



Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held in Wren Cottage, Kirdford on Thursday, 14th January, 2016, commencing at 5.00 p.m.

Present: Cllr. Mrs. J. Robertson (Chairman)
Cllr. Mr. I. Campbell
Cllr. Miss S. Pinder

49. **Apologies for Absence.** Apologies for absence had been received from Cllr. Mr. Ransley (personal reasons).
50. **To Receive Declarations of Interest.** There were no declarations of interest.
51. **To consider and comment upon the following Planning Applications :-**

- (a) **KD/15/03367/FUL: Cala Homes Land on the East Side of Plaistow Road, Kirdford – Proposed construction of 54 residential dwellings and associated works – to comment on the Additional Information.** It was **AGREED :-**

General

- That the additional information did not resolve the problem of the fact that this application did not meet the requirements within the Kirdford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan for phasing of development to meet local need.
- Given that one of the applicant's main arguments against phasing is 'viability' the Parish Council should continue to press for sight of the Viability Appraisal in order that it may see why the applicant considers it unviable. This has meant that the Parish Council is not in a position to challenge this. The Parish Council would appreciate sight of this.
- It should be pointed out that the Parish Council had never agreed to 54 dwellings on this site.
- The site layout was not the same as the last one seen by the Parish Council prior to seeing this application as it contained 4 and 5 bedroom properties and it was made clear to the developer that this did not meet the requirements of the Kirdford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan and it objected thereto. Members were not happy with the aspects of the site layout and certain houses.
- The affordable housing is all in one small area and not pepper potted throughout the site; likely preventing phasing of these and contrary to current good practice.
- The Parish Council only received a copy of the Housing Needs Survey on the 12th January, 2016, therefore it has not had long to study this document and would like to reserve the right to come back with further comments on this document. However, initially it would comment that it is stated that there are 471 dwellings in the Parish – how do they know that only 433 were usually occupied? It states that the total

SAMPLE of 347 households were issued with a Survey. How can they therefore state that 17.5% return (82) out of 471 when they did not send to every household and who is to say that the 124 households that were not sent a Survey did not require housing!

Design and Access Statement

- The proposed new footpath is still shown (this is across private land whose ownership is separate from the application site) and the existence of the new footpath is used to say that the development is close to amenities. However, should this not be put in place surely this would affect the Transport Statement as there could be issues with increased car journeys. Also, should this footpath not prove to be possible, there is no provision for a footway from the main entrance of the site down Plaistow Road, etc., which would be required for the safety of residents and children to get to the school bus pick-up point, etc. To the knowledge of the Parish Council the owners of the land have not been approached and are against a new path across their land.
- The access to the site is said to be via the existing entrance, but this would obviously not be wide enough and require widening and yet again this is over privately owned land not in the ownership of the site owners and is also **Common Land**.
- There is reference to some properties being colour washed to the first floor level, but there is considered to be a need to ensure the look in Bramley Close is avoided.
- There is reference to Solar Panels; these would need to be sympathetically placed. Is thought not being given to other forms of 'green' energy?
- Page 13 – Water - SUDS drainage scheme referred to as 'subject to ground conditions' – what happens if the ground conditions are not suitable? KPNDP Policy EM1 refers to a payment to help maintain the ditch system – surely this should apply as in any event surface water will enter the poorly maintained ditch system and the aqua-cell outfall will enter the poorly maintained stream (it is a common issue when disused farm land is developed)!
- The document states that there is no flood risk. Whilst there is no history of flooding, this could be because currently it is a field and therefore should a section get flooded at times, this would not concern anyone. It is intended for all the water to eventually go into the stream through Bramley Close and this is not well maintained and is often blocked at certain points and the stream is a raging torrent in heavy rain – it is already overloaded especially now surface water from Bramley Close discharges into the stream (some discharge pipes are already under the water level).
- It is intended to install aqua-cells – it is wondered what happens when this is full and cannot take any more water?
- There does not appear to be any reference as to where the proposed 'gas' tank is to be located.
- Section 3 – First paragraph – 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.

- Section 3 – Third paragraph – “The 16 affordable dwellings created are distributed across the site”. The plan clearly shows 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” – it is assumed ‘for’ should be ‘or’. What is the ratio of each to be? It states that this is yet to be determined.
- Section 5 – Visual Impact – it stated “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 – it is not felt that this land is 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 all the Affordable Housing.
- Section 9 – Second paragraph – refers to “Level 3” whereas the Kirdford Parish Neighbourhood Plan requires “Level 5”.
- Page 14 – Pollution Control – It states 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 had “good connectivity to transport networks” – The Parish Council would strongly disagree with this statement.

Transport Statement

- The number of houses stated in this document is 50.
- There is reference to the Weald School in Billingshurst – does this school and the junior schools in the area have sufficient capacity to cope with all the other development in this area?
- Refers to a bus to Billingshurst station, but this service is unreliable and non-existent at times it is needed and it would not be possible to rely upon it to catch a train to London. There are two in the mornings; 07.10 and 08.00, but there is only one (other than the school bus) that goes to Kirdford from Horsham/Billingshurst and this is at 18.41 and is not a practical proposition for most. The first bus terminates in Billingshurst whereas the 08.00 terminates in Horsham.
- The trip rates in 4.3 do not look realistic, irrespective of whether they comply with some theoretical model!
- The outflow discharges (as stated earlier) into the stream that goes through Bramley Close and this already seems overloaded due to discharge from Bramley Close and poor maintenance. The whole question of drainage from the site needs a ‘real world’ assessment rather than what appears to be a desktop review.
- 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 (towards the junction) – when the Chapel is occupied cars would be parked and the visibility would be extremely limited.

Flood Risk Assessment

- The foul sewer pipes need upgrading and it would be essential that this was done.
- This document assumes that land drainage is not a risk, but the existing ditch network surrounding the site appears significantly obstructed.
- This refers to a 1:100 year event plus 30% for climate change. Whilst this is possibly some accepted formula, given recent weather events and statements by the Environment Agency, it is considered that this should be re-examined.
- In this document they once more refer to the use of aqua-cells (not balancing ponds) but the final outflow is to a small/poorly maintained culvert under Plaistow Road. It is wondered whether this can cope.

E-mail dated 23rd December, 2015 from Paul White, Genesis to Stephen Harris

- It states that “the application boundary can be extended to include the footpath” which is not thought to be within the ownership 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, which the Parish Council understands they will?
- 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. As previously stated 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. **The Parish Council again requests sight of this document for formal review and comment.**
- Southern Water requirement to upsize the pipe – further details will follow in the New Year – will the Parish Council have sight of these?
- Are there details available of the proposed size/capacity of the proposed underground aqua-cell storage tanks?
- Service Statement that is being drafted – will the Parish Council get sight of this?
- 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.
- No lighting other than low bollard lighting will be included if required. **Kirdford is a Dark Sky Area.**
- The roads are to remain private and the responsibility of the management company which gives rise to future maintenance concerns of roads and drainage.
- Bat Survey – a new rare species had recently been found nearby. A copy of this Survey had been sent to Chichester District Council.

The Clerk should put the above comments into a letter to Chichester District Council and arrange a meeting in Kirdford with the Officer dealing with this application.

52. **To Note Planning Decisions received from Chichester District Council.**
- (a) **KD/15/03790/TCA:** Mr. A. Hall, Black Bear, Village Road, Kirdford – Notification of intention to fell 1 no. Ash Tree. **NOT TO PREPARE A TREE PRESERVATION ORDER.**
53. **Enforcement.** No matters were raised.
54. **Think Villages** – to discuss the Council’s strategy. Think Villages had requested a meeting with this Committee regarding the proposals within the Kirdford Parish Neighbourhood Development Plan at the bottom of Townfield and had suggested some dates. It was **AGREED** that there was a need for a pre-meeting with all members of the Committee prior to arranging this.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 6.30 p.m.