

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 9th April 2013 at 7.30 pm
Council Chambers, 49 High street Polegate**

Present: M Clewett **MCI** (chair), Cllr H Parker **HP**, Mrs M Piper **MP**, Mrs C Berry **CB**, J Harmer **JH** (5)

Not present: Cllr M Cunningham **MC**, Mrs J Voyce **JV** T Voyce **TV**, (3)

2 members of public

Cllrs D Broadbent and J O'Riordan were also present

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution	Action
10564	Apologies for absence Cllrs Mrs J Voyce (personal), M Cunningham (personal), T Voyce (personal)	
10565	Declarations of Interest in any items on the agenda None	
10566	Minutes of the Planning committee meetings of the 14th March 2013 and 8th March 2013 It was resolved that the minutes were accurate and signed by the chair VOTE all in favour	
10567	Opportunity for Public comment Standing orders suspended Mrs Large spoke against the 1 Sunstar Application WD/2013/0491/F. She stated that the style was not in keeping with the other properties; the proposed application would extend beyond the backline and remove her privacy; the space was cramped and the proposed property squeezed into the space; loss of light on the east side of her lounge; loss of privacy in her garden lounge and patio; parking is not sufficient for the property; the pattern of driveways along the road are staggered dropped kerbs this would be directly opposite the neighbours. Standing orders reinstated	
10568	Planning Applications WD/2013/0491/F 1 Sunstar Lane, Polegate BN26 5HS Provision of detached dwelling A discussion took place on the site, its locations and the impact of the proposed property. The comments of the public were also discussed. It was resolved to object to the application on the following grounds: An application for a bungalow on this site was made in late 1994. Turned down by WDC in early 1995, see reasons given in refusal notice WD/94/2746/0. Appealed and the Inspector agreed with WDC on similar grounds. He was particularly concerned about the "cramped" effect. The proposed design is for a house rather than a bungalow	

	<p>(which would normally have a constant eaves level at about 2.5M.) This design has full height flank walls which will have a considerable effect on the adjoining property, no. 5. The front elevation also appears top heavy and it is considered the design is poor. It is noted from the application forms that the agent did not consult the Planning Authority prior to submitting the application.</p> <p>The Polegate Planning Chair has visited no, 5 and their reservations are clear and appear valid. Their sitting room is at the rear overlooking their garden. There are two semi circular headed windows in the flank wall which admit a surprising amount of light. This would be totally lost given the proximity of the two-storey flank wall of the proposed dwelling. In addition, all the bungalows in this road have a reasonably common rear wall line. The proposal indicates the dwelling extending well beyond this and this will seriously affect east light into the bay window at the rear of no. 5.</p> <p>Parking at the front is extremely cramped and it is doubtful that two cars could park here therefore more on-street parking will no doubt occur. The owners of no. 5 have commented on the juxtaposition of the dropped kerbs to the existing dwellings which are staggered to give easy access to drives. For this property it is not the case and the opposite bungalow would be affected. It is noted that the owner of this property has complained about loss of amenity but this does not seem valid.</p> <p>The council consider the application overdevelopment and also contrary to EN27(1) of the Wealden Local Plan The scale, form, site coverage, density and design of the development and the use of materials and landscaping should respect the character of adjoining development and , where appropriate, promote local distinctiveness.</p> <p>EN27(2) The proposed development should not create an unacceptable adverse impact on the privacy and amenities of the adjoining developments and the neighbourhood by reason of scale, height, form, noise, and traffic movements.</p> <p>EN27(4) the proposed development should not constitute and unacceptable backland or tandem form of development.</p> <p>Polegate Town Council were unanimous in their objections to this proposal.</p> <p>VOTE All in favour of submitting the objections as above</p>	
<p>10569</p>	<p>Any other plans received prior to the meeting and notified to the public WD/2013/0392/F Saddlers, Stud Farm, Polegate BN26 5HQ Removal of existing window and insertion of composite doors, removal of existing doors and insertion or composite window. It was resolved to submit no objections to application WD/2013/0373/F VOTE All in favour</p>	

<p>10570</p>	<p>Planning decisions</p> <p>WD/2013/0294/F 19 Hyperion Avenue, Polegate BN26 5HT Proposed extension at rear to enlarge bedroom together with alterations to convert conservatory into an extension. Proposed replacement of existing pitched roof with new pitched roof incorporating existing side garage and proposed rear extensions.</p> <p>Approved by Wealden District Council on 9th April 2013</p> <p>WD/2013/0126/FA Land A Ditfoord, Dittons Road, Polegate BN26 6HS Variation of condition 14 of WD/2012/0680/F Development of 5 No. detached 3 and 4 bedroom houses on land at Ditfoord, Dittons road, Polegate</p> <p>Approved by Wealden District Council 20th March 2013</p>	
<p>10571</p>	<p>Planning updates/general Information – for information only None</p>	

The meeting closed at 8.47 pm