

POYNINGS PARISH COUNCIL

Clerk to the Council
Mr Colin Warburton

Minutes of the Virtual meeting of Poynings Parish Council using Zoom on
Wednesday July 8th, 2020 at 7.00pm

Present: Nigel Evans Chair
Neville Searle
William Selby
Michael Crowther

Colin Warburton - Clerk to the Council
Colin Trumble - District Councillor
Joy Dennis - County Councillor

10 members of the public attended

1 Apologies,

2 Minutes

The Minutes of the previous meeting, as circulated, were agreed.

3 Matters Arising

None

4 WSCC Joy Dennis

Covid-19 - The WSDC outline response is now online and the community hub is running. Cases are rising in care homes, there are 235 homes in West Sussex, 30% of which are commissioned by WSCC.

There is adequate hospital capacity in West Sussex.

Businesses have been affected especially in Crawley and the surrounding area.

Unemployment there is now 8%, there is normally negative unemployment.

WSCC is hoping to get everyone back to school in September.

Temporary cycle lane proposals have been submitted, the closest to Poynings is Shoreham.

Footpaths are doing their annual footpath checking.

Most recycling sites are open and most objects are now accepted.

Councils have adapted new ways of working.

WSCC is £8m over budget and although there is some help from the government the budget will have to be revisited to assess the longer term impact.

MSDC Colin Trumble

The financial impact of Covid-19 has been high as MSDC has been hit by a loss of income from fees and rent. The leisure centre alone has lost £270,000 month. Even when partially open there will still be a drop in income.

Had expected a loss of £67m but so far £4.5m. To re-assess next month.

There has been an increase of homelessness with the usual figure about 85 rising to 110 in May. Mainly single people with a significant proportion having mental health issues.

The numbers have been rising over the last 3-4 years which puts a lot of pressure on the councils. £4m has been spent on buying houses which should save £3.5m over 15 years as

opposed to using rented accommodation.

J Digby asked if was cheaper to build hostels and CT replied that it is easier and quicker to buy houses over obtaining land/planning etc.

MSDC has been supporting businesses £23m in the last 4 months.

The Community applauds are coming out soon and anyone can put someone's name forward in the various categories.

5 Public Participation

M Airey asked if anything had been done about the red car in the car park. The clerk advised that this was run by MSDC and it had been reported to them. MSDC have said that the police have to remove it and they won't as it isn't on the public highway.

Expenditure for April 2020 and May 2020

The following amounts have been paid for April 2020 and May 2020

Date	Payee	Amount
12/05/20	MSDC Dog bin emptying	£275.70
18/05/20	M Brennan - Cemetery grass cutting etc	£510.00
20/05/20	Clerk wages March - April 2020	£500.00
20/05/20	Castle Water	£6.11
21/05/20	BHIB insurance	£351.45
27/05/20	DM Payroll	£70.50
	TOTAL	£1,713.76

Receipts for April 2020 and May 2020

Date	Payee	Amount
30/04/20	MSDC Precept and Burial	£3,488.00
12/05/20	HMRC VAT refund	£87.90
	TOTAL	£3,575.90

6 Planning Applications

a. Orchard Cottage Dyke Lane Poynings BN45 7AA

Proposal: Demolition of existing dwelling and associated outbuildings and erection of single replacement 3 bed dwelling with ancillary detached garage and home office.

After a discussion with PPC councillors, MSDC (CT) and members of the public, Poynings PC supports this application with comments.

There is a modest increase in the floor area over and above the 30%, and it is slightly higher, however, it was felt that it is not excessive in relation to the size of the plot. There is a large area of glazing and due to the dark skies, the PC would like reassurance that measures will be taken to reduce light. (Reflective glass/blinds).

Also, there is a large amount of dark material used and the PC felt it would be desirable if this was lighter.

b. The Gate House Poynings Road Poynings West Sussex BN45 7AG

Proposal: Provision of external cladding, insulation, flue and new roof to outbuilding (part retrospective), new wall to north of house (retrospective), retaining wall close to west boundary (retrospective), wall and entrance gates at south end of house (proposed)

There are various sections to this application so the comments have been split. After a long discussion with PPC councillors, MSDC (CT) and members of the public, Poynings PC objects to this application. Colin Trumble (MSDC) helped with various aspects of the application as did MC (PPC) who, as a retired architect, is used to handling planning applications. Reasons for objection below.

1. Provision of external cladding, insulation, flue and new roof to outbuilding (part retrospective)

a. The application states that this is a conversion from an existing structure. However, the Parish Council and neighbours have already supplied copious evidence to the SDNP that this is not the case and there has been a massive increase in size, both in footprint and height without planning permission. The images supplied show the building as it is, not as it was.

b. This was originally a small parrot aviary and it appears to have been converted to a large habitable dwelling with heating, drainage, insulation, cladding etc. It is not in keeping with the original structure and is a change of use, contrary to that stated in the application. Whilst there is no suggestion that they plan to make a habitable room, all indications show that this could happen and therefore a restriction should be included that this cannot be allowed, and indeed shouldn't be that large to start with.

c. The large structure is now visible from the scenic public footpath, when it wasn't before and the new windows create a light spill in a dark skies area.

d. Another drawing of the proposed structure was added on the 17th July 2020 where it still refers to the existing roof and ground floor plan. This was not existing, and the planning application should be for a much larger structure and change of use from an aviary to a workshop.

2. Retaining wall close to west boundary (retrospective).

a. This wall creates a Dark muggers alleyway on what was a scenic country footpath.

b. The application incorrectly states that the wall is set back to create a lighter footpath. The wall is in fact situated right on their boundary, not inside; the other land does not belong to the applicant.

c. The retaining wall has changed the level of the land and is now much higher. A concrete beam was the original ground level which was there just to support a fence. This was bulldozed to create the new level with concrete. This is not safe as the shuttering collapsed when being built so was built in two sections instead of one with no foundations. The only reason that there is a difference in height is because the area on the applicant's land was raised.

d. The wall that has been built has blocked the ditch drainage by 50% and could lead to flooding of the PROW which has recently been resurfaced due to previous flooding before the obstruction.

e. It is not apparent why the high concrete wall is necessary.

3. Entrance gates at south end of house (proposed)

a. The village hall is nearly opposite (used as a nursery school with small children) and as the proposed entrance is enclosed and close to the road, it will be difficult to see cars exiting. This is a dangerous road anyway and this can only make it worse as there is not a footpath.

b. These should be 5 metres from the road. See WSCC 'Vehicle Crossing Guide' para. 11 'gates must be set back 5m from the edge of the carriageway'

c. See WSCC 'Local Design Guide' para. 4.12 visibility splays: for access onto a 30mph limit highway; these are required to be - set back 'X' of 2.4m and along the carriageway 'Y' of 43m to be maintained free of obstruction.

d. the gates need to be set back to allow cars waiting to enter the property to be off the road, and therefore not having cars passing on the opposite side, then causing danger to the pre-school and any users of the road.

e. Highways must visit the property, a desktop survey is not sufficient it is simply too

dangerous.

4. Wall at south end of house (proposed)

a. The wall here used to be set back from the road and as such, walkers (Scouts and Duke of Edinburgh children use this regularly) could see up the dangerous road as they exited the PROW. With the wall right on the boundary and higher than permitted, it is impossible to see cars coming down the road anymore until you are actually in the road. It appears to create a pinch point. With parents collecting school children this is even more dangerous as there is not a footpath.

b. See WSCC 'Local Design Guide' para. 4.11 Pedestrian Visibility 'to be free of obstruction in excess of 0.6m in height'

c. Not only is the wall too high, in direct breach of the previous planning application consent, the fact that 250mm isn't much is a point of opinion, not fact. It's taller than permitted and causes a danger through height, and the way it bows into the highway.

5. Terracing of garden (part retrospective)

a. The terracing of this garden has created a need for the wall next to the footpath which is not in keeping with the PROW (see 2)

b. The terracing is much higher than before and is now near the top of the new wall and would need a barrier for safety reasons, thus eventually making the wall even higher.

Other comments The Wildflower Meadow does not have suitable medium for cultivation as a thin layer of soil has been laid on compacted builders' rubble, presumably to save the cost of having it removed.

A full biodiversity survey should be carried out.

There are various references to experts, these are just opinions which in the PCs opinion, are not acceptable.

There are also references to Modest changes this may be true in a heavily built up industrial area, but they are not modest in a sensitive National Park.

The incomplete application, errors and information suggestion things referred to existing have not always been existing, therefore the accuracy is misleading to a planning officer, who isn't aware of the items that are actually correct, or not.

There are many references to existing, when they are in fact referring to what they have changed without permission, not what was there when the property was purchased not that long ago.

Permitted development rights have been used, these were removed on the original planning application.

The proposals do not respect the integrity of the original design structure. SD30 and SD31 purpose is to avoid adverse impacts on rural character and landscape, due to over-development.

The main mechanism for achieving these objectives is to limit the increase in the size of existing dwellings to approximately 30%.

Work should only be carried out from 8am to 6pm Monday to Friday, 9am to 1 pm Saturday and no work on Sundays or Bank holidays.

8. Winter Plan

As it was a mild winter and an extra bag had been obtained last year, and not used, it was not felt necessary to order any this year.

9. Covid-19 update

It was agreed to keep the WhatsApp group running.

10. Financial Report

- a. Certificate of Exemption. Agreed
- b. Annual Governance Statement. Agreed
- c. Accounting Statement. Agreed

11. Items for next month's meeting

A letter to the planning department should be drafted to show the lack of concern about the way planning is handled

13 Date of next meeting

Wednesday 9th September

The Chairman thanked everyone for attending and closed the meeting at 9.00pm

The following amounts have been paid for April 2020 and May 2020


Date	Payee	Amount
12/05/20	MSDC Dog bin emptying	£275.70
18/05/20	M Brennan – Cemetery grass cutting etc	£510.00
20/05/20	Clerk wages March - April 2020	£500.00
20/05/20	Castle Water	£6.11
21/05/20	BHIB insurance	£351.45
27/05/20	DM Payroll	£70.50

TOTAL £1,713.76

Receipts for April 2020 and May 2020

Date	Payee	Amount
30/04/20	MSDC Precept and Burial	£3,488.00
12/05/20	HMRC VAT refund	£87.90

TOTAL £3,575.90


08/04/2020