



DRAFT Minutes of the Bury Parish Council meeting on Monday 9th January 2023 at Bury Village Hall

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence

In attendance: Councillors Champness (Chair), Davis, Daykin, Driver, Labarte, Rudd and Whyles

Apologies: Councillors Marconi and Morrison which Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve.

Also in attendance: 12 members of the public, County Councillor Tom Richardson and District Councillor Alan Sutton

2. To Receive Declarations of Interest, Notification of Changes to Members' Interests and consider any requests for a dispensation.

There were none

3. Approval of the Minutes from the Extraordinary Council Meeting held on 1st December 2022

Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve the minutes from the meeting on 1st December as a true and accurate record.

4. Public Session (Members of the Public may speak for up to five minutes at the discretion of the Chair)

To note any comments.

One member of the public informed the Council that although he supported the redevelopment of Hillside Nursery, he could not support the plans in the current form as he believed the design was not in keeping with other properties in Bury Common, particularly the metal roof plots of 6&7. He was also concerned about the balconies of these plots overlooking his garden as well as the privacy of other neighbouring properties. He also requested further details on the flow and drainage in and out of the attenuation pond and who would have responsibility for managing it as well as clarification about the amount of parking to be expected on the lane. Another resident raised concerns about the use of the commercial units and said the impact assessment stated they would not be noisy but gave no indication of what type of business would be there. Councillor Daykin responded saying he believed they would be class c use such as office and retail.

5. Councillor Reports

(a) To receive a report from the District Councillor

Councillor Sutton advised that the Council was still revising its Local Plan and was looking at how they could increase the energy efficiency of properties; ensuring every social housing provider shows how they were treating mould; looking at ways of securing more funding to invest in business; applying for a grant of £65,000 from central government to reduce homelessness and continuing to support people through the Supporting You campaign. He also advised that the local NHS Community Trust was looking at ways to release beds in hospitals by paying for residential care, and at the end of March there would be community pharmacists from 111 referrals.

(b)To receive a report from the County Councillor

Councillor Richardson advised that the Council's new speed limit policy had been approved, which made it easier for communities to apply to reduce speed limits, and if the scheme was paid for then it could be processed immediately.

6. Planning Applications

SDNP/22/05635/TCA: Leghorn Cottage The Street Bury West Sussex RH20 1PA Proposal:
Notification of intention to fell 1 no. Maple tree.

Councillors **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

SDNP/22/05683/TCA: Smiths Barn Church Lane Bury West Sussex RH20 1PB
Proposal: Notification of intention to height reduce by up to 4m (back to previous pollard points) on 1 no. Eucalyptus tree

Councillors **RESOLVED** to remain neutral on this application.

SDNP/21/05619/FUL: Hillside Nursery Bury Common Bury RH20 1NR
Proposal: Demolition of existing glasshouse and associated horticultural structures and erection of 7 no. C3 residential dwellings and 7 no. commercial workspace suites (class E(g)), including access landscaping and associated works

Bury Parish Council (BPC) has monitored the progress of this application with great interest. If approved, it will be by far the largest development in the village for some time and the effect of such a substantial development needs to be fully considered. There are arguments for the development and arguments against and BPC is aware of the considerable tensions that the prospect of the development is causing to its neighbours and in particular to the owners of Southview Farm. Those clearly articulated objections are that the proximity of the new residential development to the farm may affect its 24/7 operation and that parking on the shared access road may compromise access to the fields. The objectors argue there is no case for any development within the village on the west side of the A29. Equally, there is an argument that suggests it could be a positive move for such a development to happen as a village on both sides of the road would promote the sense of the A29 being less of a 'higher speed' by-pass and more of a 'lower speed' road that passes through a community.

In an ideal world, BPC would have wished the Hillside Nursery would continue as a viable business. This, sadly, is not the case, and its owners are faced with the problem (or the opportunity) of what to do with a derelict site. There are those who would wish to see it returned to a field and agricultural use and, if this was remotely realistic, such a plan would no doubt receive BPC's full support. The reality, however, is that the buildings exist and there is a legitimate case to be made for an alternative use. BPC is confident that the planning authority will have carried out all the relevant checks on marketing the site in its existing condition and use. It is also confident that it will have precedents to refer to in considering the condition to be imposed to deal with the potentially abrasive issues of a new residential development adjacent to an existing farm. Though BPC supports any negotiations that help protect the operational disciplines of Southview Farm, its position in relation to this application assumes that a change of use is likely to be granted. Its concern is therefore on the quality of the development rather than whether or not it should happen at all.

Given that context, BPC has looked carefully at the design proposal and welcomes it as an imaginative re-use of the disused nursery. The direction is very clear. It is well thought through and it has the potential to be a scheme that is well suited to its site, appropriate in its density and a worthy extension of the village. The careful site analysis led to the discovery of the earlier field pattern that provoked a

natural division in the site between a more commercial front and the residential back. In terms of character, the drawings of the long barn with its sloping gutter and integrated route to the parking yard, show a promising and familiar response to the presence of the main road. Similarly, the compositional reference to a farmstead shows a sensitive approach to the view from the coffin trail and the characterisation of the yard at the rear of the site, with buildings of varying significance and scale, should set this proposal apart from the more suburban developments all too commonly seen over the last few years.

In considering the accommodation, BPC welcomes the variety of house types and the inclusion of smaller and more affordable cottages. It does, however, have some concerns about the amount of E class accommodation proposed and would like reassurance that there is indeed a market for this space as the units at Carringdales, the development close to Bury Gate and also off the A29, may not yet be fully let. BPC is also concerned about the amount of parking required for these commercial units. It seems like a large car park that, on the face of it, looks like too many cars. Equally, it would not wish to see the development have too few, particularly if that meant that cars were parked in the street. BPC would wish to see the evidence that supports the numbers proposed.

In terms of the process, BPC has found the pre-app discussions positive and is pleased to have had its voice heard. This proposal represents a step change from the one seen a year ago and it is a credit to the developer that such a strong change direction was countenanced in favour of a more sensitively considered approach. That said, though BPC had hoped it could support the design content of the full application, it has three serious reservations that prevent it from doing so.

The commercial barn roof

The earlier sketches shown to BPC in the pre-app process (which copiously illustrate the Design and Access Statement) show the commercial barn divided into two parts under a single long roof. This image gave a bold and convincing impression of a single large barn which, very disappointingly, has not been carried through to the submitted design. Instead of two parts of a single building united under one roof, there are now two distinct, smaller buildings revealing blank gable walls separated by a very large gate. It is the main part of the composition seen from the A29 and, with this change, the proposal now lacks both the confidence and conviction of the previous idea. The continuity of the form is made to depend on this rather feeble and unresolved gate which has all the charm of an industrial estate. Though it may be open most of the time, its message is more of a 'keep out' signal rather than the more welcoming gesture of the continuous roof. This change is a serious disappointment and, in the view of BPC, undermines one of the key ideas in the proposal.

The residential car barns

Similarly, the character of the 'farmstead' yard has taken a backward step from the earlier sketches. The Design and Access Statement shows small, pitched roof structures adjacent to and attached to the houses around the yard. These have now been substituted by flat roofed car ports. The original composition of an informal group of different types of buildings was completed and held together by these smaller scale pitched roof structures which gave a spatial and characterful continuity. The new flat-roofed structures take the grouping back to a 60's cul-de-sac or the very suburban character that this design sought to avoid. This is not a point that should be considered as too subtle or unimportant as the picturesque proposition on which the design is based is dependent on that picture being complete.

The car parking for the cottages

With the car parking largely screened or hidden, the parking strategy seems generally successful. It is a pity therefore that the four parking spaces for the cottages closest to the front of the development is so obvious. It seems the discipline of sight lines is driving the layout all to be below the eye level of a

driver making the presence of the cars all too visible. These four cars will be clearly seen in the foreground of the layered view so valued in the design and will form the first impression approaching the residential yard. It is the one point where the general layout remains unconvincing.

BPC is disappointed that these three aspects of the design have left the earlier promise of well-considered proposal short of a scheme that it could support and, as long as they remain unresolved, BPC objects to the application on design grounds. BPC believes these are matters that are easily fixed and very much hopes the issues will be properly addressed during the application process. If that were possible, BPC would look forward to rescinding its objection and, instead, be in a position to support the application as, in principle, it is in favour of a positive development replacing the disused Hillside Nursery.

In the event of the application being approved, BPC would like to see three conditions imposed on the approval. First, a commitment from the applicant that there will be no additional parking on the street and that a management plan is proposed to bring this into effect is included as a formal part of this application. Second, that further details of the fencing and perimeter landscaping are submitted for approval and that BPC will be allowed to comment on them. And third, the proposed details of the fenestration of the commercial barn's street elevation are submitted for scrutiny by BPC and agreed prior to an approval.

SDNP/22/05649/FUL: Land at Timberley Farm Bury Common Bury West Sussex RH20 1NP Proposal: Conversion of barn complex into dwelling with associated parking.

The Council voted to remain neutral on the condition that any light spillage was reduced as much as possible in order to comply with policies SD8 and BNDP 15 and protect Bury's Dark Night Skies.

The Council generally supported the application and welcomed the designer's approach to Energy and Ecosystems Sustainability, but had the following reservations with respect to light pollution

The Design and Access Statement does consider this issue at some length and the requirements of Local Plan policy SD8 that requires a developer to ensure that any proposed lighting was necessary and to reduce light spillage as a result of poor design. Furthermore, the statement noted that the proposed roof lights could be fitted with electrically operated dusk-dawn internal blackout blinds if required.

As there are 11 number proposed roof lights, the Council questioned whether the designer had truly tried to limit the roof lights to those that were absolutely necessary and indeed given that Timberley Farm was at the centre of an International Dark Night Sky Reserve should there be any roof lights at all. The Council also added that it did not consider the fact that a roof light was existing exempts it from the principles of light spillage reduction as required by policy SD8 which seemed to be implied in the D&A statement

Secondly, it was proposed to replace 2 full height barn doors and infills with large glazed panels. Again, the Council questioned whether the amount of glazing was necessary as they were nearly 5 metres in height. And had light spillage mitigation been considered beyond manually operated blinds.

SDNP/22/05117/HOUS: Squires Cottages

The Parish Council voted to remain neutral on SDNP/22/05117/HOUS on the condition that the roof light was fitted with an automated blind and the amount of glazing on the proposed extension was reduced by 50% in order to comply with policies SD8 and BNDP 15 and protect Bury's Dark Night Skies.

7. Tupperney Fields/Roman Mile Farm

To discuss the recent caravans at Tupperney Fields

Councillor Daykin advised there was an 8 acre plot of land at Roman Mile Farm that had been divided into three areas and was being used for non-agricultural purposes. Gateways had been widened without permission and pipes installed which had already caused flooding. CDC planning enforcement had already been notified but the Council **AGREED** to write to them with their concerns and also include breaches of planning at Sandy Meadow Farm.

8. Budget and precept 2023-24

To adopt a budget and precept for 2023-24

The clerk presented the draft budget and precept request of £30,337 for 2023-24 which was a 4% increase on the previous year and 3% increase per band D property of £82.32. After consideration, Councillors **RESOLVED** to approve the budget and precept request of £30,337.

9. Village Hall

(a) To receive an update on the village hall refurbishment

Councillor Whyles advised that, following the public consultation with residents, it was suggested that the plans for the kitchen were revised to make it bigger and to use the first floor space as a flat instead of office space to which Councillors **AGREED**. These revised proposals would then be presented at public meetings in the spring. He added that two applications for funding had been submitted to SDNPA and the Jubilee Hall Fund.

(b) To receive any other updates from the working group

Councillor Whyles advised that a working group to research kitchen equipment for the new hall had been formed.

10. Grounds and Highways

(a) To receive an update from the A29 Road Improvement Committee

Councillor Whyles informed the Council that the RIC intended to host a mini-conference in Spring for stakeholders to discuss improvements to the A29 and that Chief Constable Jo Shiner, MP Andrew Griffiths and Police and Crime Commissioner Katy Bourne would be in attendance.

(b) To discuss the changes to the WSCC speed limit policy

Councillors discussed WSCC's new speed limit policy and **AGREED** to investigate applying to reduce the speed on the A29 through Bury subject to cost.

(c) To note the recent WSCC ash dieback works in Bury

Councillors noted the recent works on Bury Hill and the clerk advised future felling would happen soon. Councillors **AGREED** that they would approach WSCC and CDC about replanting.

(d) To consider a request from Fittleworth Parish Council to move the Fittleworth road sign on Tripp Hill

Councillors **AGREED** to approve the proposal from Fittleworth Parish Council to erect a gate on its land at Tripp Hill subject to the necessary licence from WSCC.

11. Bury and West Burton Volunteers

To receive an update and consider any requests

The Chair of BWVB reported that the Christmas lunch sold 67 tickets and made £540 profit part of which has been donated to the Snowdrop Trust and the rest would be kept for the village hall refurbishment. Councillors also **AGREED** to request that the volunteers organised a social event for the coronation of King Charles III.

12 Local Government Pension Scheme

To consider adding the clerk to the Local Government Pension Scheme

Councillors unanimously **AGREED** to table a statutory resolution to enable Mike Simpson (The Clerk) to join the Local Government Pension Scheme.

13. Parish Council Elections

To discuss the forthcoming elections in May

The Chair informed that local elections would take place on 4th May 2023 and suggested the Council should advertise it so any residents wishing to stand knew how to apply which Councillors **AGREED** to approve.

14. King Charles III coronation

To discuss a social event to celebrate the King's coronation on May 6 2023

Councillors **AGREED** to host a social event for the coronation and requested the Bury and West Burton Volunteers help.

15. Future Meeting dates

(a) 13th March 2023 (Full Council)

Councillors **AGREED** to move this meeting to Monday 27th March 2023

(b) 13th February- Environment and Planning Committee

(c) To discuss the date of the Annual Meeting in May

The Chair advised that the first meeting of a new Council had to take place within two weeks of the election and suggested 15th May 2023 which Councillors **AGREED** to approve.

The meeting finished at 8pm