

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on 14th March 2013 at 7.30 pm St Johns Church Hall, High Street Polegate

Present : M Clewett **MCI** (chair), J Harmer **JH**, Cllr H Parker **HP**, T Voyce **TV**, Mrs M Piper **MP**, Mrs C Berry **CB** (6)

Not present: Cllr Mrs J Voyce **JV** M Cunningham **MC** (2)

Clerk J Ognjanovic **JO**

Staff in attendance C Hale, Mrs S Godfrey

25 members of the public including Cllrs M Pybus & J O'Riordan

1 member of the press

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution	Action
10520	Apologies for absence Cllrs Mrs J Voyce (personal), M Cunningham (work)	
10521	Declarations of Interest in any items on the agenda None	
10522	<p>Opportunity for Public comment Standing orders suspended</p> <p>Tom Porter spoke on behalf of The Wind Farm applicant. He stated that there had previously only been three reasons for refusal all were visual and amenity based on the South Downs National Park. He stated that the new developments had been considered and were around 500m away from the nearest turbines.</p> <p>Andrew Durling spoke on behalf of the yes to the wind farm group. Stating concerns over fossil fuel use and climate change and stated that he was in support of the wind farm application.</p> <p>Roy Van Der Kieft spoke against the proposal stating that he was the nearest resident and the impact would make a number of dwellings nearby unsuitable for living. He stated that it would have a visual impact on the South Downs National Park. He stated that Glynde turbine, the only one is Sussex, was only working to 18% efficiency; There will always be a need for power stations for when the wind does not blow; Heritage sites nearby would have moderate to severe damage caused to the site; he stated he was not against renewable energy, but that this location was not suitable.</p> <p>Trevor stone spoke for the application and stated that the noise of the wind farm would not be a problem as the noise from the bypass would be louder. He stated there was a National requirement and a need for renewable energy and that he felt the site was the ideal location. He stated that he was part of the silent majority who were for the wind farm.</p> <p>Mrs Munday spoke against the wind farm. She stated that the site was very near to the new developments and near to Dittons road. She had experienced the problems with the turbines at Glynde and</p>	

	<p>in Wales, where she experience noise vibration. Mrs Munday stated that she suffered from vertigo and that this affects her badly when near turbines. She also stated she had serious concerns about subsidence. She stated that she had lived in Polegate for 46 years and this was the worst proposal that she had ever seen and that she felt it would be detrimental to hers and others health.</p> <p>Mr Casselden spoke against the wind farm. He stated he was a local resident who the wind farm would affect. He was one of 1500 letters of objection sent to Wealden District Council. He stated that he felt most people that were in favour did not live in Polegate and they were outside residents. He said there were flaws in the application which had been submitted as a new application, and that no public consultation had been carried out on this application. The applicant had failed to consult the bodies required and that this was is a technical issue.</p> <p>He stated that under the Human Rights Act 1998 that it should be rejected on the grounds that it would unlawfully interfere with the peace and enjoyment of the residents properties by the residents and could be unlawful.</p> <p>Standing orders reinstated</p>	
<p>10523</p>	<p>Minutes of the Planning Meetings 14th January 2013 It was resolved that the minutes be accepted and signed by the chair as accurate. VOTE All in favour</p>	
<p>10524</p>	<p>Planning Applications WD/2013/0346/MEA Land Off Shepham Lane, North of A27, Polegate BN24 5BT Erection of three wind turbines, on site access tracks, temporary site access from A27, site access from Hailsham Road, 1 site substation and control building, on site underground cabling.</p> <p>Each councillor spoke on the wind farm and the issues surrounding them at that site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Bluebells development would be around 380m form the nearest turbine which was not considered suitable or recommended. • It would be an intrusion on the landscape and would adversely affect the South Downs National park • 3 turbines would not produced sufficient energy to be of value to the National grid but would cause a severe impact on the landscape. • It was considered to be an inappropriate location. • Concerns that the developers had not consulted the public as with the previous application • The reduced height would still cause a significant negative impact on the South Downs National Park. • The turbines would also cause a negative impact on the RAMSAR site and the SSSI site (Pevensey Levels area) • The Town Council had a duty of care to its residents to object to the application • A cllr confirmed that 1500 letters of objection had been sent to Wealden District Council. • A cllr felt that the proper place for a wind farm would be out at sea 	

- Although the habitation bill had not completed through parliament the recommendations were at least 10 times the turbine diameter would be the minimum distance between the turbines location and local residents/houses. At this site that would mean 10 x 90m which would be at least 900m from the nearest dwellings. The nearest dwellings of this site are only 380m away. This was under 1/3rd of the recommended distance. The reduction from 5 to 3 turbines did not change all of the previous objections and requested that the previous objections be also submitted in response to the application.
- Concerns were aired over the recommended distances and in Europe it varied between 1km and 1.5km from nearest dwellings, the nearest turbine is only 380m away.
- In principle nothing had changed from the previous application.

The following comments to be submitted to Wealden along with the previous letter of objection.

The lower number of turbines does not materially affect the principles and objections that were submitted in November 2011. I have attached the letter of objections from November and all of those are considered to apply and submitted as objections to this current application.

At the previous meeting not a single person spoke in favour, this time two objections were raised. One from a non resident representing a conservation group, who are concerned with climate change and anti fossil fuels. The other was a local resident who stated that he had no objection.

Other local people reiterated what was said previously and particularly efficiency, having been determined that the Glynde turbine, the only one in Sussex at the moment, runs at only 18% efficiency. It was also pointed out that the majority of local residents object and a resident (later confirmed by a councillor) stated that 1500 letters of objection had been sent to the District Council. The anti fossil fuels campaigner stated that in a letter in the press two weeks ago that he had gathered 150 signatures in support, there still remains a 10:1 majority against in local residents.

Another resident suffers from vertigo and has stated that once when she was in the vicinity of a wind turbine the vibration caused her to nearly collapse. She was obviously against the proposal on health grounds, which was what people stated before.

One other resident mentioned that he considered that the proposed development was in contravention of the Human Rights legislation, particularly the right of peaceful enjoyment of his property. He considered that this right would be breached and therefore the

	<p>development would be unlawful. The same objector also contended that the developers had not properly complied with the consultation terms as this was a new application. Councillors agreed with the statements of objections above</p> <p>Councillors comments also included "what was the point of three turbines. Compared with the very large number included in offshore wind farms. The value of the three turbines would not outweigh the destruction of habitats and wildlife and would be insignificant to be of value to the National Grid. The recent habitation bill, although lapsed through time constraints, recommended that the diameter of the turbine blades times 10 should be the minimum distance between the turbines and local housing. Therefore in the Polegate application it should be a minimum of 900m from the nearest housing. In addition it is known that in Europe the general recommendation is a separation of between 1.5 – 2km to the nearest dwelling. In this instance the nearest dwelling according the calculations on the ordnance survey will be approximately 380m.</p> <p>It was resolved to submit the above objections to Wealden District Council along with the previous letter of objections. VOTE All in favour</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned for members of the public to leave if they wished.</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>The committee commented that the area of land was quite large and plans well drafted.</p> <p>It was resolved to submit no objections to the application WD/2013/0294/F VOTE All in favour</p>	<p>JO</p> <p>JO</p>
<p>10525</p>	<p>Other Plans Notified to Public None</p>	
<p>10526</p>	<p>Delegated Applications</p> <p>WD/2012/2484/F Cherry Tree, Wannock Road, Polegate, BN26 5EA Construction of conservatory to rear elevation and porch to front elevation Delegated Committee Cllrs M Clewett, T Voyce, Mrs C Berry No Objections</p> <p>WD/2013/0126/FA Land at Ditfoord, Dittons Road, Polegate, BN26 6HS</p>	

	<p>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 Delegated Committee Cllrs M Clewett, T Voyce, Mrs C Berry No Objections</p> <p>WD/2013/0087/F The Centre, High Street, Polegate, BN26 6AQ Part retrospective proposal for the conversion of vacant office space to nine flats with associated parking, cycle and refuse store Delegated Committee Cllrs M Clewett, T Voyce, Mrs C Berry, Mrs M Piper No Objections</p>	
10527	<p>Details of Planning Decisions</p> <p>WD/2012/2439/F 6/6A Gilda Crescent, Polegate, BN26 6AN Proposed vehicular crossing and vehicle hardstanding Approved by Wealden District Council on 21st January 2013</p> <p>WD/2012/2420/F 3 Millfields, Station Road, Polegate, BN26 6AS Change of use from retail use to clinical healthcare use – Physio, Podiatry, Complementary Therapy (D1 Class XV) Approved by Wealden District Council on 31st January 2013</p> <p>The following decisions had been notified to the council prior to the meeting. In addition the following were read out at the meeting, having been received recently:</p> <p>WD/2012/24847/F Cherry Tree, Wannock Road, Polegate BN26 5EA Construction of conservatory to rear elevation and porch to front elevation Approved by Wealden District Council 6th March 2013</p> <p>Appeal APP/C1435/A/12/2184690 Chaucer Industrial Estate, Dittons road, Polegate, East Sussex BN26 6JF</p> <p>The appeal was allowed by the Inspector CJ Leigh on 22 February 2013. Costs in relation to the above were refused.</p> <p>TM/2013/0061/TPC fell one Oak tree subject to conditions related to planning permission WD/2007/1060, WD/2008/0699, WD/2009/1549 bay tree Farm, Bay Tree Lane, Polegate The works were allowed to proceed.</p> <p>TM/2013/0031/TPO 59 & 61 Greenleaf Gardens, Polegate BN26 6PF</p> <p>No.59 remove dead wood and crown lift one oak tree, No. 61 Dead wood and reduce one oak tree by 2-2.5m and crown</p>	

	<p>lift, within tree preservation order (Polegate) No. 45 1989 Given consent by Wealden District Council.</p> <p>TM/2013/0022/TPO 23 West Close Polegate BN26 6EQ Pollard one ash tree within tree preservation order (Polegate) No 20 1985. Granted consent by Wealden District Council</p> <p>TM/2013/0016/TPO 8 North Close, Polegate BN26 6HH Fell one oak tree within tree p[reservation order (Polegate) No.20 1985 Granted consent by Wealden District Council</p> <p>TM/2013/00255/TPC Bay Tree Farm, Bay Tree Lane, Polegate Fell one oak tree subject to conditions related to planning permission WD/2007/1060, WD/2008/0699, WD/2009/1549 Consent given by Wealden District Council subject to replanting a replacement.</p>	
<p>10528</p>	<p>Planning updates/general Information – for information only WD/2012/1320/MAJ Nightingale Place, Hailsham Road, Polegate, BN26 6RD Nightingale Place New Day Care Hub and Residential Care Resource Centre Refused by Wealden District Council and subsequently appealed APP/C1435/A/12/2189997/NWF Decision of appeal to be notified after 13th March.</p> <p>The clerk had previously circulated a letter from Eastbourne Borough council informing them of the notice of publication of modifications to the Eastbourne Town Centre Local Plan.</p>	

The meeting closed at 8.12 pm