



CATSFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**Minutes of the Parish Council Meeting held on
Wednesday 9th November 2022 at 6pm
in Hermon Cottage, Church Road, Catsfield TN33 9DP**

Attended by: Cllr K Robertson
Cllr G Curtis, Cllr K Curtis, Cllr J Fowle, Cllr S Jacques
Also in attendance: Clerk Alexandra Sharp

Members of the Public: 129 and 2 Representatives from Greystoke/SP Broadway

The Clerk:
Mrs Alexandra Sharp
The Village Hall, Church Road
Catsfield, East Sussex
TN33 9DP
Phone 07483 306519
Email clerk@catsfieldpc.co.uk
Website www.catsfieldpc.co.uk

Alexandra L Sharp

PARISH COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA		
Item	Agenda Item	
1.	To receive apologies for absence. RESOLVED: Apologies were received from County Cllr Kathryn Field.	
2.	To approve the minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 19 th October 2022 RESOLVED: The minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on 19 th October 2022 were agreed and approved. The Chair is authorised to sign the minutes.	
3.	To receive declarations of interest on agenda items	
	Public Questions relevant to items on the Agenda Cllrs Gary Curtis and Kirsty Curtis declared a personal interest in item 9 – The Normanhurst Estate as a neighbour to the application site. The Chair proposed that as both Cllrs had knowledge of the estate that may be useful in understanding the presentation that they be allowed to remain in the meeting when the item 9 on the agenda is discussed. This was approved.	
4.	To receive reports from Cllr Kathryn Field (ESCC) and Cllr Gary Curtis (RDC). District Cllr Gary Curtis confirmed there were no updates to report in relation to RDC.	KF/GC
5.	Planning and Enforcement	GC/KC
5.1	RR/2022/2470/P Lantern Cottage, Church Road, Catsfield TN33 9BG Outline: Installation of solar panels on the roof of 2x detached sheds RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council have no objections.	
5.2	RR/2022/2475/P Horns Hill, Horns Corner, Catsfield TN33 9DT Outline: Erection of rear and side extension and rebuild of pool house and green house. RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council have no objections.	
5.3	RR/2022/2506/P Wylands Farm, Powdermill Lane, Catsfield TN33 9SU Outline: Replacement of the existing store building with a new commercial building comprising Class E (offices and workshops) and B8 (storage use) uses. RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council object to this planning application due to the un-resolved previous planning enforcement issues and overdevelopment.	
5.4	RR/2022/2192/P Ivy House, The Green, Catsfield TN33 9DJ Outline: Erection of 3 x dwellings RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council object to this application. We note the original application permission was for 2 houses. This new application would result in overdevelopment of the site, with dangerous access and insufficient space for vehicles for each house. Furthermore it is a ribbon development and is not in-keeping with the road.	
5.5	RR/2022/2397/P Henley Down Farm, Watermill Lane, Henley Down, Catsfield TN33 9BN Outline: Proposed extension and alterations to a listed building including demolition and reversal of unpermitted works. RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council have no objections.	
5.6	RR/2022/2398 Henley Down Farm, Watermill Lane, Henley Down, Catsfield TN33 9BN Outline: Proposed extension and alterations to a listed building, including demolition and reversal of unpermitted works. RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council have no objections.	
5.7	RR/2022/2479/P Normanhurst Stables, Horns Corner, Catsfield TN33 9DU	

12

Outline: Demolition of existing block of 7 stables and erection of new block of 8 stables.
RESOLVED: It was agreed for the following comment to be submitted to RDC Planning Dept: The Parish Council have no objections.

6. Finance, Audit and Legal

6.1 To approve the accounts, payments and finance pack to 31st October 2022 and first draft budget Appendix 6.1

RESOLVED: The accounts and finance pack to 31 October 2022 were reviewed and approved, the first draft budget was deferred to December 2022 Parish Council meeting and the following payments were approved:-

November Payments

Payments by Bank Transfer pending authorisation

	Payee	Payment Details	Amount
10/11/2022	Alexandra Sharp	Clerk's Salary for November 2022	£682.20
10/11/2022	John O'Conner	Grass Cutting in October 2022	£305.14
10/11/2022	She's Got It Maid	Cleaning of Pavilion for October 2022	£55.00
02/11/2022	I.B Safe	Changing of Locks to Pavilion Boiler Room	£108.00

Payments by direct debit for authorisation

Payment Date	Payee	Payment Details	Amount
28/10/2022	JM Waste Management	Waste Collections in Oct 2022	£76.44
17/10/2022	Sage	Monthly subscription -October 22 (final invoice)	£86.40
21/09/2022	Eon	Electricity Charges for Pavilion October 2022	TBC
26/10/2022	Npower	Electricity Charges for Streetlighting	£140.86
03/10/2022	Npower	Electricity Charges for Streetlighting	£134.72

Payments by debit card pending authorisation

Payment Date	Payee	Payment Details	Amount
06/10/2022	The Poppy shop	Poppy Wreath	£20.99

6.2 To receive and approve the bank statement Appendix 6.2a and reconciliation Appendix 6.2b and balance sheet Appendix 6.2c to 31st October 2022.

RESOLVED: The bank statement, reconciliation and balance sheet to 31st October 2022 was reviewed and approved.

7. Recreation Ground (Playing Field, Playground and Community Pavilion)

7.1 To note any urgent matters arising from the monthly playground inspections.

RESOLVED: There were not urgent matters arising from the monthly playground inspections. It was noted that the Parish Council contractor would be installing a stake/support to the Oak Tree at the recreation ground on 26th November 2022.

It was agreed for the Clerk to purchase a Vodafone SIM card for the CCTV to enable improved CCTV remote access. If this doesn't resolve the issue then the Clerk should contact 1066 Security to ask them to resolve the issue.

8. Traffic/Roads/Policing

8.1 To receive an update on traffic surveys and Speedwatch

RESOLVED:

It was noted that the Speed Watch sessions held during the week of Project Edward were successful with 30 cars caught exceeding the speed limit.

It was agreed for a video showing the difference in outcome of a collisions at different speeds would be uploaded to the Parish Council website and Facebook page.

Cllr Jacques updated the Parish Council on the Warm Spaces initiative, and explained the funding that is available if the Parish Council decide to hold warm spaces sessions for the village. It was agreed to arrange a leaflet drop in relation to this initiative whilst reaching out to residents of Catsfield with the Village survey. Cllr Sarah Jacques and Cllr Kirsty Curtis will visit other parishes who have already encompassed this to get an idea of how they run their warm space.

The meeting was paused at 6:25pm in anticipation of a 7pm start re: The Normanhurst Estate

The meeting was restarted at 7pm

9. The Normanhurst Estate to commence at 7pm

9.1	To receive a presentation from Greystoke in relation to their proposals for the Normanhurst Estate RESOLVED: A 15 minute presentation was given, regarding the development proposals, by the Planning Consultants acting for Greystoke Estates. It was noted that the proposals had been amended slightly following feedback at the exhibition held on 31st October 2022, this included the removal of the proposed Normanhurst village green. Furthermore it was announced that the updates/amendments would be viewable on Greystoke's website shortly.
9.2	To consider a response to the proposals including public questions. The Chair read aloud a summary of the comments submitted to the Parish Council regarding the development proposals. It was noted that every comment made was in objection to the proposals. It was noted that all except one member of the public in attendance at the meeting (approximately 130 in attendance) was in objection to the development proposals. The chairman managed questions from members of the public to the planning consultants for Greystoke. The detail of the questions raised by residents in attendance and the responses given from the consultants representing Greystoke can be found in Appendix 9.2 Public Questions. This Appendix plus all of the responses received prior to the meeting are available on the Parish Council website). A summary of the Q&A at this meeting is outlined below. <u>Summary Q&A.</u> Why is this proposal being made? Public questions and statements assessed this to be for financial gain for investors who would see large gains if planning permission for this development were to be approved, and then sell of the site pre-development. This was not about providing a demand led holiday site with any concern for the environment. Concerns were raised that any outline planning application or a full planning application would be subsequently revised and result in permanent or long-term accommodation letting at the site. The Greystoke planner advised that planning law and Section 106 agreements would prevent this. The Council Chairman stated that such laws and agreements have and are currently being ignored with no enforcement, and as such we have no confidence that any approved application would be followed or enforced if not followed. Wildlife, Nature and the Environment. Many questions were raised concerning the substantial damage to the environment, flora and fauna that would result from this development. The developer responses to mitigations of such damage were not considered plausible or supported by facts or any studies that were available for review. The developers confirmed that they had not contacted Natural England and had not completed an Environmental Impact Assessment. Questions on the relocation of wildlife and "deer training" were received with disbelief. Several questions from residents living or working on the estate concerned a depletion of their quality of life. Responses were broadly non-committal or vague or required a future response. Traffic and Access The three proposed access points for visitors to the site are via (1) a new entrance near to Horns Corner, (2) Service entrance through stone pillars further north and (3) an entrance for some lodges via Frickley Hollow. The new site (1) is within a series of S bends where there are frequent accidents. (A fence just metres from this site has been crashed through three times in the past year). This stretch of road is dangerous. Any of the substantial amount of additional traffic generated and needing to queue in or out would be at risk. The response was that no accidents on that road has been recorded (traffic statistics only record killed or seriously injured, not all crashes) and that if queuing was needed the plans would be re-drawn, and if needed road safety audit would be conducted. Resident though that again the evidence to support these proposals was missing or had not been properly considered.

Site (2) while on a more open stretch of road would require the stone pillars to be moved and not destroyed. It was not clear if that was in fact what was proposed.

Site (3) would significantly increase traffic on a very narrow road of one car width. That road cannot cope with anything but the very lightest of traffic movements. There were no substantial responses to this statement explaining how the traffic from several lodges could use this road as an entrance.

Utilities. (Power, Water, Sewage, Communications)

Several questions were asked concerning how would the water would be supplied and how would waste be removed (Given there are no sewers). The responses were that this would need to be considered. No evidence of planning for this was available.

There is no gas supply in the area. Would the lodges and facilities run on Oil or bottled gas or some other means? No evidence of planning for this was available.

Catsfield has frequent electricity power outages. How would the additional load of 230 lodges and facilities impact the supply and how could a "high quality" holiday site such as this cope with power outages. No evidence of planning for this was available.

Internal access via cable is poor unless you live close to a fibre junction box. Internet and phone access via phone signal is poor almost everywhere. What plans are there to make access available? It was noted that in other communities with new developments the new developments benefited from new internet infrastructure and connections with no upgrade to the existing community access. There were no specific plans outlined by the developers for this development.

Economics & the impact on our local community.

Greystoke claim that the financial benefits are substantial, benefitting the local community by many millions of pounds. There were no reports of how these sums were calculated or substantiated other than it was from a "professional source". It was clear that "local" did not mean Catsfield. If any such benefits exist they could not be challenged at this meeting but will be challenged if any planning application is made.

Catsfield would suffer the consequence of the damage to its environment, years of works traffic in the building of the site, and a loss of quality of life for residents living on the state. The impact on anyone walking the 1066 route through the estate will be negative.

Benefits to Catsfield suggested were more employment at the lower scale of earnings at the site, or local spending from visitors. Employment though hospitality is not a primary goal for Catsfield and is not seen in any way as a significant benefit. Availability of hospitality staff to local hospitality businesses is already a problem that would be made worse if the development were to go ahead. It was also thought that large construction projects would source contractors from beyond the local area. Benefits from increased visitor spending may occur but not on a significant scale, with most visitors expected to be site self-catering or use the on-site site facilities. The Centre Parcs model.

Items for referral to next agenda / reports / future agenda items / correspondence.

Meeting Closed at 21:08pm

Next Parish Council meeting to be held at
6pm on Wednesday 14th December 2022 in Hermon Cottage.

Signed:

 Chairman

Dated:

14 Dec 22

Appendix 9.2

Public Questions Re The Normanhurst Estate Development Proposals.

The Chair read aloud a summary of the comments submitted to the Parish Council regarding the development proposals. It was noted that every comment made was in objection to the proposals.

The chair managed questions from members of the public to the planning consultants for Greystoke. The questions were raised by residents in attendance and the responses were from the Planning Consultants representing Greystoke:

Nature, Wildlife and the Environment

- **Resident: Have Rother District Council indicated to Greystoke their stance on the development proposals at this stage?**
Response: It was confirmed that RDC have not made any indication as to their thoughts on the application and should not/will not do so until the decision has been made following submission of the full planning application.
- **Resident: A member of the public present at meeting asked other attendees whether anyone had changed their mind and is now in agreement with the proposed development following the public exhibition held on 31st October 2022.**
100% of the residents in attendance confirmed they were still in objection.
- **Resident: Have Natural England been contacted about the proposed development as it would seem from residents investigation that they had not?**
Response: It was confirmed that they will be made aware and will have a view and this will be published once the full application is submitted.
- **Resident: here is a vast amount of wildlife on the Normanhurst Estate, many of which are protected species. What surveying have Greystoke undertaken in this respect?**
Response: Surveys had been conducted throughout the seasons over the last 18 months by Bioscan and an Environmental Impact Assessment will be undertaken. There is potential to relocate some wildlife.
- **Resident: The development proposal is entirely for financial gain and the suggested benefits are questionable at best. Residents believe that this should not be sold as beneficial to the village when the so-called benefits will merely be actions in place to attempt to right the damage caused.**
- **Resident: The presentation showed that a building will be removed. What building is this?**
Response: One farmhouse – but unclear at this time which one.

- **Resident:** Has anyone from Greystoke actually walked the estate?
 Response: Some have (it is unclear exactly who).
- **Resident:** Part of an Ecological Impact Assessment requires alternative sites to be assessed. Has this been done and if so, where were the alternative sites?
 Response: Yes this has been undertaken. The alternative site details are unavailable at the present time but this will be publicly available if requested from RDC and also on RDC planning portal once the full application is submitted.
- **Resident:** 45% of the planned building work will destroy wild bluebell fields (7 named Bluebell Fields in fact) Why can't open land be used instead?
 Response: It is our understanding that the lodges are being placed in lesser ecological areas.
- **Resident:** At the Public Exhibition on 31st October 2022 a representative for Greystoke stated that there would be a designated green area that they would be training the wild deer to go? How will this be done?
- **Resident:** On the plans shown on the presentation this evening there was a blue line representing the proposed area of the development however this blue line encompasses residents own properties that are not owned by Greystoke. Why is this?
 Response: We will re-look and update if this is the case.
- **Resident:** The development proposals will be changing the quality of residents lives, especially those neighbouring the Normanhurst Estate. The proposals will significantly diminish their livelihood and compromise their privacy.
 Response: The bridal licences will be retained and if necessary relocated to alternative areas of The Normanhurst Estate. The stables will also be retained. There will be a cycle route through the estate and there will be soft landscaping to maintain a natural environment.
- **Resident:** This proposed development is not for the village or existing community at all, this is purely for investment and financial gain.
- **Resident:** It appears that the placement of lodges actually covers an area as big as the whole remaining areas of the village of Catsfield. How will it be possible to maintain any Dark Skies Policy with plans of this size, while bearing in mind necessary lighting to the lodges, security etc. A Dark Skies Policy doesn't seem possible from the look of the proposals.
- **Response:** The proposals will be Dark Skies Policy compliant. Lodges will not have rooflights to avoid unnecessary light spill and there will be censored lighting, and no use of LED bulbs as these would not be compliant with a Dark Skies Policy. Plans will ensure that unnecessary light spill will be avoided where possible.
- **Resident:** You have stated that there will not be any unnecessary removal of trees. How is this monitored and have the effects of piling of the felled trees been considered? This can cause significant damage to the roots of other trees.
 Response: There will be a root protection zone in place.

Traffic and Roads

- Resident: In relation to road safety, a representative of Greystoke stated that in the surveys that are undertaken crashed are only taken into account if a hospital visit was logged, only such incidents will be included in any statistics used for the application.
Response: A road safety audit will be undertaken as part of the application process.
- Resident: A transport assessment needs to also be undertaken because residents already encounter severe issues with traffic congestion and delays because of public busses, cars and school busses. Additional traffic will only cause this already bad situation to get worse i.e. children arriving at school late. Access to the lodges by guests will increase the traffic and will cause even more congestion and dangerous queuing to get into the site.
- Response: Queuing is not acceptable on the highway and so if this was thought to be the case the application would not meet the criteria.
- Resident: Construction traffic while the development is be created will also have a hugely negative and dangerous impact on the Village, traffic and roads.
- Resident: The proposals state that there are already 326 vehicles entering the estate on a daily basis. This is not correct.
- Response: It has been noted that there is currently 5000 vehicles travelling through the village and it is expected that the proposed development will increase this by 474. The requirements state that up to a 10% increase is acceptable. The anticipated increase comes in at 9.5% increase and therefore considered acceptable.
- Resident: Skinners Lane/Frickley Hollow proposed access to 5 lodges is preposterous. The road is already too narrow for more than one car. Currently during the pheasant shoot the traffic backs up and is queuing outside residents homes, emitting engine fumes. A representative of Greystoke advised at the pubic exhibition that there will not be any lodge-related traffic entering via Frickley Hollow, why has this now changed?
- Response: There will not be any set change over days and so this will minimise congestion on particular change over days.
- Resident: There are too many unknown details for a well-considered application to be submitted by the middle of December as you claim. Too many details are 'unclear' and there is too much contradiction in the answers given by Greystoke and their representatives.