

Fairlight Parish Council Planning Committee – 11th March 2014
Notes of Meeting

Present: Councillors S. Leadbetter (Chairman), A. Mier, Mrs C. Gallagher, Rev V.Gibbs, Mrs J. Annetts.

Public: Mr & Mrs King (applicants – 12 The Close), Roger Greer, Mr & Mrs Batchelor, Mrs Nunn and 2 interested residents.

- 1) **Apologies for Absence** : None
- 2) **Code of Conduct and Disclosure of Interests:** None.
- 3) **Planning -**

a) Planning application RR/2014/415/P
12 The Close, Fairlight, TN35 4AQ
Erection of replacement dwelling

Mr King was invited to briefly outline the application. He declined and advised he was only present to observe.

The committee then discussed the application and it was noted that there had been 4 objections noted on the planning website. The Chairman read out the comments from Mr & Mrs Lucas. Generally it was felt that height was an issue and although the building appeared to be out of character with other properties, it was also noted that most of the properties had individual designs. Concern was expressed about the lack of specific provision made for parking, surface water disposal and the removal of hedges. The applicants confirmed the hedges will not be removed, they have 2 cars and surface water will be disposed of as required by building control.

Comments to Rother Planning will be:

- a) The Parish Council has concerns over the height of the proposed property which would be dominant and overbearing in relation to neighbouring properties
- b) Surface water drainage needs to be managed in accordance with building control requirements
- c) The plans do not allow for parking spaces. In view of the lack of on road parking in The Close, these should be stipulated
- d) No hedges to be removed
- e) Any comments from residents in nearby properties should be considered.

(b) Planning Application – RR/2014/456/P
The Anchorage, The Avenue, Fairlight, TN35 4DE
Demolition of existing dwelling, erection of two dwellings

The Chairman advised that this was a second application and was an amendment to the first. The applicant was not present. Neighbours, Roger Greer and Mr & Mrs Batchelor were present. The Chairman allowed each neighbour to express their views about the proposed development. Mr Greer was totally opposed to the present proposal. The neighbours are concerned about:

- 1) Over development i.e. two dwellings replacing one.
- 2) Japanese Knotweed removal. The chosen method of dig and dump will mean some digging will have to be undertaken on their properties, possibly affecting structures.
- 3) Tree removal affecting surface water drainage.
- 4) Loss of light and privacy due to overlooking from the front first floor windows.
- 5) Extra weight pressure on the cliff due to the close proximity.

The Committee debated the new application compared to the original and looked at whether the concerns from the first had been addressed. It was generally felt one dwelling was preferable.

Comments to Rother Planning will be:

1. Any redevelopment proposal other than one to one replacement within 100m of the cliff is of concern to the Parish Council due to the effect the development might have on cliff stability and the long-term risk to the new properties.

2. The site of the Anchorage is within 100m of the cliff edge and directly in line with the Rockmead Road landslip / coastal erosion area. While the 2007 engineering scheme which includes a ground water pumping system has reduced the rate of erosion, the works are a temporary measure expected to last only for 45 years, after which time erosion and slippage will increase. The cost of maintaining the pumping system falls on Rother (with a contribution from Fairlight Parish Council) and in the event of a major failure there is at present no guarantee of funding to maintain the scheme. The winter storms and very wet weather have taken their toll on the works and on the unprotected area between the two berms.
3. The replacement of one dwelling with two will increase surface water run-off. The Parish Council considers it essential that surface water be piped away as proposed by the applicant and this should be a requirement of any consent.
4. The Avenue is a narrow cul-de-sac, and an unadopted road, it should be a condition of any consent that the developer commission a condition survey before work commences, keeps the roadway in good repair during work, and returns it to its original condition before completion.
5. For the same reason it should be a condition that any site traffic , delivery vehicles and site workers vehicles must not be parked on The Avenue but be kept within the site or on the public highway. Access for emergency vehicles is paramount.
6. We are aware that there is a major problem with Japanese knotweed in the grounds of this property which are so overgrown as to be impenetrable at the rear. We also understand that the suggested removal method is “dig and dump” which in order to be successful will involve access to neighbouring properties and may involve structures on those properties. This should be investigated by referral to neighbouring residents. Rother need to assess whether the proposed method of dealing with the knotweed is acceptable and in line with current best practice.
7. There is a potential problem of overlooking from the first floor front window of each property. In the case of Sea Holly into the rear garden, and in the case of Parida into a bedroom window. This needs to be carefully assessed prior to any consent.
8. While the applicant proposes to retain mature trees at the rear the Planning Authority should check to see whether there are trees on the site that merit Tree Preservation Orders and request the planting of new trees where others are removed, in particular to provide screening to Sea Holly.
9. Two parking places per property are not sufficient, especially noting the impossibility of on-street parking in The Avenue and Lower Waites Lane. There is room on the site for adequate parking and proper provision should be made.
10. Any comments made by residents in neighbouring properties should be considered.

**c) Planning Application – RR/2014/277/P
Tamarisk, Shepherds Way, Fairlight, TN35 4BD
Proposed porch**

The committee discussed the proposal and decided there was no objection.

Comments to Rother Planning will be:

- a) The Parish Council has no objection to this proposal.
- b) Any comments from residents in nearby properties should be considered.

4) Any Other Business

The Chairman advised the committee that Sedlescombe Parish Council Chairman has offered to visit and answer any questions about the Neighbourhood Plan. The Chairman will arrange a suitable date.

Rother have advised that the sending out of plans will cease from July. The Chairman believes they comply with The Town and Country Planning Act 1990 schedule 1 para 4 by sending out the weekly list. He will go back to Tim Hickling and ask about the

possibility of sending out plans when the development involves two or more properties.

There was a discussion about buying a printer which could print A3 size but it was not felt cost effective.

Meeting closed 3.42 pm

5) Date and Venue of Next Meeting

Tuesday 25th March 2014 at 6.15pm in Fairlight Village Hall unless otherwise notified.