

Kingston Parish Council Planning Update

10th July 2024

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
<p>SDNP/23/04896/FUL Spring Hayes Ashcombe Lane Kingston East Sussex BN7 3JZ</p>	<p>Erection of 2no bedroom, two storey dwelling and carport, along with associated tree works</p>	<p>Revised comment sent 19/02/2024.</p> <p>SDNP/23/04896/FUL: Object</p> <p>Kingston Parish Council would like to object to the planning application to build a two-storey house within the curtilage of the property known as Spring Hayes, Ashcombe Lane, Kingston BN 7 3JZ: SDNP/23/04896/FUL.</p> <p>KPC feel compelled to object to this application despite having some sympathy for the position of the applicants. Recently agreed applications have significantly changed the street scene at this point on the East side of Ashcombe Lane as a result of the building line being pushed forward on the adjacent site to the immediate North on which houses are in course of construction. The proposed development at Spring Hayes references the neighbouring site's building line which results in the new house being significantly further forward than the existing house on Spring Hayes or any of the other houses on that side of Ashcombe Lane. We feel this proposal will contribute to the sense that this part of Kingston is being subjected to infill development and gives the appearance of ribbon development at this part of the village which historically was not the case, the adjacent property being essentially an open field with the main house situated at the extreme North-West end of the site.</p> <p>This application takes little account of the importance of the view towards the North-East seen from Ashcombe Lane as shown in the Conservation Area Character Appraisal & Management Plan (CAAMP),</p>	<p>Refused</p>

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p data-bbox="1048 138 1765 403">Kingston near Lewes 2021, Village Appraisal map on p 51, marked by the most Northern of the two arrows facing outward from the Conservation Area plan. The site is on the opposite side of Ashcombe Lane to the Conservation Area boundary, and consequently the drawing of the building line much closer to the road on this and the adjacent site runs counter to the intention of the Conservation Area to preserve this view.</p> <p data-bbox="1048 443 1720 504">We would like the Planning Officers to consider our few comments below.</p> <ul data-bbox="1099 547 1765 1358" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1099 547 1765 746">• This proposal removes even more trees from a stretch of road where many have recently been removed. We would ask that consideration be given to ensuring the retention of as many trees as possible while still facilitating the development, should it be approved. <li data-bbox="1099 786 1765 1153">• We would also question the need for so many parking spaces in the new (combined) development. We would consider two each at most to be appropriate. The sewage from this development would need to flow into the sewer the capacity of which was called into question during the application from the upstream development, at Castelmer SDNP/22/05983/FUL. KPC would like to see greater interrogation of the capacity of the sewer to cope with this additional flow. <li data-bbox="1099 1193 1765 1358">• We would also like to bring to your attention that the application form published online includes an error. The section Site Visit incorrectly says the site cannot be seen from the road; it can be. 	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
SDNP/23/05291/CND Juggs Corner Cottage SDNP/23/04322/HOUS Ashcombe Lane Kingston East Sussex BN7 3JY	Variation of Conditions 2 & 3 related to Planning Approval to include installation of solar panels on roof of outbuilding and raising of roof pitch	The parish council has no comment to make on this application.	Granted
SDNP/24/00579/HOUS Juggs Corner Cottage Ashcombe Lane Kingston East Sussex BN7 3JY	Demolition of an existing shed and erection of replacement outbuilding, to include solar panels.	The parish council has no comment to make on this application.	Granted
SDNP/24/01962/LIS Kingston Manor The Street Kingston East Sussex BN7 3PD	Alterations to internal layouts including creation of cut through links on the ground and first floors to facilitate link between the Main House and the Coach House; relocation of WC from ground floor to first floor and removal of walls and doors; Removal of ground floor conservatory at the Coach House; Replacement of all UPVC walls for timber; Removal of kitchen from the Coach House and removal of porch on the Main House and reinstatement of hung clay tiles	As this is listed building could the planning authority consider asking the ESCC archaeology team to take a watching brief and ask for a recording programme to be implemented and that consideration be given when the front porch is removed to whether there are any below ground archaeological implications	Application in progress
SDNP/24/01666/FUL West Laine House Church Lane Kingston East Sussex BN7 3LW	Erection of a new 5-bedroom house with a carport, accommodation over and associated space for bins and cycles	Kingston Parish Council objects to the planning application SDNP/24/01666/FUL. We object to this new proposal and ask that if granting a new application, consideration is included to amend the permissions already granted so any development can be done with least impact on the environment, neighbours and other members of the community as well as users of the site access, such as Bridleway KIN /6/1. This proposal marks a considerable change in nature from the two previous applications that were	Application in progress

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>granted permission; in June 2019 SDNP/19/01270/FUL and February 2022, SDNP/21/02685/FUL. This proposal would replace the flat roof with a double-gable pitched roof which would increase significantly the visual impact of the development, to not only the neighbouring properties, but also within the landscape. Any new permission must not increase the height of the building and the opportunity to amend design flaws of the previous applications should be taken such as the size and location of the garage. Many elements of this and previous applications can be perceived as development by stealth, which we do not believe is in the interests of Kingston. Design The Planning Applications Committee report for the 2021 application SDNPA/21/02685/FUL, observed that the 2021 proposal did not deviate considerably from that approved in 2019, SDNPA/19/01270/FUL. The report specifically referred to the visual impact: "the proposed development is considered to be acceptable in principle and would not have a significant adverse impact on visual amenity or neighbour living conditions." Executive Summary 1.1 We believe the 2024 proposal is at odds with that assessment as it has altered the outline of the building considerably and that previous permissions bear no relevance to the current application Main House The proposed alteration to the roof has increased the bulk of this building, increasing its impact in the landscape. The flat roof as previously granted permission, sat within the landscape better, as well as better protecting the aspects of near neighbours. The site is conspicuous when viewed from the top of the downs to the south-west. Therefore only a design which minimises the visual impact of the building should be considered. We do not believe this design does. The large extensive areas of glass proposed for the SE elevation, in terms of windows and balustrade represents a considerable risk of light emissions from the proposed building. The design is for both gables to be glazed to full height, i.e.</p>	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>the rooms to have vaulted ceilings. This will increase the potential for light to be emitted from these rooms. There has been a suggestion in paragraph 6 of the Design and Access Statement, p6 that blackout blinds could be fitted. For the 2021 application, SDNPA/21/02685/FUL, condition 26 stipulates that low transmittance glass be used. This application would raise the top of the glazed area thus increasing the potential for light to escape. There is no condition that blackout blinds be used even if installed so KPC considers this solution inadequate. There is potential for future unregulated enlargement in the loft areas (as well as above the garage). Any approved plans must ensure that this is not possible by design as future enforcement is likely to be patchy. Garage As this is a new application, KPC would like to see amendments to some of the previously approved plans; not unreasonable as this is a new design and if any elements are approved, the design will have been amended. The location of the garage is very close to the boundary. Indeed, in the southerly most tip of the garage and its relationship to the boundary are missing from the Site Plan submitted 22nd April 2024. This document should be resubmitted with the site boundary shown. Given the proximity of the boundary to the garage, we feel the external staircase to be completely inappropriate and should either be located on the NW flank, or internally. As the height of the two-story garage is as high as a two-storey house, we would like to see the top storey removed or at least the ridge lowered. the purpose of the living accommodation above is opaque. Given that permission has already been granted for a five-bedroomed house. We are concerned that its presence as residential accommodation may at some point in the future be used to argue that it be converted into another dwelling. Foundations and Groundworks We note that the architect is proposing a "cut and Fill" approach to the site, 'Design and Access Statement, page 4 paragraph 5'. This proposal</p>	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>recognises the difficulty in removing waste from site and the proposed method, cut and fill, acknowledges the degree of slope on the site. KPC would like to see detail of how the foundations would be constructed to ensure a stable structure to the development and any retaining walls. If the design is to include piling, then the design should be included in the application together with an explanation of how plant might be brought onto site. We cannot see how excavating for the foundations for the garage will not damage the rooting system of the row of trees just beyond the SE boundary. Moreover, the driveway leading to the house and garage will, in its proposed location, compact the rooting system of even more trees along this boundary. This is of concern, not just during the occupation stage, but particularly during construction. Surface Drainage. East Sussex CC objected to the proposal in 2021 due to insufficient information contained in the application SDNPA/21/02685/FUL regarding surface water drainage; their reference; SUD/SDNPA/21/005. We note that the current application contains no plan to deal with surface water drainage. This is a sloping site and much of the surfacing is likely to result in run off. Semi permeable surfacing will only remain so with maintenance and careful management, see pavingfrontgardens.pdf (publishing.service.gov.uk) p 19. Given the sloping nature of the site, the direction in which any surface drainage is likely to run, KPC would like to see a comprehensive and detailed plan to deal with the surface drainage. Condition 4 of the SDNPA/21/02685/FUL approval should include mitigation for the fact that underground soak-aways may well result in landslip on a sloping site. Southern Water stated in their letter of the 20th of May 2024, ref DSA000033845, that; "The Council's Building Control officers or technical staff should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development." We assume this to mean prior to determination. This is reflected in</p>	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>the Planning Applications Committee's observations in their report of the 16th February 2022, section 6.3. The 2019 application, SDNP/19/01270/FUL, proposed using the sewer for surface water run-off. The 'SUDS Objection Withdrawal' of the 7th May 2019 conceded that this proposal was not straightforward and the issue remains unresolved. Given the realisation that surface water entering the sewage system has contributed to the discharge of untreated sewage into water courses, this option should never be considered. Environmental impact It has been noted that the Ecological Survey appears to have been conducted on the 2nd November 2023. This is not a suitable time of year to survey for many species. Hibernating and migrant species will not be present and some resident species may utilise the site at different times of year, for example when they breed. Many reptiles and amphibians will be less active or hibernating. The Arbeco Reptile Survey undertaken in May 2019 found evidence of Grass Snakes <i>Natrix Helvetica</i> and Slow Worms <i>Anguis fragilis</i> (both protected species). Arbeco also conducted an Ecological Survey and concluded that: "The habitats present on site provide suitable habitat for the following protected species: foraging bats, badgers <i>Meles meles</i>," (sic) "breeding birds, hazel dormice <i>Muscardinus avellanarius</i>," (sic) "great crested newt <i>Triturus cristatus</i>," (sic) "reptiles and invertebrates". We feel that a more thorough ecological survey be carried out, at a time of year when the results are more dependable and mitigation undertaken to compensate for habitat loss for species affected as well as to ensure there is a 10% net biodiversity gain. This aligns with Conditions 18 and 19 in Section 10 of the Planning Applications Committee report the 16th February 2022 and Condition 18 and 19 of the Decision Notice, SDNPA/21/02685/FUL Site Access This is a very difficult site to develop, as recognised in the conditions applied to the approval of the 2021 application; condition 3 should apply to any approval,</p>	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>i.e. that a CEMP should be approved before any works commence. The case has been adequately put that access to the site is via a narrow track which has been built up and will be vulnerable to collapse to the SE (downhill) side if used by heavy vehicles, laden or unladen. The entrance to this track is from a Public Bridlepath where heavy goods vehicles have been seen struggling to manoeuvre in the confined area available. We therefore believe that, if approved, the CEMP must restrict the weight and size of vehicles which are permitted to use the access beyond the highway (The Avenue) from point TQ 38867 08334. The conditions 22 and 23 of the 2021 Decision Notice SDNPA/21/02685/FUL, should be part of any permissions granted KPC believes the CEMP should, in addition to the conditions already imposed in previous applications, be included in any approval</p>	
<p>SDNP/24/02088/24BC Kingsbrook Farm The Street Kingston East Sussex BN7 3NT</p>	<p>Use of land as recreational campsite for up to 60 days</p>	<p>:Kingston Parish Council appreciate that as the notification SDNP/24/02088/24BC is just that, a notification, then we are not statutory consultees for this application. However, we would like to raise some concerns we have about the notification so all parties are aware of our position. While we have no objections to camping under strictly controlled conditions on the site (see below), we believe that permitted development allowing up to 50 pitches is in excess of the capacity of the site. We would like to see a limit placed on the number of pitches which can be used at any one time in addition to a maximum number of campers permitted to camp overnight at any one time. This is to minimise the impact on the landscape and on the neighbouring properties. We would also like to see greater detail of where the pitches are to be located. The plan submitted with the Notification, outlines the entire holding owned by the applicants. In recent years there has been camping close to the gardens of houses on The Street. Indeed, there have been what appears to be prepared pitches in a similar location i.e. within c 30-40 metres of the boundary of some of the houses. This is a large site, a</p>	<p>Approved</p>

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		<p>little over 13 Ha, and pitches could be located much further away, e.g. 250 metres. We are concerned about fire hazard. The hot, dry summer of 2022 highlighted the need to prepare for and respond to, conditions under which fire may spread, once out of control. We would like to see adequate fire breaks prepared before the period of greatest risk to maximise their effectiveness. Also, a fire plan to deal with fire should it spread beyond prepared areas. E.g. water tanks. This is of greatest concern as the site bounds residential areas and by the time an out-of control fire has been reported to the Fire and Rescue Service, great harm may have already been inflicted on neighbouring properties. In the plan we would like to see where campers are permitted to have camp fires, and what precautions are in place to prevent their spread, e.g. fire pits. We also note that the Fire and Rescue Service are content with their ability to access the site. However, there is potential for inappropriately parked cars to hinder emergency vehicles on the Street as is often witnessed, hence the desire to minimise the need to call upon their services. We would like to see a prohibition of amplified music as well as a curfew on noise, however that might be defined. We believe this, in addition to the distance from residential properties, will reduce the potential for disturbance and conflict. This would benefit the campers also, as their holiday won't be ruined by someone complaining about their activities; its better to know in advance what behaviours are expected. We believe the provision of hygiene and welfare facilities should be given greater consideration than has been the case until now. We would like to be more certain that the camping will not lead to more on-street parking on what is already a busy, narrow residential street, particularly at the weekends. E.g. making on-site parking a requirement for those who visit the site in cars. Kingston Parish Council would like to reinforce our view that only a comprehensive planning application, containing all future plans for</p>	

Application No & Location.	Description of Application	Summary of KPC in Comments	Status
		Lovebrook farm, can address the many issues the owners, community and National Park will have to contend with in the future	