



Mrs J.Toomey, Clerk to East Chiltington Parish Council
 Bowling Green, Chiltington Lane, East Chiltington BN7 3QU, East Sussex Tel: 01273 890621
www.eastchiltington.net email: clerk@eastchiltington.net

DRAFT minutes of the virtual meeting of EAST CHILTINGTON PARISH COUNCIL
 held using Zoom on 10th March 2021 at 6.00pm.

Present: Cllr.M.Symes, chair
 Cllr.C.Funnell, vice chair
 Cllr.M.Goodenough
 Cllr.R.Nurse Cllr.M.Elms
 Cllr. P.David

Apologies: Cllr. M.Durham

In attendance: Mrs J.Toomey - Clerk to the Council. LDC Cllr.Rob Banks Maria Caulfield MP
 4 members of the public.

		Action
3/21/01	Any apologies for absence – As above	
3/21/02	Any questions <u>sent in advance</u> from the public There were no questions	
3/21/03	Declaration of interest on any of the agenda items and update of interests. None	
3/21/9 3/21/9.1	<p>It was agreed that agenda item 9 should be moved up the agenda and the meeting was adjourned in order for council to speak with MP Maria Caulfield and members of the public. (18.05pm)</p> <p>To agree the council response to the LDC draft methodology statement with particular regard to the proposed site for 3000 houses at North barnes Farm, East Chiltington.</p> <p>Cllr.Elms said there seemed to be some difference between information from LDC and the MP. He understood that part 1 of the local plan will be 5 years old in May and a new plan is unlikely to be produced before 2023 during which time there would be no cap on housing numbers, leaving the district open to speculative developers. The MP advised that changes have been brought in that may mean the LDC plan is not up to date after May but it would still carry some weight. The planning inspector would give some weight to refusing applications outside the old plan but they will carry less weight after May and may be appealed. However, any updates in place toward the revised plan will carry some weight and sites could be refused if they were not likely to be included in the updated plan. Again, this could be open to appeal.</p> <p>The local plan part 2 is current until 2025 and this will still have standing with officials. The MP is currently working to get clarity on housing numbers.</p> <p>Cllr.Elms asked if the housing number currently in the plan could continue to be the correct number for the new plan? The MP needs to check this will be the case and numbers will not be queried. Cllr.Nurse asked why LDC had been so slow if they had known of the changes since 2018. The MP said that actually Lewes have been quite proactive but were held up when their plan was disputed by Wealden District causing a delay to getting part 2 adopted. Some districts have a rolling plan, meaning that if sites drop out they can quickly be replaced, this makes updates much easier.</p> <p>Cllr.Banks understood that Eton would not be putting their site forward before the revised plan is in place and LDC now has more resources in place to get the plan done. There is a proper process to follow or the plan could be rejected by the inspector, this takes time.</p> <p>Cllr.Elms asked the MP if she knew whether other sites of this size had been put</p>	

3/21/9.2	<p>forward? There were large sites in Newhaven and the Phoenix quarter in Lewes but nothing like 3000 houses on one site. If the old housing numbers stay then LDC have enough sites already and even with the higher figure this site would probably not be needed. With the district restricted by the SDNP and the coastal strip, LDC have a good case to keep the lower numbers. The main point of the plan is to show what housing numbers a district can realistically provide and the Eton site is completely out of scale.</p> <p>Chair asked whether the developer could appeal if this site is not included in the plan? Yes. There's no way to stop appeals but the process is robust if a site is not in any plan the secretary of state is likely to uphold refusal. The MP gave an example in Newick which has been refused on appeal as it is not in any local plan.</p> <p>Cllr.Elms explained that EC did not have a neighbourhood plan as LDC designates the parish as a Hamlet not suitable for development. MP said the District plan should act as a safeguard. Cllr.Elms asked if anything else should be done to keep this site out of the plan. The MP said LDC must show it has examined a range of sites and must show valid reasons for accepting or rejecting them. Officers will recommend sites to cabinet but the full council will have the final decision and must show they have made robust assessments.</p> <p>Cllr.Nurse asked how would EC be sure that their response was given due diligence by LDC planning officials. The MP said every submission has to be marked and assessed. LDC must give rationale to show how they support or reject the submission from the PC. This is just the start, there will be a period of public consultation and the inspector will look at that and there will be an opportunity to appeal any of the sites. A resident said the government statement of 16th Dec.2020 gave the Lewes housing figure as 385. LDC say nearer 800. This is hugely significant. The MP is hoping to provide the correct numbers in writing and will check if the 2020 part 2 date can be used. She is happy to work with all the parishes to get the Eton site rejected.</p> <p>Chair thanked Maria Caulfield for her time and support. Meeting resumed 18.49</p> <p>Council agreed they would send LDC their response.</p> <p>To consider whether the parish council would want to employ a planning consultant.</p> <p>It was agreed that a consultant may need to be employed later in the process but for now a resident had offered the PC consultant services free of charge.</p>	
<p>3.21.7</p> <p>3.21.7.1</p> <p>3.21.7.2</p>	<p>Council agreed to move item 7 up the agenda</p> <p>Planning matters (P&E committee: Cllr.Symes,chair, Cllr.Nurse, Cllr.Durham)</p> <p>a) To note or discuss any current application</p> <p>LW/21/0001 Mount Pleasant Highbridge Lane East Chiltington: Conversion and extension of redundant forge to dwelling house and demolition of redundant outbuildings.</p> <p>The meeting was adjourned to hear from the applicant (18.52pm)</p> <p>Applicant explained their mortgage lender would not lend on the B2 business and they need to look for a new use for the Forge. Chair explained that council must only look at planning considerations not personal circumstances.</p> <p>The working blacksmith on the site said he understood the position of the applicant but was concerned about how another residential property close to his forge would affect his business. Presently access is shared but if the new bungalow is sold it could cause access problems. This was always a working site and now a non designated heritage asset will be lost forever.</p> <p>The council meeting resumed at 18.57pm</p> <p>Chair said the owners don't want the Forge to be a working forge and she feared the building could be left to collapse. The planning committee had been to the site and felt there would be reasonable access. Cllr.Funnell said if the owners were not in a position to preserve the building it would be better to allow the conversion. Cllr.Nurse felt the new bungalow would be so close to Mount Pleasant that is was unlikely to be sold as a separate unit. Cllr.David had concerns regarding access and parking but thought these might be solved amicably between the applicant and the blacksmith. Council agreed not to object to the application.</p> <p>b) To note any decisions by LDC:</p> <p>LW/20/0730 North Barnes Farm North Barnes Lane: Extend existing cattle building by 18 meters (3 bays) for a new indoor livestock handling facility – <i>awaiting decision</i></p>	

Glossary:

LDC – Lewes District Council

SDNPA - South Downs National Park Authority

ESCC - East Sussex County Council

AIRS – Action in Rural Sussex

SSALC – Surrey and Sussex Association of Local Councils

TECT – The East Chiltington Trust

LDALC – Lewes District Association of Local Councils

CPRE – Campaign for the Protection of Rural England

OART – The Ouse and Adur rivers trust