

FRAMFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Planning Committee Details of Delegated Decisions June 2017

Decisions can be delegated to the Chairman (or Vice-Chairman) plus two other members if agreed by the Chairman.

The following decisions were made under delegated authority by Keith Brandon (Chairman), Selina Allen and Maria Naylor. (The Chairman has the casting vote in any tie).

- **WD/2017/1168/FR for LITTLE GOLDSMITHS FARM, BEECHY ROAD, BLACKBOYS, TN22 5JG**

Retrospective application for change of use of part of agricultural barn to microbrewery

Strongly object – The Parish Council objects to this retrospective application as it is evident of the intention due to a prior application which was withdrawn but then subsequently built.

The Parish Council's original comments under application WD/2016/3092/F still stands: *"The Parish Council objects to this application. They believe there is a distinct lack of information included in the application. They believe the proposals constitute over development in open, scenic countryside which will create extra traffic movements with vehicles potentially being of a large nature in the very rural lanes. The Parish Council agrees with the contents of the report from ESCC"*.

Further to this, there is some discredit in the traffic analysis in which the applicant states that the buildings are redundant and not in use, yet uses a fully operational dairy as a comparison to the proposed business. There are limited trips/traffic movements shown within the proposed table on Page 14 of 17 where for this business to operate there will only be malt deliveries, cleaning materials and beer deliveries. This alone does not seem to take into account, staff (which in clause 4.2 states 2 persons). It does not take into account, visitors or other deliveries, materials etc which must be required. It states that there will be 30 beer deliveries a week which is concerning to the effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC as this is a significant amount for what is supposed to be a micro-brewery. The staff vs trips do not tally with the business purposes and requirements. One full time worker and one part-time are referenced yet 30 trips a week for deliveries by who as 4.2 also suggests that these two staff will simply arrive and leave once a day. This would suggest a third member of staff or third party agency for deliveries alone. This would then offer the question as to whether the proposed scale of business can realistically be operated with 2 or 3 members of staff as the traffic data is very economical with traffic movements, and further – pollution, disturbance and effects on the local and wider environment and neighbours.

A business of this nature is not conducive to a rural setting where it is proposed. A dairy would have had movements but is conducive to this

environment and thus more acceptable. The area is in an unsustainable location, that is set in idyllic landscapes with limited access to main traffic routes and the proposal would only increase commercial traffic movements on small, quiet lanes and roads.

- **WD/2016/1819/F SEPTEMBER FARM, LEWES ROAD, BLACKBOYS TN22 5JH**

Demolition of existing agricultural building, construction of replacement outbuilding and change of use of land to residential

The Parish Council supports this application. The existing building is in a dire condition and the replacement is sensitive to the existing footprint. The PC supports non-residential occupancy. The proposal for change of use is also supported.

- **WD/2017/1157/F SEPTEMBER FARM, LEWES ROAD, BLACKBOYS**

Proposed alterations and extension to existing dwelling

The Parish Council objects to this application which is a vast over development of the property and including a recent approval for a new dwelling within the curtilage and another current application for outbuildings including an office, and a change of curtilage makes this a substantial development outside of any development boundary in open countryside.

- **WD/2017/0858/F BLACK MEADOW, HOLLOW LANE, BLACKBOYS, UCKFIELD, TN22 5JB**

Timber Residential Dwelling for Farm Owner/Manager and Change of Use of Land to Residential Curtilage

The Parish Council strongly objects to this application as previously – WD/2012/2573/FR and stands by those comments: “The Parish Council objects to this retrospective application and wishes to see the appeal decision enforced as a matter of urgency as the matter has been allowed to continue, unauthorised, for some time. The proposals in the application do not meet either the functional or financial tests under previous planning policy. In addition, with the arrival of the NPPF paragraph 55 'Planning authorities should avoid new homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances such as the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside' - there is absolutely no need or requirement for the applicant to live on site”.

Further to this, having looked at aerial photography using the location can only be described as a blot on the scenic landscape around it. The location for a permanent dwelling is obtrusive to the setting as it is neither adjacent to or in line with the boundary.

Within the application document itself, section 15 states: “And/or: Are there trees or hedges on land adjacent to the proposed development site that could influence the development or might be important as part of the local landscape character?” which was answered “no”. It should be noted that the woodland on the Southern boundary to the site is designated as Ancient Woodland.

There is no ecological or archaeological survey to support this application and apart from the Ancient Woodland there is also a large pond and streams nearby which could provide for wildlife. The setting is conducive to support

birds, bats, and other wildlife which should be assessed before any building works takes place.

The provision of essential services to what is currently an agricultural area may need above ground supplies which could further blight the idyllic surroundings. With the proposal being of a permanent nature, it can only facilitate for extra trips wither by the resident or service providers such as refuse, post etc. This will only increase the effect on the Ashdown Forrest but cannot be verified as a traffic report has not been included either.

The application proposal is not in keeping with the local surroundings, there is no justification that chickens require 24/7 on-site management and it could set a precedent to allow for building residential properties on a greenfield site. WD/2017/0337/F was recently refused for these very reasons. The local area is unsustainable in accordance to the Wealden Core Strategy Local Plan and therefore should be refused.

- **WD/2017/0819/FR GATE HOUSE, GATE HOUSE LANE, FRAMFIELD, TN22 5RS**

Retrospective application for Agricultural Barn for the storage of agricultural vehicles/machinery

The Parish Council strongly objects to this retrospective application as it is evident of the intention due to a prior PD application which was refused by WDC and then built without approval.

This proposed (and now built) barn is vast over development built at 23.8m long, 6.8m wide and 7m high this is a barn cognisant of an operational farm, not a detached Grade II Listed residential property.

This a greenfield site, and adjacent structures already influence the over development locally. The site plan (WD-2017-0819-FR_General Plan_D2R-GHF-RT-01 Rev BB Proposed Barn) shows the barn next to a 40m x 20m sand school. The other main structure (tennis court) has been omitted altogether. However, due to structures being misrepresented to scale or missing, it portrays the barn to be smaller, and less densely cluttered than it actually is compared to its surroundings.

To require an extremely large barn/building it can only be assumed that it would be for the storage of machinery and agricultural vehicles. There is no support in regards to additional strain on local roads and the wider Ashdown Forest SAC, and by all accounts – no support for the need of it at all. The Parish Council would be disappointed if the application is approved and therefore should be refused.

AEN/28.06.2017

Circulation: Planning Committee/All other Parish Councillors.