

# Wisborough Green Parish Council

## Draft Minutes of The Planning Committee to be agreed on 17<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Date: Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2017

Present: Mr A Burbridge (AB), Mr N Beresford (NB), Mr P Drummond (PD)  
Mr A Jackson (Planning Committee Chairman), Mr M Newell (MN)

Apologies: Mr H True (HT), Mr M Watson (MW)

Held in: The Committee Room, Village Hall

Members of Public: 12

Mr D Stewart, Land & Planning Manager, Jones Homes (Southern) Ltd  
Mr W Simons, Senior Land Buyer, Jones Homes (Southern) Ltd

The Chairman opened the meeting at 8.00 pm.

1. Apologies for Absence: Apologies were received and accepted from Mr True and Mr Watson.

2. Declaration of Members' Interests: Being a neighbour, MN declared his interest in the Stonewall Cottage application. PD also knew the applicant, but had not had contact for many years. In terms of the Far Meadow application, all noted that the applicant was a Parish Councillor who was not in attendance.

3. Public Participation: The members of the public attended the meeting in relation to the Land South of Meadowbank. All were given an opportunity to speak and the following views and concerns were expressed:

- There had obviously been considerable debate with Chichester District Council (CDC) and it was unclear from the CDC website as to the status of the application.

*AJ gave a summary of the process to date and explanation to the Outline and Reserve Matters applications. In response to the Parish Council's last objection letter, some amended plans had now been submitted to the local planning authority. The application was scheduled to go to the CDC Planning Committee on 11<sup>th</sup> October 2017.*

- Concern was expressed that street lighting would be included – there was some ambiguity in the application. The resident was keen to understand the Parish Council's position on lighting and what lighting the developer proposed, particularly as the police commented on lighting in relation to anti-social behaviour. The absence of street lighting in the rest of the village was noted.

*AJ explained that the Parish Council promoted the South Downs National Park Authority's Dark Skies policy as the village was a 'gateway' to the Park and had included a Street Lighting Policy within the Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The Parish Council had previously submitted comment in this regard.*

*Mr Stewart was invited to address the meeting to clarify. He explained that any lighting was yet to be confirmed. There were matters reserved by condition on the original outline permission, some of which had been discharged, but those that had not included road design, drainage and lighting. West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) would be responsible for giving approval as the highways authority. There was no detailed lighting scheme to show at this stage, but WSSCC would be involved; the proposal would be shared when drawn up.*

- Whilst acknowledging the importance of renewal energy sources, concern was expressed at the potential noise created by air source heat pumps.
- Pedestrian access to the village was again raised as a real safety issue, residents expressing concern for the potential of a serious accident due to the narrowness, as well as poor condition, of the pavement into the village and the increased foot traffic.

*AJ advised that this matter had been raised for the original outline permission and throughout the planning process as the Parish Council also recognised this concern, particularly with extra families using the pavement in close proximity to fast and large traffic. The Parish Council raised this in the early stages of planning but was unsuccessful in obtaining any specific traffic calming; WS Highways did not identify with this concern. A good pavement would be provided in front of the site but there was no ability to enhance the existing pavement into the village due to property boundaries. The Parish Council had provided comments and had attempted to influence the local authority to provide safer access for pedestrians but without success. He reminded that that the Parish Council did not determine*

*applications and as such, members of the public were invited to contact CDC Planners and the local West Sussex County Councillor.*

- The speed of traffic and overtaking, particularly with a new access, was highlighted as a safety concern. It was felt that double white no overtaking lines should be extended.  
*The Clerk advised that the Parish Council's Traffic Management Group had already discussed with WSCC and would be following up.*
- It was questioned whether consideration had been given to the many additional traffic movements in and out of the site. Many residents already experienced visibility issues, particularly with the speed of traffic, expressing concern that there were already multiple entrances and private driveways on the road.  
*AJ advised that new developments had consideration for access and infrastructure and all stakeholders were given an opportunity to comment upon provisions. PD advised that additional signage would highlight the entrance which had the potential to reduce speed.* Dismissed as unlikely by residents. Disappointment was expressed that local comments were held in little regard by the local authorities.

#### 4. Land South of Meadowbank, Petworth Road WR/16/02096/REM

*Approval of the details of the layout of the site, the scale and the appearance of the buildings and the landscaping of the site.*

The Parish Council had previously submitted objections to the application. Mr David Stewart had requested to meet with the Parish Council to present proposed changes; he and Mr Simons were invited to address the Council. Presentation slides were displayed (which would be made available on the village website).

Mr Stewart explained that he had only recently joined Jones Homes (Southern) Ltd. He had some knowledge of the site but was not totally aware of historical details. The purpose of attending the meeting was to explain proposed changes to address the Parish Council's previous comments.

Explanation was given to the history of Jones Homes Ltd, being a small family run business which had a reputation for providing better quality housing. Nationwide about 600 houses were built annually, with 100-200 in the south. The site in Wisborough Green was purchased from Rydon Homes which obtained the outline permission. In relation to the traffic concerns and pavement provision, this was formally addressed at the outline stage. He could understand the residents' concerns but this was a matter that should have been picked up by the local authorities for the outline application. Developers were often asked to provide better off-site infrastructure but this was always identified early in the planning process. In this case, it was not a developer requirement. WSCC must have considered the access and pavement provision acceptable.

*MN asked if any off-site improvements could be undertaken to address the concern, particularly as the path could be used by young families; he felt that this might be a concern for the marketing.* Mr Stewart advised that it would now be difficult and Highway authority approval would be required; the authority obviously considered the access, traffic numbers and pavement provision acceptable. Speed and visibility splays were reviewed at an early stage and not considered retrospectively; parameters were set at an early stage and if not met, a development would be refused.

A map showing the company offices and sites currently being developed was displayed. As a company, it was attempting to source more sites nearer to head office, on the west side of the M25 corridor. Wisborough Green had been regarded at the time of purchase as a strategic site in an attractive village. Mr Simons reiterated that Jones Homes was a privately owned family run business, founded in 1959 and the founder was still the Chairman. In the south this year it was the intention to build and sell 80-100 units, small numbers compared to the large building companies. He and Mr Stewart had been recruited to move business and sites forward.

Mr Stewart then gave explanation to the changes that had occurred since the outline approval (bungalows changed to houses) and submission of the first Reserve Matters application. They had not taken the Parish Council's adverse comments lightly and had looked at potential changes which would be of mutual benefit. Details were displayed which addressed concerns in the Parish Council's letter dated 8<sup>th</sup> August 2017.

Tile Hanging: Agreed that the original proposal was bitty and not traditional. Had dropped tile hanging on plots 5, 12, 15 and 18 to ground floor lintel and taken around the sides; it was hoped that this went some way to address the Parish Council's concerns.

Zinc Canopies: The regency style canopies were popular on sites in the north but acknowledged that they were out of character for this rural area. Now removed and replaced with flat roofs over projecting bays.

String Courses: At first floor level not common in the rural area so some had been removed.

Landscaping: The areas of common space would remain in the company's ownership and were highlighted on the plan. The front hedge would be retained at 2.5 meters. A maintenance company would be employed by Jones Homes; assurances were given that costs would be kept down and a regular maintenance schedule implemented. The properties would remain as Freehold and a service charge would be levied accordingly. Fell Reynolds was the maintenance company, which Mr Stewart believed was independent to Jones Home. Assurances were given that best value would be achieved and costs were reviewed. Mr Stewart agreed to provide more information about the relationship between the two companies.

The east boundary hedge/fencing was raised by residents as being unsatisfactory and insecure. The description of natural hedge in the application details was incorrect; it was scrub and broken fencing. One resident provided Jones Homes with a solicitor's letter providing boundary details and requested that this be given consideration; Mr Stewart to review. He confirmed that the boundary would be remarked.

Jones Homes would engage a landscape consultant to look at the details and Jones Homes would liaise directly with the residents.

Drainage: Mr Stewart advised that foul water would be discharged into a private on-site system. There would be a pumping station in the left corner which would pump into the existing main sewer.

Parking: Although the Parish Council had raised concerns, no changes were proposed as the current parking provision was already in excess of WS Highway Authority standards; there were 64 spaces within the scheme. Mr Stewart emphasised that the standards were based on studies of residential development which were continually monitored and updated, although he acknowledged that Kent County Council had a different approach by not including garages in the calculation and the use of car barns. He was satisfied that the development would not lead to parking on the A272.

*AJ highlighted that 5 visitor parking spaces had been mentioned but only 4 identified on the plan. There were also a couple of garages that could be moved back by a few feet which would allow an additional car on the drive. AJ felt that within new developments, WSCC standards appeared to be inadequate and assumed that one solution would fit all. The last development within the village exceeded these standards but on a daily basis there were regularly 4 cars parked outside the site on the pavement, creating a safety concern. Any parking on the A272 would be unacceptable and could lead to further pavement parking reducing pedestrian access. The parking spaces relied upon garages being used, but in reality, many garages would be used for storage. The Parish Council felt strongly that parking within the site should be maximised and requested that this be revisited, which Mr Stewart agreed to do.*

Garage Size: Mr Stewart advised that some garages were 3.3m wide, which would allow for a car and side area, others were longer to allow for storage. He agreed to check the garage sizes.

Materials: Two brick colours, red and yellow, had originally been proposed. The yellow had now been removed; Jones Homes acknowledged that it was not in character with the village. The Parish Council's comments about subtle changes and colour had been noted and samples had now been provided to the local planning authority and were displayed. The proposal was to use Marpessa Multi (close to Sussex Red) and Reno Red Multi. Explanation was given to production methods and the difficulties that some developers experienced in obtaining bricks which caused delay. Jones Homes knew that these bricks were obtainable in the next 6 months and believed that the variations in colour produced in production would achieve the subtle variation that the Parish Council requested.

*PD was concerned that the bricks should match others in the village and asked how many differing bonds would be used, which was confirmed as likely to be a single bond. PD highlighted that the Parish Council put great emphasis on the built environment. There were 3-4 different bonds in Sussex/Wisborough Green and he believed that Jones Homes could introduce. He appreciated commercial constraints, but felt that the introduction of variation through bonds (Flemish was used in the locality) would improve kerb appeal. The Parish Council would be keen to work with Jones Homes in this regard; variation could be achieved with bond, brick and mortar colour.*

Tiles: Sussex Red. Mr Stewart was unable to confirm if they were concrete or clay; they would review the samples.

Weatherboarding: Responded to Parish Council's suggestion to introduce weatherboarding to create variation. There were a number of colours that could be used and the preference for white or pastel had been noted. If boarding was white, Mr Stewart felt that brick rather than render was more appropriate for the ground floor. The boarding would be wood and well treated to minimise maintenance.

*AJ advised that white boarding was seen around the village and would be in character. The Parish Council was looking for some gradual variation across the development to help settle the buildings into the built environment, and including white and pastel boarding would be acceptable.*

Air Source Heating: Jones Homes would normally install gas central heating but with the absence of gas in the village, air source heating was being proposed. Some units were not well orientated for the sun and did not have the roof capacity for PV to work well. The primary and most successful renewable energy source, to meet the government targets in this situation, was air source heat pumps. Modern properties were extremely well insulated so the heat input was less than a traditional house. The unit proposed was a Mitsubishi which complied to all the standards set by the Noise Abatement Society; baffle screening could also be installed if required. An expert in the field would be used to look at the location for each appliance in relation to the dwelling and neighbours. Mr Stewart acknowledged that the units could be sited away from the house and sites would be selected to meet noise requirements.

*In relation to PV panels, PD highlighted that roof integrated panels possibly took cost away from tiles and were more attractive. PD questioned whether PV would be combined with air source for the affordable homes, expressing concern at the cost of operation of air source heating. He questioned whether the panel size could be increased from 250w to 350w, which would ultimately reduce cost for the householder and benefit the environment.*

Name: Mr Stewart confirmed that 'Bluebell Meadow' was a marketing name only and was not intended to influence the road name; this was a matter for the local planning authority. He suggested that the Parish Council follow this up with the CDC. *AJ advised that the Parish Council was normally consulted on such matters.*

Price Range: Mr Simons advised that the sales figures had not been confirmed but broadly between £300 - £800,000.

AJ thanked Mr Stewart and Mr Simons for the presentation and invited members of the public to ask any further questions.

- Assurance was sought from residents that during development the impact upon local residents would be considered and minimised. Mr Stewart advised that it would be necessary for a Construction Management Plan to be submitted to the planning authority. This would detail access, delivery times, turning on site, parking, wheel wash and he would also expect, highway wash. The site would have a manager who would be responsible for day to day management and local residents would be provided on commencement with contact details for the local development liaison officer; any issue would be dealt with as a priority. The Parish Council would also be updated as the build progressed.  
*AJ advised residents to get to know the site liaison officer.*
- In terms of build start, Mr Stewart advised that if planning permission was granted next week, the build would start early in the New Year if ground conditions permitted, certainly by March. The build duration would be about 12 months.
- Residents with specific concerns, such as boundary, were advised to speak with Jones Homes directly; the Clerk was authorised to provide contact details to Mr Stewart for two residents.
- When asked about the attenuation pond, Mr Stewart confirmed that the outfall was down towards the river. In terms of the impact when the river flooded, Mr Stewart advised that the local authority had to pass the arrangements, and confirmed that the outfall was controlled.
- A neighbouring resident gave details of a large ditch that used to be located on her boundary but had been filled over the years; water run-off and soil erosion was now every evident as a result. She asked if this water flow had been considered. Mr Stewart advised that it had not been highlighted by engineers but any issue would come to light once on-site.

9.25 pm – the members of public left the meeting room.

The following points were then raised:

- Georgian garage doors were shown on the plans which the Parish Council felt were out of character. Mr Stewart advised that these would be timber tongue and groove throughout.

- The suggestion of working chimneys had been made as the houses were in an area prone to power loss, and would therefore provide an alternative heat source. Being in a rural area there was also perhaps an expectation to have an open fire. It was noted that the larger houses appeared to have chimneys, confirm by Mr Stewart as working, but it was suggested that perhaps the installation of wood burning stoves, with a simpler flue, would be a desirable alternative in some of the smaller housing and would perhaps be appealing in this situation.

Mr Stewart advised that it was not standard policy either way and they would look into the possibility.

PD thanked Mr Stewart and Mr Simons for presenting to the Council and for addressing many of the Council's concerns. The Parish Council was keen to work with Jones Homes to achieve the best development that would both enhance and preserve the character of the village, but also appreciated commercial considerations.

9.30 pm – Mr Stewart and Mr Simons left the meeting room.

AJ reiterated that the decision was being made at the CDC Planning Committee meeting on 11<sup>th</sup> October, with the officer's recommendation to permit. Members agreed that Jones Homes had addressed many of the Parish Council's concerns in the revised drawings which were now published on the CDC website and that making any further representation to CDC was unlikely to influence the decision. It was hoped that Jones Homes would be receptive to Parish Council comments about design. Members expressed a wish to remain in dialogue with both CDC and Jones Homes to try to align the development to the village vernacular.

Members agreed that the Parish Council would write to CDC to advise that the Parish Council withdrew its objection to the application as shown in the substitute plans but requested conditions to help influence design. The Parish Council was also keen to work further with Jones Homes and would write accordingly.

5. New Planning Applications: The following applications were reviewed. Application details had been circulated in advance of the meeting and were also displayed:

WR/17/02594/TCA - Case Officer: - Summer Sharpe - Tree Apps (TCA's and TPA's)	Mr Hugh Pye Stone Wall Cottage Butts Meadow Wisborough Green RH14 0BN Notification of intention to fell 2 no. Chestnut tree (T1 and T3), 1 no. Oak tree (T2), 1 no. Yew tree (T4), and prune 50% on 1 no. Cherry tree (T5). O.S. Grid Ref. 504849/126020 <u>Objection</u> The Parish Council objected to the felling of so many trees close together on the Conservations Area boundary due to the visual impact from the village green and neighbouring properties. The Parish Council would recommend substantial pruning as an alternative.
WR/17/02635/TPA - Case Officer: - Adele Poulton - Tree Apps (TCA's and TPA's)	Keith Charman Far Meadow Newpound Lane Wisborough Green RH14 0EG Removal of 2 no. lateral branches from right side and crown reduce by up to 4.5 metres of the sub-lateral branch at growth point on the left side of 1 no. Oak tree subject to WR/98/01122/TPO. O.S. Grid Ref. 505740/126726 <u>No Objection</u>

6. Any Other Planning Matters to Report: Nothing to report.

7. Date of Next Meeting: Parish Council meeting on Tuesday 17<sup>th</sup> October 2017 at 7.45 pm.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 9.55 pm.

Signed by the Chairman: ..... Date: .....