

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Monday 14th July 2014 at 7.45 pm
Council Chambers, 49 High Street, Polegate, BN26 6AL**

Present: T Voyce **TV** (chair), M Clewett **MCI**, Mrs J Voyce **JV**, Mrs M Piper **MP**, Cllr H Parker **HP**, J Harmer **JH**, J O’Riordan **JOR** (5)

Not present: Cllrs Mrs C Berry **CB** (1)

No members of public

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution	Action
11042	Apologies for absence Mrs C Berry (ill health)	
11043	Declarations of Interest in any items on the agenda None	
11044	Minutes of the Planning Committee meetings of the 23rd June 2014 It was resolved that the minutes were accurate and signed by the chair VOTE all in favour (FOR Cllrs T Voyce, M Clewett, Mrs M Piper, Mrs J Voyce, H Parker)	
11045	Opportunity for Public comment None	
11046	Any other plans received prior to meeting - notified to public. None	
11047	Planning Applications WD/2014/1240/F LITTLE COPHALL STABLES, HAILSHAM ROAD, A22, POLEGATE BN26 6RF NEW DWELLING (AMENDMENT TO WD/1998/2423/O & WD/1999/2069/RM) A discussion took place on the lack of information about the application. It was stated as an amendment but no previous papers. The clerk had found previous information in the old archived minutes and informed the committee that previous applications had been approved by the Town Council based on the size and conditions set by Wealden District Council. A councillor stated that he had visited the area around the site and had obtained Google images to view the site. It was discussed that the previous approval was with conditions and had been for a 100 square metres footprint and single storey and this was for two stories and was around 70% larger. A councillor commented that there was not enough information to make an informed decision on the plan and many agreed, however a councillor commented that the application had all of the legally required elements for the application. It was questioned whether the base had been installed within the time frame of the first application and that the buildings inspector at Wealden should have this information. A councillor commented on the conditions placed on the original application, but another councillor remarked that changes may have occurred to the regulations since that time. It was questioned whether the application was within the development boundary as it appeared not to be, the clerk was asked if she knew this information and she stated that she did not. The committee discussed if the application had the same footprint as the original, without paperwork this was hard to determine, but based on sizes it was presumed this was not the case.	

	<p>The committee felt that it could only reject the application, despite it being of a reasonable nature as there was not enough information provided to contradict the local information held. It was also a concern that no enforcement team would be able to enforce any breaches, so it was not clear how this would be concluded. A councillor stated that he was concerned if a comment was not made to Wealden District Council it would not be clear what the Town Council's view on the matter was. A councillor stated that as a fairly new councillor there was not enough information in this application to consider it. A councillor stated that the Council had to be independent and not be concerned with who owned the land, but to address the current application only. A councillor stated that on the face of it the dwelling was not an issue, but it appeared to be outside of the development boundary and there may be issues with previous conditions placed on the original approval. It was agreed that the committee would object to the application on these grounds as there were many areas where developers could submit an application on someone else's land and set a precedent of building outside of the development boundary.</p> <p>It was resolved to object to the application WD/2014/1240/F based on it being outside of the development boundary, insufficient detail to determine whether conditions had been complied with and no detail on whether the original application had been completed within the legal time frames. Additional comments to be submitted regarding adherence to previous conditions (specifically a footprint of 100 square metres increasing and the condition of a one storey dwelling changing to a two storey dwelling) VOTE All in favour of rejecting the application Cllrs T Voyce TV (chair), M Clewett MCI, Mrs J Voyce JV, Mrs M Piper MP, Cllr H Parker HP, J Harmer JH, J O'Riordan JOR</p>	
<p>11048</p>	<p>Delegated Applications None</p>	
<p>11049</p>	<p>Planning decisions WD/2014/0971/F 18 Sayerland Road, Polegate BN26 6NU Erect a single storey extension at rear Approved by Wealden District Council on 4th July 2014</p>	
<p>11050</p>	<p>Planning updates/general Information – for information only None</p>	

The meeting closed at 8.09 pm

Cllr Harmer made a comment after the meeting about the colour that the Dinkum pub had been painted and asked if the clerk would be able to call the brewery to let them know the complaints that had been received about the colours.