



Sedlescombe Parish Council

Meeting Minutes

Planning Committee meeting
on Tuesday 10th January 2023 at CR2 18:30

Cllrs Present:

Pauline Glew (PG), Roy Chapman (RC), D Caney (DC), Lindy Latrielle (LL), B Coupar (BC), J Saull-Hunt (JSH), N Moore (NM), Parish and District Cllr. Jonathan Vine-Hall (Chairman of the Parish Council) (JVH).
Mrs Jackie Scarff (JS) (Clerk/RFO)
15 members of the public

Meeting opened at 18:55

Item	Agenda Item (P23.)	
47	To receive and accept Apologies and reasons for absence (LGA 1972 s85 (1)) There were no apologies.	
48	a To elect a chairman for the committee PG proposed JVH, all agreed. Resolved that JVH be chair of the planning committee. b To elect a vice chairman for the committee. JVH proposed DC, all agreed Resolved that DC be the vice chair of the planning committee.	
49	Interests in accordance with the Localism Act 2011 and the Parish Council Code of Conduct. To receive councillors' declarations of interest regarding matters on the agenda and consider any written requests for dispensation as a result. JVH declared an Interest personal and prejudicial interest in item 51 & 52 and left the room for both items. To grant any requests for dispensation as appropriate. There were no requirements. Reminder: any changes to register of interests should be notified to the clerk immediately. JVH stated that he had updated his interest to reflect no longer being the chair of Raystede.	
50	To consider for approval the terms of reference for the committee. Resolved to adopt the terms of reference with the addition of 'To attend an annual refresher training session to qualify to be a member of the planning committee' in Areas of Responsibility list.	
51	Public participation session re matters on the Agenda at the Chairman's discretion. 18:58 JVH left the room, DC took the chair. DC explained that members of the public are welcome to speak for a maximum of 3 minutes, SPC is an apolitical council and requested that no political or personal comments are made. DC closed the meeting for members of the public to speak. The following questions were asked, there were also other comments during the discussion. A member of the public, who introduced themselves as being from Burwash, asked if questions could be asked after the cllrs had had their discussions as that was how his Parish Council conduct their meeting? Ans: No, SPC have public speaking first and once the cllrs have deliberated there are no further questions. A member of the public who introduced herself as from Burwash asked, on the last application the cllrs resolved not to comment having declared an interest, has that position changed?	

Ans: The clerk clarified that in May the Cllrs declared a personal interest as a close colleague of the Chairman of the Parish Council (the applicant). This time, because the Chairman of the Parish Council is not the applicant there are no interests to declare.

The lady went on to ask if the cllrs could comment on any application where a cllr is an applicant, and therefore none of the village can be represented in their views?

Ans: No, a personal interest does not preclude them from discussing or making a recommendation on any planning application.

The lady went on to clarify if the cllrs couldn't comment on the previous application. The clerk explained that the cllrs decided not to comment/make a recommendation on the actual application, but they did comment on the carbon negative and other elements of the type of dwelling.

The gentleman who asked the first question asked if the property will be tied to the existing owner of the house?

Ans: DC commented that there is nothing in the application and asked the agent for the application to comment. The agent affirmed that there would not be a tie, normally this would not be standard practice.

The gentleman went on to ask why not as it's a farmhouse and as in Burwash they have been told by Rother that a property would have to be tied by Rother.

Ans: If it was going to be an agricultural dwelling there would be a condition.

DC asked if anyone from Sedlescombe would like to speak.

A member of the public commented that she would like to have a comment about the last meeting formally minuted.

Ans: The clerk will listen to the previous meeting and establish what was said.

A Sedlescombe resident asked that the cllrs respect the spirit of the AONB plan and the village plan in any recommendation it makes.

The agent spoke in favour of the application explaining the details of the application and the criteria that the application has been submitted against and answered questions during the course of the public participations.

A Sedlescombe resident made further comments but did not ask a question.

DC closed the public participation session at 19:27.

52 Applications to be considered

[RR/2022/2690/P](#)

**Land at Beech Farm, Hawkhurst Road, Sedlescombe, TN33 0QS
Demolition of storage building and roadway and construction of a carbon negative live work unit, parking and restricted curtilage. Landscape and biodiversity enhancements to the wider site and new access to the B2244. Stopping up of access to the northern boundary of the site.**

DC asked cllrs if they had any questions for the agent.

RC asked about the fire regulations regarding the construction material that uses foam.

Ans: The agent said it wasn't his area of expertise but it would be subject to building regulations and could find out more.

JSH asked whether the site was Brownfield or Greenfield?

Ans: The site is part Brownfield and part Greenfield.

NM asked if the footprint of the house is on the brownfield part.

Ans: No, the footprint of the house will be on a part of the land that currently has diseased trees on it

and the brownfield part will be replaced with greenfield. The footprint of the house will be smaller than the current brownfield part.

JSH asked if it is listed and Brownfield.

Ans: It doesn't have to be listed on a register. Brownfield is a planning definition.

BC asked if the site would be classed as infill.

Ans: No, it's the outer edge of a farmstead.

There was further discussion about the application.

DC asked the agent to elaborate on the point from BC regarding the Kent Wildlife document.

DC asked a member of the public to refrain from interrupting the meeting so that the agent could reply.

Ans: It's an extra strand to the biodiversity case. The applicant commissioned a report to calculate the net gain on site. Using the specified metric the overall net gain is 33%. There are other extra things that will be done as extra on site which cannot be calculated through the metric. Regulations that are going to be introduced will only require a 10% gain so it reinforces how much improvement there will be on 98% of this site (the footprint of the house taking the other 2%).

DC asked what improvements there would be in biodiversity if the site was just left to grow.

Ans: It would have to be measured against the baseline of the site. The plans have been designed by a landscape consultant and an ecologist for the maximum benefit.

DC stated that in the May meeting the cllrs resolved not to comment then on the previous application but commented that they support buildings that are environmental superior and that are within the criteria of the HWAONB standards.

DC asked cllrs if they would like any additional thoughts of this application.

BC commented that the previous application had been scrutinised by experienced cllrs at Rother twice and approved and since then there has been a further document from the Kent Wildlife Trust which praised the biodiversity aspect of the application. Having seen the site and the prototype house it will meet the criteria of being exceptional.

DC asked each cllr whether their comments should reflect the comments made in May.

NM added a comment that generally she would support an application that meets the NPPF criteria.

DC proposed that a similar comment be entered but in support of the application.

NM proposed that the comment be no comment on this application but to highlight the general support of buildings of this type.

The clerk clarified the vote: 2 cllrs abstained, 2 cllrs felt the comments should remain the same, 3 cllrs would support the application.

DC proposed that the cllrs would submit a general comment that they support this type of application in line with the declared climate emergency.

2 cllrs abstained 5 cllrs agreed.

Resolved that

- the cllrs would submit a general comment that they support this type of application in line with the declared climate emergency.
- the cllrs asked the clerk to represent them at the Rother planning committee and a copy of what will be said will be circulated to cllrs in advance of the meeting.

DC thanked everyone for their time and comments and declared the meeting closed at 19:45