with solar panels!
- SUDS referred to as subject to ground conditions – what if not suitable?
- States that there is no flood risk – I question the basis of this given recent severe weather events – the past is clearly no guide to the future.

3. Transport Statement

- Refers to 50 houses?
- Refers to Weald School – thought this was full?

- Refers to bus to Billingshurst station but in the real world this is not a practical proposition for most.
 - Entrance visibility – the sight line towards the junction is often obscured by parked cars for the Chapel.
 - The trip rates in 4.3 do not look realistic – although I am sure they comply with some theoretical model!
4. Flood Risk Assessment
- States that foul sewer needs upgrading – need to ensure this is done.
 - Assumes land drainage is not a risk, but the existing ditch network surrounding the site appears significantly obstructed.
 - Refers to a 1:100 year event plus 30% for climate change – assume this is some accepted formula but given recent weather events and statements by the EA this should be re-examined.
 - They are planning to use aqua-cells (not balancing ponds) but the final outflow is to a small/poorly maintained culvert under Plaistow Road – can this cope?
 - The outflow discharges into the stream that goes through Bramley Close and this already seems overloaded due to discharge from Bramley Close and poor maintenance – I think the whole question of drainage from the site needs a real world assessment rather than what appears to be a desktop review.

Observation of Clerk:

Comments on e-mail 23.12.15 from Paul White, Genesis to Stephen Harris

1. It states that “the application boundary can be extended to include the footpath” which is not within the owners of the application site. It then states that they “can serve notice on the owners once you have confirmed the revised plan meets your requirements”. What happens if the landowners in question object?
2. It states that “the viability assessment is being revised to address your queries on the phasing timescale ... amount of affordable housing in each phase and assumed tenure ...”. They are to advise which parts of the document need to be omitted for commercial confidentiality purposes. The Parish Council has not had sight of this document at all and as far as can be seen, there is no proposal within the application to phase the housing.
3. Southern Water requirement to upsize the pipe – further details will follow in the New Year – will the Parish Council have sight of these?
4. Are there details available of the proposed size/capacity of the proposed underground aquacell storage tanks. What happens when these are full and then there is more heavy rainfall?
5. The land at the entrance to this site is Common Land under private ownership.
6. Service Statement that is being drafted – will the Parish Council get sight of this.
7. It is noted that there is a **revised** Design and Access Statement and plans. The drawings are so small on a laptop that it is impossible to see what the revisions are.

8. No lighting other than low bollard lighting will be included if required. Kirdford is a Dark Sky Area. Roads to remain private and responsibility of the management company – future maintenance concerns.
9. Housing Needs Survey – still not seen by Parish Council.
10. Bat Survey – a new rare species recently found nearby.

Design and Access Statement.

Section 3

First para - Affordable Housing – states “with a mix of one, two three and four bedroom flats and houses”. The application is only for 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units.

Third para – “The 16 affordable dwellings created are distributed across the site. The plan clearly show that all the affordable housing is in the south eastern corner of the site and not distributed across the site. These to be “for both affordable rent for intermediate tenure” – assume mean ‘or’. What is the ratio of each to be? Stated yet to be determined.

Section 4

Second para – discussions taken place between developer and Parish Council – however the last drawings the Parish Council had sight of included 4 and 5 bedroom properties and it was made clear to the developer that this did not meet the requirements of the Neighbourhood Plan and it objected thereto. The first time this Council saw the current plan was upon receipt of this application.

Section 5

Visual Impact – “boundary zones remain within the ‘public’ realm – when has a management company been ‘public’.

It talks of incorporating the existing stream and footpath into a wider landscape context – is this land within the ownership of Cala?

Section 6

Page 9 – it states that “The scheme layout is deliberately at its most dense in the south east corner” – this is where they propose putting the Affordable Housing.

Section 9

Second para – refers to “Level 3” whereas the Neighbourhood Plan requires “Level 5”.

Solar panels – are there plans showing the proposed locations of these?

Page 13 – Water – “SuDS drainage scheme – dependent on suitable ground conditions being confirmed” – what happens if the ground conditions are not suitable?

Page 14 – Pollution Control – Any street lighting provided will be designed to minimize light pollution – repeat Kirdford is a Dark Sky Area, so there should be no street lighting.

Page 15 – Climate Change Adaptation – it states the site has “good connectivity to transport networks” – The Parish Council would disagree with this statement.

Transport Statement

Existing Highway Network – 2.4 – the grass verge referred to is Common Land.

Accessibility to Local Facilities – 2.11 – School – capacity?

Site Access and Arrangements – Page 8 – Photograph 6 – view in southerly direction – surely when the Chapel is occupied cars would be parked and the visibility would be extremely limited.