

This transcript is based on the publicly available recording of the Wealden Minors Planning Committee meeting held on 14 May 2026 and was auto-generated and lightly edited for clarity by The Friends of Bewl Water. The times referred to are those on the clip of the agenda item, which has been published on our website and has not been edited in any other way than to cut out the recording to show agenda item 8 only, which relates to Beals Barn Gardens.

1.00:00:00,000 --> 00:00:06,480

[CLLR ALISON WILSON (CHAIR)] - We do agree to
um go beyond 1:00 if that's necessary.

2

00:00:06,480 --> 00:00:13,200

Councillor Everitt, [CLLR EVERITT] can we put the
constraint of 2:00 so that because I think we have

3

00:00:13,200 --> 00:00:21,040

as Councillors training planned for 2:00 for
1.[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] It's actually for 1:30.

4

00:00:21,040 --> 00:00:26,160

Um so it does present some difficulties.
I'm just mindful that the public are here

5

00:00:26,160 --> 00:00:34,640

um and ready to ready to speak. So we would need
to have um a constraint, shall we say a constraint

6

00:00:34,640 --> 00:00:40,800

to 1.30. I mean it would still obviously delay the
beginning the beginning of what's to come next.

7

00:00:40,800 --> 00:00:48,480

Um Councillor Shing [CLLR SHING] I don't like
that. Sorry because I don't want to continually

8

00:00:48,480 --> 00:00:54,560

without without food I am not not able to cope.
Sorry. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] So you would oppose

9

00:00:54,560 --> 00:01:00,320

us going Yes. beyond one:00. [CLLR SHING] Yes.
I at least I have half an hour for a break for

10

00:01:00,320 --> 00:01:06,960

a training. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Councillor
Gadd, [CLLR GADD] um I assume the training is

11

00:01:06,960 --> 00:01:13,360

in this hall and it's got to be rearranged. So
1:30 it starts.[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] I I agree.

12

00:01:13,360 --> 00:01:17,680

We we are up really up against it. [CLLR GADD]
So we got to give them time to rearrange it.

13

00:01:17,680 --> 00:01:22,320

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)]

14

00:01:22,320 --> 00:01:28,960

Can I just check with officers whether whether we
have any um indication whether we could just run

15

00:01:28,960 --> 00:01:34,160

uh a bit over and then the start of the training
would be delayed. [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] I I

16

00:01:34,160 --> 00:01:38,400

think it's with the gift of the members today
if you did consider that you were able to get

17

00:01:38,400 --> 00:01:43,600

through the items or at least clear an item
we might be able to have some flexibility

18

00:01:43,600 --> 00:01:48,880

in some additional time beyond 1:30. [CLLR

HOWELL] But I think chairman I don't think

19

00:01:48,880 --> 00:01:54,080

you'll be able to give these uh two items the full consideration you need within that time

20

00:01:54,080 --> 00:01:59,840

frame personally and I am mindful that we have people in the audience and they spent the time

21

00:01:59,840 --> 00:02:04,880

coming here but these are important to the communities that within and to not give them

22

00:02:04,880 --> 00:02:28,720

the proper hearing that they deserve is wrong.
[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] I agree. Councillor Howell.

23

00:02:28,720 --> 00:02:34,240

Okay. So um just um for members who are concerned about the beginning of the planning training which

24

00:02:34,240 --> 00:02:39,600

is to go on later that that will be delayed that can be delayed until 2:30. That means

25

00:02:39,600 --> 00:02:44,720

that we could um go with Councillor Everitt's proposal that we agree to extend until 2. I

26

00:02:44,720 --> 00:02:49,920

appreciate what you said Councillor Shing but we we will just need to take a vote on

27

00:02:49,920 --> 00:02:57,920

that. [CLLR SHING] Um chairman I think when we look at the constitution we know we did is

28

00:02:57,920 --> 00:03:04,480

not going to work the way it's set up I strongly
against that with the constitution we changed is

29

00:03:04,480 --> 00:03:11,120

not working we have this situation all the
times now so I think I'm very disappointed

30

00:03:11,120 --> 00:03:15,280

what what happened [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)]
I'm sorry Councillor Shing I think what

31

00:03:15,280 --> 00:03:21,040

we're trying to do is to balance um everybody's
needs and as Councillor Howell pointed out Um,

32

00:03:21,040 --> 00:03:25,920

and I agree the members of the public are here
to have their applications heard. And I think we

33

00:03:25,920 --> 00:03:30,560

need to make every effort within the constraints
that we've got, which is obviously that this this

34

00:03:30,560 --> 00:03:37,040

training this afternoon to try to um deal with
these matters as quickly and as as fully as we

35

00:03:37,040 --> 00:03:46,240

can. Um, so I'm going to propose that we we
vote um to extend the session until 2:00. Um,

36

00:03:46,240 --> 00:03:52,000

and would anybody second that proposal? Oh,
sorry, Councillor Everitt. I think you proposed

37

00:03:52,000 --> 00:04:12,880

it. I'll second it in that case. Um, so could we have a vote on that? Um, all those in favour.

38

00:04:12,880 --> 00:04:17,280

So, that's um that's carried.

We've got six votes in favour. So,

39

00:04:17,280 --> 00:04:31,600

we will continue. Um with the next agenda item with agenda item item eight WD 2025/2595/F

40

00:04:31,600 --> 00:04:38,800

Beals Barn Gardens Bewlbridge Lane Cousley Wood Wadhurst. Um can I just quickly ask

41

00:04:38,800 --> 00:04:42,960

whether we have any officer updates first?
CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] No updates for

42

00:04:42,960 --> 00:04:46,720

this item. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you.
Um, in that case, Councillor Fairweather,

43

00:04:46,720 --> 00:04:51,360

can we introduce the public speakers,
please? [CLLR FAIRWEATHER] Thank you. The

44

00:04:51,360 --> 00:05:01,880

first public speaker against
is Russell Ford a neighbour.

45

00:05:01,880 --> 00:05:16,240

[RUSSELL FORD (NEIGHBOUR)] This is speculative
development in the countryside and overdevelopment

46

00:05:16,240 --> 00:05:24,960

of the former nursery site. Doubtless with another
residential the end game. I've lived next door to

47

00:05:24,960 --> 00:05:31,920

this site for over 40 years. I know its history and I know its activity. Time only permits two

48

00:05:31,920 --> 00:05:40,560

points. First, in substance, this is no longer any business activity at this site. It's now

49

00:05:40,560 --> 00:05:47,920

residential with three dwellings on the former nursery site of over 20 years ago. The subsequent

50

00:05:47,920 --> 00:05:56,400

short-lived Tea-room, long since closed, was sold off as a residential dwelling five years ago. far

51

00:05:56,400 --> 00:06:05,040

from the development boundary with no justified future use. This is wholly dependent on BS9 for

52

00:06:05,040 --> 00:06:15,840

policy support. But BS9 only applies to existing business sites. In substance, real business

53

00:06:15,840 --> 00:06:25,120

activity has ceased. Any growing or selling is now a side hustle by the applicant for pin money.

54

00:06:25,120 --> 00:06:33,600

This is no longer a business site. It's residential. Second, materials and design.

55

00:06:33,600 --> 00:06:40,960

Walls and roof of black metal sheeting is out of keeping with surroundings,

56

00:06:40,960 --> 00:06:49,760
the locality and Wadhurst. That's contrary
to WAD3 and its integral design code.

57
00:06:50,400 --> 00:06:56,800
The building will look like an industrial
building in a national landscape area of

58
00:06:56,800 --> 00:07:05,120
outstanding natural beauty less than 8 meters
from the boundary of Bewl Water. Decline this

59
00:07:05,120 --> 00:07:13,440
speculative further overdevelopment of the former
nursery site, which doesn't add any employment,

60
00:07:13,440 --> 00:07:20,800
will result in applications for more windows
and for a building with residential use all in

61
00:07:20,800 --> 00:07:26,480
the countryside far from any development
boundary and adjoining Bewl Water. Thank

62
00:07:26,480 --> 00:07:31,360
you. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you. Sorry.
In fairness to everybody. Thank you very much.

63
00:07:35,760 --> 00:07:38,640
The next public speaker is
against. This is Councillor

64
00:07:38,640 --> 00:07:40,211
Philip Moore from Wadhurst Parish Council.

65
00:07:40,211 --> 00:07:52,240
[CLLR PHILIP MOORE (WADHURST PARISH COUNCIL)] Good
afternoon and thank you for hearing me. The parish

66

00:07:52,240 --> 00:07:57,760

council fully agrees with Mr. Ford and we wish to expand on the point about BS9. This application

67

00:07:57,760 --> 00:08:03,360

is presented as employment retention, but there is no substantive business activity on this site.

68

00:08:03,360 --> 00:08:08,160

Previous conversion of the commercial buildings to residential on this site were granted permission

69

00:08:08,160 --> 00:08:12,960

on the basis that they were redundant. Now we are told conveniently that the site is commercial

70

00:08:12,960 --> 00:08:20,240

again. These two positions cannot both be true. This matters because policy BS9 only applies to

71

00:08:20,240 --> 00:08:26,080

genuine existing business sites. If selling the odd daffodil is enough to trigger BS9, then any

72

00:08:26,080 --> 00:08:32,160

garden in the High Weald National Landscape could apply under BS9 to put commercial buildings in

73

00:08:32,160 --> 00:08:39,120

them. This is not what the policy was written for. There is no business plan, no identified occupier,

74

00:08:39,120 --> 00:08:45,920

and no evidence of demand. Indeed, even inside Wadhurst's development boundary over 3 km away,

75

00:08:45,920 --> 00:08:49,520
sustainable offices, including space
at the Commemoration Hall Charity,

76

00:08:49,520 --> 00:08:54,800
cannot be let at even low rents. This proposal
is therefore speculative and highly likely to

77

00:08:54,800 --> 00:09:00,400
fail. When it does, the pattern here is clear. We
will see yet another application to convert this

78

00:09:00,400 --> 00:09:06,240
building to residential use, just as has happened
before on this site. Previous conversions have

79

00:09:06,240 --> 00:09:10,640
relied on permitted development to add windows.
There is no reason to think this proposal would

80

00:09:10,640 --> 00:09:16,160
be any different. Finally, members should note
the site context. This building would sit less

81

00:09:16,160 --> 00:09:20,960
than 8 meters from the Bewl Water boundary in
an exceptionally dark skies area and around

82

00:09:20,960 --> 00:09:28,000
250 meters from the water sports clubhouse which
WDC recently refused. Natural England has advised

83

00:09:28,000 --> 00:09:32,960
that a precautionary approach to environmental
issues be taken because of the internationally

84

00:09:32,960 --> 00:09:38,800
important winter gull roost at Bewl Water which

has been recommended to be an SPA. Taken together,

85

00:09:38,800 --> 00:09:44,400

this is overdevelopment, policy stretching and speculative planning in a protected landscape.

86

00:09:44,400 --> 00:09:49,360

If this is allowed here, there's nothing to stop every garden in the national landscape

87

00:09:49,360 --> 00:09:57,120

making the same case. We respectfully ask you to refuse this application. Bewl is again at risk.

88

00:09:57,120 --> 00:10:01,360

Please draw on your experience in the recent clubhouse application. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)]Two

89

00:10:01,360 --> 00:10:11,021

minutes has come up. Thank you.
Many thanks. Thank you very much.

90

00:10:11,021 --> 00:10:24,784

[CLLR FAIRWEATHER] The next speaker is in favour. This is John McSweeney. the agents.

91

00:10:24,784 --> 00:10:27,040

[JOHN MCSWEENEY (AGENT)]Um, good afternoon Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity

92

00:10:27,040 --> 00:10:31,280

to allow me to speak. This application follows constructive pre-application engagement with the

93

00:10:31,280 --> 00:10:35,360

council. The feedback of which has informed this submission. The site is in commercial

94

00:10:35,360 --> 00:10:39,600

horticultural use. At its peak, the business ran in conjunction with a successful Tea-room.

95

00:10:39,600 --> 00:10:45,120

As members will appreciate, business operators can vary over time and in respect to the previous

96

00:10:45,120 --> 00:10:50,400

businesses it is due to the personal circumstances of the applicant critical illness and COVID which

97

00:10:50,400 --> 00:10:54,400

has ultimately led to change at the site rather than failing business. However, despite this,

98

00:10:54,400 --> 00:10:58,800

the applicant has continued to operate a horticultural enterprise here. It is welcome that

99

00:10:58,800 --> 00:11:03,520

officers have a correctly assessed application against POLICY DS9 which supports proposals for

100

00:11:03,520 --> 00:11:08,560

the redevelopment of existing business sites. This also accords with the objectives of the NPPF which

101

00:11:08,560 --> 00:11:12,960

seeks to support a prosperous rural economy and say planned decision should enable the growth and

102

00:11:12,960 --> 00:11:17,760

expansion of all business types in rural areas. Further recognizing that sites to meet business

103

00:11:17,760 --> 00:11:23,840

needs in rural areas may have to be found beyond existing settlements. It is welcome officers agree

104

00:11:23,840 --> 00:11:28,000

that the proposed simple low-level design results in a building which is appropriate in the context

105

00:11:28,000 --> 00:11:32,560

of the site and therefore conserves enhance the natural beauty of the high wield. Furthermore,

106

00:11:32,560 --> 00:11:36,000

at the request of the planning officer, we reduce the scheme to reduce the number of

107

00:11:36,000 --> 00:11:40,640

windows. We agree with the plan department's view that the post will not result in harm to neighbour

108

00:11:40,640 --> 00:11:44,640

amenity. The replacement building being within the same position within the site means that how it

109

00:11:44,640 --> 00:11:49,040

relates to neighbours will not materially alter. Furthermore, the proposed uses falling within

110

00:11:49,040 --> 00:11:54,160

class E are appropriate in residential areas. We agree with the officers that vehicle movements

111

00:11:54,160 --> 00:11:59,200

associated with this modest unit would not result in unacceptable impact to local highway.

112

00:11:59,200 --> 00:12:03,600

In addition, adequate parking provision can be accommodated within the site. Respectfully,

113

00:12:03,600 --> 00:12:06,960

we hope that members are able to share
the conclusions drawn by your planning

114

00:12:06,960 --> 00:12:11,360

department in recommending this application for
approval and therefore support this application

115

00:12:11,360 --> 00:12:15,200

for which provides a commercial premises
at this existing commercial site to help

116

00:12:15,200 --> 00:12:22,538

support local businesses. Thank you for
time and consideration on this matter.

117

00:12:22,538 --> 00:12:26,560

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you. Um
before we go to the local ward members,

118

00:12:26,560 --> 00:12:30,480

can I just check whether the planning officers
have any comments? [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] Yes,

119

00:12:30,480 --> 00:12:36,320

just wanted to just come back on a couple of
points. Um the officer case officer visited

120

00:12:36,320 --> 00:12:43,040

the site and observed that there was a commercial
activity taking place albeit smaller scale than

121

00:12:43,040 --> 00:12:47,520

it historically used to be. Um and there's
nothing to restrict the site coming forward

122

00:12:47,520 --> 00:12:52,640

and increasing that intensification back to how it used to be. I'm also just wanted to flag that

123

00:12:52,640 --> 00:13:00,560

there's no policy requirement for them to provide um details of who the end user may be or justify

124

00:13:00,560 --> 00:13:06,000

a business use in this location. Um and you do need to ensure members that you're assessing the

125

00:13:06,000 --> 00:13:11,440

application as before you and not speculate around any potential future uses that may come forward.

126

00:13:11,440 --> 00:13:17,120

Thank you.[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you. Um so can we go to Councillor Howell who's the local

127

00:13:17,120 --> 00:13:24,000

ward member? [Cllr Howell] Thank you very much indeed. Um first of all I'd like to um re remind

128

00:13:24,000 --> 00:13:32,960

um the committee that yesterday at full council we congratulated our Olympic rower who trained on

129

00:13:32,960 --> 00:13:41,840

Bewl Water. So this is a very um acceptable place for training of our Olympians as you will know. I

130

00:13:41,840 --> 00:13:50,960

called this in because it is not in a sustainable location. It has a failed business and a continued

131

00:13:50,960 --> 00:13:58,240

failed business. I am a ward member. I know this

as do the local Councillors. There is no business

132

00:13:58,240 --> 00:14:05,920

working on this site. I would also like to remind you that we today have already looked at a former

133

00:14:05,920 --> 00:14:15,280

nursery site called Perry Hill which we were encouraged to turn down. There is no business plan

134

00:14:15,280 --> 00:14:24,400

here. There is a lack of design. It has failed business use. We have lots of uses in Durgates

135

00:14:24,400 --> 00:14:34,000

and Wadhurst that we ask people to go through and it is not in a sustainable location and

136

00:14:34,000 --> 00:14:41,120

I think you have read and heard all the reasons that this should be turned down. It is not in a

137

00:14:41,120 --> 00:14:48,800

situation that we should be encouraging use of. And I come back to what we need to do at Bewl,

138

00:14:48,800 --> 00:14:55,200

which is to preserve and enhance, not build all over our countryside. This is in the

139

00:14:55,200 --> 00:15:02,080

natural landscape. It is a preserved site. It is a failed business. And I have been there. I used

140

00:15:02,080 --> 00:15:06,160

to go there and I used to have coffee there. So, I do know what I'm talking about. And I didn't

141

00:15:06,160 --> 00:15:13,440

just go once. So I'd like to say that as a local member this is not a sustainable location. We have

142

00:15:13,440 --> 00:15:20,560

no business plan. There are businesses that are needing that place in Durgates and in Wadhurst

143

00:15:20,560 --> 00:15:32,058

which are in a center not just outside. So I really urge you to not give this your approval.

144

00:15:32,058 --> 00:15:38,480

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you Councillor Howell. Um so members it's over to us. Um I just have

145

00:15:38,480 --> 00:15:45,280

a question if I may start with that. Um just in relation to the there's been a lot of mention of

146

00:15:45,280 --> 00:15:48,960

um there being no business plan and that this is there's a failed business on the

147

00:15:48,960 --> 00:15:56,160

site. Can I just ask to what extent we need to be taking that into account as a consideration

148

00:15:56,160 --> 00:16:02,160

particularly in relation to um policy BS9.

[SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] Thank you chair. I

149

00:16:02,160 --> 00:16:09,280

think obviously view is that there is no local or policy or um national policy requirement for

150

00:16:09,280 --> 00:16:17,120

a business plan for a development like this to be to be submitted. Um as uh Mrs. Boddy has already

151

00:16:17,120 --> 00:16:27,840

um allude alluded to. Uh when the case officer made a made a site visit and saw evidence of a

152

00:16:27,840 --> 00:16:39,200

business operating more low key than obviously it previously was but evidence was there.

153

00:16:39,200 --> 00:16:47,440

Yeah. So, this is still a commercial site. Yes, more low-key than it was,

154

00:16:47,440 --> 00:16:53,440

but it is still a commercial site. It can be bought back into use. Somebody could buy it

155

00:16:53,440 --> 00:17:01,600

tomorrow and operate a much larger horticultural use that similar to what used to be there. I think

156

00:17:01,600 --> 00:17:07,360

members do need to factor that into account that that could that could happen. So the site could

157

00:17:07,360 --> 00:17:17,520

be brought back into that former more intensive use. Um this is a I I don't think it's necessarily

158

00:17:17,520 --> 00:17:21,760

building over the national landscape. This is buildings that are being replaced with another

159

00:17:21,760 --> 00:17:29,360

building of a similar design. Um obviously members will debate as to whether they agree

160

00:17:29,360 --> 00:17:36,800

with that chosen design or not but it is um
it is replacing existing buildings on a site

161

00:17:36,800 --> 00:17:45,738

which can be brought back into a more intensive
use because it's authorized to do so. Thank you.

162

00:17:45,738 --> 00:17:49,520

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you. I'm just um
reading BS9 and actually it does talk about

163

00:17:49,520 --> 00:17:55,920

existing business sites. So I'm just thinking
whether the meaning of that is relates to the

164

00:17:55,920 --> 00:18:02,240

site rather than the business being existing.
But I I accept what um the officers say about

165

00:18:02,240 --> 00:18:06,320

there being a scaled down business. [SCOTT
CAREY (OFFICER)] I would also just just add

166

00:18:06,320 --> 00:18:13,280

yeah I mean yeah BS9 existing business sites.
This is what we consider this to be. It may

167

00:18:13,280 --> 00:18:18,800

not be any what it was like you know 10
years ago 20 years ago but it is still

168

00:18:18,800 --> 00:18:27,760

an existing business site. Um I think also
the sustainability side of things is a bit

169

00:18:27,760 --> 00:18:30,800
of a red herring in the sense of we're not
talking residential development here where

170
00:18:30,800 --> 00:18:34,640
there's a different sort of criteria in
terms of sustainability. We are talking

171
00:18:34,640 --> 00:18:41,600
about again a site which has adequate parking
and turning from the horticultural use that

172
00:18:41,600 --> 00:18:49,600
is authorized on the site. Um so again it has
that business use authorized on the site. So,

173
00:18:49,600 --> 00:18:56,240
I don't think the sustainability is too much
of a shouldn't be too much of a consideration

174
00:18:56,240 --> 00:19:02,080
if I'm honest because it's an authorized site
where they're just looking to uh put a new new

175
00:19:02,080 --> 00:19:12,218
building on for for the class E uses which are
acceptable within a residential amenity area.

176
00:19:12,218 --> 00:19:15,360
[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you.
Um Councillor White. [CLLR WHITE]

177
00:19:15,360 --> 00:19:20,080
Yeah, I noticed that it says a new build
commercial units within class E and then

178
00:19:20,080 --> 00:19:27,200
gives some letters after it. Is it not true

that class E is interchangeable between all

179

00:19:27,200 --> 00:19:35,018

of the classes and once planning permission it could be used for light industry for instance?

180

00:19:35,018 --> 00:19:37,120

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Could officers come back on that? It's an important

181

00:19:37,120 --> 00:19:41,840

question. [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] Yes. Um so class E does encompass a number of

182

00:19:41,840 --> 00:19:49,200

different uses. However, this has been specific in which bit of class E it's being um sold. So

183

00:19:49,200 --> 00:19:56,880

you're looking at class EC which is the financial professional and other and then class EG IO use

184

00:19:56,880 --> 00:20:02,320

which is office or research um development products. So and we've put in a condition

185

00:20:02,320 --> 00:20:08,960

um which would it would restrict that to the use class as well. [CLLR WHITE] Excellent. Thank you.

186

00:20:08,960 --> 00:20:16,000

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Do we have any comments from other members? Councillor Everitt. [CLLR EVERITT]

187

00:20:16,000 --> 00:20:28,160

Well, just it is well set back from Bewl and uh the intervening area is an extensive car park. Um

188

00:20:28,160 --> 00:20:37,760

so any building there and it's also quite low down. It doesn't overshadow the the Bewl. So

189

00:20:37,760 --> 00:20:48,960

the effect on the Bewl Water I would have thought would be very minimal. So it's just an observation

190

00:20:48,960 --> 00:20:49,594

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Councillor Fairweather.

191

00:20:49,594 --> 00:20:58,000

[CLLR FAIRWEATHER] Right. Thank you. Looking at the wording of uh policy BS9,

192

00:20:58,000 --> 00:21:02,320

proposals for expansion, redevelopment or intensification within existing business

193

00:21:02,320 --> 00:21:07,040

sites outside development boundaries will be permitted only where the following criteria

194

00:21:07,040 --> 00:21:14,080

are met. Number one, there will be no adverse effect on the landscape. Now, you may well

195

00:21:14,080 --> 00:21:20,400

um decide that with the building that is being proposed that it is ugly and it would have an

196

00:21:20,400 --> 00:21:29,680

adverse effect on the landscape. This is also covered by NPPF paragraph 88 provides support

197

00:21:29,680 --> 00:21:35,040

for the sustainable growth and expansion of all

types of business in rural areas including through

198

00:21:35,040 --> 00:21:45,498

well designed new buildings. Um you may well argue that this is not well designed. Thank you.

199

00:21:45,498 --> 00:21:51,280

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you Councillor Fairweather. Um do we have any more comments

200

00:21:53,040 --> 00:22:06,123

from Councillors

201

00:22:06,123 --> 00:22:11,520

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Councillor Gadd Thank you.

[CLLR GADD] Yeah. Um obviously the class E and

202

00:22:11,520 --> 00:22:18,880

all the things that were discussed just then this currently has class C. Is that correct?

203

00:22:18,880 --> 00:22:33,520

[SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)]

204

00:22:33,520 --> 00:22:39,040

Um, it it has a horticultural use which agriculture. [CLLR GADD] Is that yes or

205

00:22:39,040 --> 00:22:50,800

no? [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] Well, it's not class C at the moment. [CLLR GADD] No. Okay. Um, so Again,

206

00:22:50,800 --> 00:22:57,760

the picture before was quite interesting, the one that showed the landscape. Um,

207

00:22:57,760 --> 00:23:11,760

it's clearly a rural landscape and for that reason
it is covered by NPPF 85 to 88 and GD2 and BS6.

208

00:23:12,640 --> 00:23:20,640

Um, so again I'm conflicted on this
one, but there is a Wadhurst local plan,

209

00:23:20,640 --> 00:23:26,800

a neighbourhood plan with the several policies.
So how much weight should we be giving to the

210

00:23:26,800 --> 00:23:32,640

Wadhurst neighbourhood plan? That's my first
question. [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] Well,

211

00:23:32,640 --> 00:23:38,560

the neighbourhood plan and the design code are
part of the adopted development plan. So they they

212

00:23:38,560 --> 00:23:49,280

need to be given weight which has been done in the
report. Uh I mean WAD9 is supportive of expansion

213

00:23:49,280 --> 00:23:55,840

of existing commercial activity. Um if it doesn't
have a harmful impact on the national landscape,

214

00:23:55,840 --> 00:24:03,920

not harmful to neighbouring uses um and ad no
adverse impacts on local road network. uh officers

215

00:24:03,920 --> 00:24:09,680

would say that it is in compliance with that. We
don't consider there to be a harmful impact on

216

00:24:09,680 --> 00:24:14,160

the national landscape and no neighbour amenity
and we consider it to be an existing commercial

217

00:24:14,160 --> 00:24:25,178

use. Obviously that has been disputed but this is officers view as as set out in the report.

218

00:24:25,178 --> 00:24:31,200

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Um thank you. Can I just ask about the point that the Wadhurst Parish

219

00:24:31,200 --> 00:24:40,560

Councillor mentioned about the potential designation of Bewl Water as a as a area of

220

00:24:40,560 --> 00:24:50,320

special conservation or um special preservation? what what should we make of that in terms of

221

00:24:50,320 --> 00:24:56,320

um obviously Natural England had advised a precautionary approach and I just wondered

222

00:24:56,320 --> 00:25:03,760

how that would impact on what we're considering today. [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] Thank you. Um

223

00:25:03,760 --> 00:25:10,160

if I can speak candidly I don't think it has any impact. Um I think I can only reiterate what was

224

00:25:10,160 --> 00:25:16,800

said at the majors meeting during the brew water discussion which is that officers checked with

225

00:25:16,800 --> 00:25:23,280

natural England and received no confirmation of a potential designation yet. Now that's there's

226

00:25:23,280 --> 00:25:28,880

a big difference between it being potentially designated and being recommended for. As far

227

00:25:28,880 --> 00:25:36,560

as the local plan authority were aware, there's no potential designation that has been handed down um

228

00:25:36,560 --> 00:25:44,560

which would trigger the need for I'm going have to bear with me for a minute so I can remember the um

229

00:25:44,560 --> 00:25:57,040

NPPF um paragraph that talks about it. But I know it does talk about um consideration maybe through

230

00:25:57,040 --> 00:26:06,800

a habitat risk assessment to be given to um an SBA and SAC or a potential SBA or a potential SPC SAC.

231

00:26:06,800 --> 00:26:14,320

Um as far as the RPA concerned, Bewl Water doesn't have that yet. Doesn't have a potential SPA.

232

00:26:14,320 --> 00:26:22,240

So and in terms of precautionary approach this has been done through the other various means

233

00:26:22,240 --> 00:26:29,760

when assessing an application generally; ecology, landscape um but there is no as far as the LPA as

234

00:26:29,760 --> 00:26:35,200

far as officers are aware there is no requirement to carry out any kind of habitat risks assessment

235

00:26:35,200 --> 00:26:44,000

or appropriate assessment uh because the site is

not um a potential special protection area yet .

236

00:26:44,000 --> 00:26:50,400

And I would also probably just add that this is not within Bewl Water itself. Yes, it's close by,

237

00:26:50,400 --> 00:26:55,600

but it's not within Bewl Water. It's within, in officers view, an existing commercial site

238

00:26:55,600 --> 00:27:03,738

and it's replacing an existing building with another building similar footprint.

239

00:27:03,738 --> 00:27:08,400

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you. Can I just ask um in relation to the proposal for the new building,

240

00:27:08,400 --> 00:27:15,840

is the is the height I know you say the footprint is similar. Would the um height of the roof and

241

00:27:15,840 --> 00:27:22,000

the sort of line of that be similar to what's there now? [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] Uh yes,

242

00:27:22,000 --> 00:27:28,080

very similar. So you're looking at the glass house. If I just get the glass house plan up.

243

00:27:28,080 --> 00:27:36,080

Um it's one of the glass houses here. Um it's a 4.4 4 meters to the ridge and the proposal

244

00:27:36,080 --> 00:27:42,480

before you is 4.1, 4.1 meters to the ridge. So yeah, very similar. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Okay,

245

00:27:42,480 --> 00:27:49,840

thank you. Does anyone else have any comments?
Councillor Everitt. [CLLR EVERITT] So if we

246

00:27:49,840 --> 00:27:57,680

were to approve it, could we condition the I
mean the aesthetics of it is not very nice. Um

247

00:27:57,680 --> 00:28:05,120

uh could we um influence the application
to perhaps put a more a sympathetic

248

00:28:05,120 --> 00:28:11,440

um roof on it rather than what looks like a um
well I'm quite not quite sure what the roof is

249

00:28:11,440 --> 00:28:18,400

intended to be. Was it a metal roof there
um which is aesthetically could we impose

250

00:28:18,400 --> 00:28:24,800

that because that that I think is the biggest
concern I have that this is a bit of an eyesore.

251

00:28:24,800 --> 00:28:32,320

[SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)]

252

00:28:32,320 --> 00:28:38,720

Sorry Councillor. Um I mean there there is
a condition requiring a schedule of external

253

00:28:38,720 --> 00:28:45,760

material to be used to be submitted. Um if
it's the if it's committee's will we we could

254

00:28:45,760 --> 00:28:51,840

amend that to say you know notwithstanding

the details submitted. Um, but I think our

255

00:28:51,840 --> 00:29:03,267

key thing would be making sure that any finished appearance is still a functional building. Um,

256

00:29:03,267 --> 00:29:06,000

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)]thank you for that, Councillor Everitt. [CLLR EVERITT] Um,

257

00:29:06,000 --> 00:29:12,400

I I cannot see any um planning reason then why we should refuse this. Uh,

258

00:29:12,400 --> 00:29:19,280

but I would like to impose a condition that the aesthetics of it is improved.

259

00:29:19,280 --> 00:29:26,880

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you, Councillor Everitt.. Um, we might need to come back on some

260

00:29:26,880 --> 00:29:32,320

detail in a moment. Um, Councillor Fairweather, you wanted to speak. [CLLR FAIRWEATHER] I would

261

00:29:32,320 --> 00:29:40,480

like to propose refusal. Um, refusal on the grounds of um BS9 there would be no adverse effect

262

00:29:40,480 --> 00:29:47,360

on the landscape. I disagree with that. And then we come on to this is in the national landscape.

263

00:29:47,360 --> 00:29:57,360

Um so we've got um NPPF paragraph 189 enhancing the beauty. Um I don't think this uh proposal

264

00:29:57,360 --> 00:30:05,760

in any way enhances the beauty. Thank you.

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you Councillor

265

00:30:05,760 --> 00:30:15,040

Fairweather,. So we've got two proposals there.

Was anyone like to second either of those?

266

00:30:15,040 --> 00:30:22,240

Can you just Sorry. So, we've got um we have a

proposal to approve put forward by Councillor

267

00:30:22,240 --> 00:30:29,040

Everitt. We don't have a second for that. And then

Councillor Fairweather has proposed refusal um on

268

00:30:29,040 --> 00:30:40,720

the basis that it doesn't um enhance the national

landscape and also um citing NPPF paragraph 189.

269

00:30:40,720 --> 00:30:53,200

Sorry, Councillor Clark. So you're happy to

second Councillor Fairweather's proposal. Okay.

270

00:30:53,200 --> 00:30:59,840

And did Councillor Shing or Councillor

Gadd want to sorry you Councillor White

271

00:30:59,840 --> 00:31:04,320

can you pop your microphone on please?

Thank you. [CLLR WHITE] Before I do

272

00:31:04,320 --> 00:31:13,360

anything I I'd like some further details

about how we can enhance the building.

273

00:31:13,360 --> 00:31:18,400

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] I was going to come to that

274

00:31:18,400 --> 00:31:21,879

Councillor Everitt

275

00:31:21,879 --> 00:31:25,520

[CLLR EVERITT] I suppose I'm looking for a green roof in an ideal world. It still could

276

00:31:25,520 --> 00:31:31,360

be commercial but be a green roof. [CLLR WHITE]
Are we talking green in colour or green in plants?

277

00:31:31,360 --> 00:31:40,698

Green in plants or green in colour? [CLLR EVERITT]
Uh either preferably plants. [CLLR WHITE] Okay.

278

00:31:40,698 --> 00:31:45,680

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Okay. um is is whilst taking Councillor Everitt's preference is

279

00:31:45,680 --> 00:31:51,760

is an actual green roof with plants is that something that we could it would be considerable

280

00:31:51,760 --> 00:31:56,080

um alteration to what's in front of us.
So perhaps you could just clarify for

281

00:31:56,080 --> 00:32:00,640

that. [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)] Yeah, thank you. I I'm not sure we could insist because

282

00:32:00,640 --> 00:32:06,000

of the design of the building in terms of a green planted roof, but we could definitely

283

00:32:06,000 --> 00:32:12,000

explore options with the applicants and agents
regarding the colour of the metal sheeting to

284

00:32:12,000 --> 00:32:20,778

be a muted green tone that would probably fall
within the remit of of the power of the committee.

285

00:32:20,778 --> 00:32:24,400

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Okay, Councillor White does
that answer your question? [CLLR WHITE] Yeah,

286

00:32:24,400 --> 00:32:30,640

I guess the slope of the roof prevents the use of
plants. Um, yeah, I'd go for green and I'd back

287

00:32:30,640 --> 00:32:35,120

um second the proposal from Mr. Councillor
Everitt. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Okay,

288

00:32:35,120 --> 00:32:42,320

so you're happy to second Councillor Everitt's um
proposal to approve. Okay, thank you. Subject to

289

00:32:42,320 --> 00:32:51,520

um discussion or um requirement on the applicant
to change the to look at the colour of the roof.

290

00:33:03,280 --> 00:33:08,320

Did anyone else have anything they
wanted to add before we go back to

291

00:33:08,320 --> 00:33:13,600

the officers? [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] Just just
a quick thing on the motion to refuse and I do

292

00:33:13,600 --> 00:33:19,360

appreciate we you probably all feel like you've

been here before. Um it was just to try and get a

293

00:33:19,360 --> 00:33:27,120

bit of clarification that if a motion is made to
refuse what about that building is unacceptable

294

00:33:27,120 --> 00:33:32,080

because obviously officers have said that it is
acceptable in terms of built form being similar

295

00:33:32,080 --> 00:33:40,240

to what's there now. So rather than just us saying
again it's within the national landscape and it's

296

00:33:40,240 --> 00:33:45,440

ugly, what is it what what what is it about
the building that does make it unacceptable?

297

00:33:45,440 --> 00:33:51,760

bearing in mind that it's replacing an existing
um obviously Councillor Fairweather has has his

298

00:33:51,760 --> 00:33:55,360

reasons that's fine but we just need to
have that bit of expansion as to what

299

00:33:55,360 --> 00:33:59,600

about the building actually does make it
unacceptable bearing in mind what's there

300

00:33:59,600 --> 00:34:08,080

now. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Councillor
Fairweather would you like to come back

301

00:34:08,080 --> 00:34:11,520

Councillor Clarke can I'm just Councillor
Fairweather is about to speak sorry and

302

00:34:11,520 --> 00:34:16,240

then I'll come back to you in a minute

[CLLR FAIRWEATHER] um the fact that um

303

00:34:16,240 --> 00:34:28,800

it's metal sheeting. Um I think we

may be into EN274 appearance. Um

304

00:34:28,800 --> 00:34:38,400

and then because of that um then we've

got um BS9 no adverse effect because

305

00:34:38,400 --> 00:34:45,200

this is the design that we've got. It is

an adverse effect. And then um national

306

00:34:45,200 --> 00:34:53,600

park uh sorry national landscape NPPF189

it does have an adverse effect on the

307

00:34:53,600 --> 00:35:00,480

um national landscape. [CAITLIN BODDY (OFFICER)]

So just to confirm your concerns are relating

308

00:35:00,480 --> 00:35:07,200

to the design and the use of the metal

sheeting as materials resulting in the harm.

309

00:35:07,200 --> 00:35:12,720

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] So can I just check

so um our officers are content because we

310

00:35:12,720 --> 00:35:18,560

would be taking the motion to refuse first.

Um so you've got it sufficient reasons. Okay.

311

00:35:18,560 --> 00:35:23,120

Um in that case let's go back to the Oh, sorry.
Council Clarke, I'm very sorry. [CLLR CLARKE] Can

312

00:35:23,120 --> 00:35:28,240

I just have some clarification because I
not quite sure I'm with this. On page 116,

313

00:35:28,240 --> 00:35:33,440

it actually says the removal of a glass house
and a smaller one to the rear associated with

314

00:35:33,440 --> 00:35:39,200

executive blah blah blah and replacement with a
new building. the same footprint as the larger

315

00:35:39,200 --> 00:35:44,400

glass house or purposes. So it sounds to me as
though I mean I thought that you were going they

316

00:35:44,400 --> 00:35:50,080

were replacing it with a glass house not a kind
of industrial units. So can you just clarify that

317

00:35:50,080 --> 00:35:56,640

it's a sort of industrial unit for horticultural
use. Is that right? [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)] No,

318

00:35:56,640 --> 00:36:02,960

it's it's it's replacing the glass house that's
there with the building you can see on the screen

319

00:36:02,960 --> 00:36:09,520

um which is proposed for more of an office kind of
use um or the the classes that have um have been

320

00:36:09,520 --> 00:36:18,960

identified in the description which I don't quite
have to hand exactly but um it's office use and um

321

00:36:18,960 --> 00:36:23,280

yeah financial and professional that was the one um so that's what the that's what the

322

00:36:23,280 --> 00:36:29,440

proposal is for. So the the building that you see there is a similar footprint to the glass

323

00:36:29,440 --> 00:36:35,840

house that's we saw earlier and there's an additional one at the rear glass house

324

00:36:35,840 --> 00:36:43,178

that's being also proposed to be demolished and they're not building over on that part.

325

00:36:43,178 --> 00:36:46,480

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Councillor Redmond. [CLLR REDMOND] Thank you chairman. Could I just ask

326

00:36:46,480 --> 00:36:53,840

a little bit of clarification on on page 117 the statement there from the officers as the that the

327

00:36:53,840 --> 00:36:59,920

proposed development will comply with the NPPF etc and all the other saved policies including the

328

00:36:59,920 --> 00:37:08,160

Wadhurst policies. Um what we have is a situation where the proposal for refusal is based on as I

329

00:37:08,160 --> 00:37:15,440

understand from Councillor Fairweather is is really the NPPF and the effect of the proposed

330

00:37:15,440 --> 00:37:22,400
thing they're building on the beauty of the NPPF.
That was the last words I picked up from him.

331
00:37:22,400 --> 00:37:28,400
But it's in obviously in contrary to what the
officers believe in the statement that they

332
00:37:28,400 --> 00:37:35,520
have on page 117 at the top of their report.
Perhaps I could ask for a few words from the

333
00:37:35,520 --> 00:37:44,720
officers in terms of why they believe in terms of
the proposal to grant this that this overrides the

334
00:37:44,720 --> 00:37:52,240
comments that were made by Councillor Fairweather
and supported elsewhere by in terms of the the

335
00:37:52,240 --> 00:38:02,720
level of why this in their view overrides
that thoughts of of of being negative and

336
00:38:02,720 --> 00:38:09,760
uh obviously gives us the point where we get to
a consideration more of the proposal to go with

337
00:38:09,760 --> 00:38:15,600
the granting of this application. So could I
ask the officers to give me more thoughts on

338
00:38:15,600 --> 00:38:21,440
that please? [SCOTT CAREY (OFFICER)]Thank you
Councillor Um not really sure what I can add.

339
00:38:21,440 --> 00:38:27,920
It's just the the beauty of planning isn't it? um

officers have taken a view and consider that that

340

00:38:27,920 --> 00:38:32,480

that building will be acceptable replacing
the building that it's proposed to replace

341

00:38:32,480 --> 00:38:41,120

um and the Councillor has given a different
view because disagrees with that um and has

342

00:38:41,120 --> 00:38:47,360

backed up his comments with with his policy
reasons why that's about all I can really say.

343

00:38:47,360 --> 00:38:52,640

the officers have have taken one view um and
Councillor has taken another view and obviously

344

00:38:52,640 --> 00:38:58,800

as a committee you uh you will be taking your
own views as to whether you actually agree it

345

00:38:58,800 --> 00:39:05,360

is harmful or whether you think it's acceptable
and um and that will show in the in in in the

346

00:39:05,360 --> 00:39:12,720

vote. Right. [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you.
Um and Councillor Redmond I mean I think page

347

00:39:12,720 --> 00:39:20,000

um 126 and 127 of the report do go into a bit
of detail certainly on the um the policies that

348

00:39:20,000 --> 00:39:27,440

they've applied in relation to landscape. Um I
think in the absence of any further Councillor

349

00:39:27,440 --> 00:39:31,360

comments we could go back to the local ward member to Councillor Howell [CLLR HOWELL] thank

350

00:39:31,360 --> 00:39:36,720

you. Thank you very much indeed and thank you for your debate. It's been very interesting to hear.

351

00:39:36,720 --> 00:39:44,720

Um I would remind you that this application is outside the local defined development boundary.

352

00:39:44,720 --> 00:39:54,560

It is also located within the High Weald National Landscape. We have within Wadhurst and Durgates

353

00:39:54,560 --> 00:40:03,840

which are the centres and within those boundaries um more than enough commercial units that can be

354

00:40:03,840 --> 00:40:12,080

rented and used. This is outside of that. I would also remind you that this has failed business use.

355

00:40:12,080 --> 00:40:21,520

I would also remind you that Natural England have stated approach with caution. Therefore,

356

00:40:21,520 --> 00:40:30,720

I urge you not to industrialize Bewl Water and this is another step on that road and it will be

357

00:40:30,720 --> 00:40:39,600

tested again and again and again. And I urge you, this is a site of special beauty within

358

00:40:39,600 --> 00:40:53,018

Wealden of special use within Wealden for natural pursuits. I urge you not to industrialise it.

359

00:40:53,018 --> 00:40:58,320

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] Thank you, Councillor Howell. So, we'll move to um to our votes.

360

00:40:58,320 --> 00:41:07,920

Um as I said the the sorry the proposal to refuse um comes first that was put forward by Councillor

361

00:41:07,920 --> 00:41:15,280

Fairweather seconded by Councillor Clarke um we've discussed the reasons um which I think

362

00:41:15,280 --> 00:41:25,680

the officers were happy with. Um so can I go to Katie to take us through that vote please?

363

00:41:25,680 --> 00:41:29,680

We can't have any more debate. Councillor Redmond.[CLLR REDMOND] But may I ask don't

364

00:41:29,680 --> 00:41:33,200

don't we have a system under which the officer's recommendation comes first

365

00:41:33,200 --> 00:41:40,000

in terms of the voting? [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] The order of um of votes is the order in which

366

00:41:40,000 --> 00:41:49,120

they're seconded. And seconded during the debate and so in this case it was um that's that's the

367

00:41:49,120 --> 00:41:56,480

way that's what our rules say. So we'll be going with the um with the refusal first.

368

00:42:04,080 --> 00:42:07,920

Can I just quickly go back to planning officers
just to double check that you're happy with the

369

00:42:07,920 --> 00:42:16,222

reasons given um for the refusal.
We've gone through that. Thank you.

370

00:42:16,222 --> 00:42:22,560

[KATIE (OFFICER)] Thank you. I'll be taking a
vote contrary to officer recommendation to refuse.

371

00:42:22,560 --> 00:42:27,600

It was moved by Councillor Fairweather and
a seconded by Councillor Clarke I will be

372

00:42:27,600 --> 00:42:31,040

as it against officer recommendation
I will be coming to a recorded vote

373

00:42:31,040 --> 00:42:39,200

individually so please Councillor Clarke
are you for or against the motion to

374

00:42:39,200 --> 00:42:42,640

refuse. [CLLR CLARKE] I'm against the office
of recommendation [KATIE (OFFICER)] so you're

375

00:42:42,640 --> 00:42:49,425

for the motion [CLLR CLARKE] I'm for the motion
thank you [KATIE (OFFICER)] Councillor Everitt

376

00:42:49,425 --> 00:42:57,760

[CLLR EVERITT] I'm against the proposal So I'm in
favour of the application. [KATIE (OFFICER)] Thank

377

00:42:57,760 --> 00:43:06,142
you. Councillor Steven Shing. [CLLR SHING] I'm for
a motion and against the officer recommendation.

378
00:43:06,142 --> 00:43:08,234
[KATIE (OFFICER)] Thank you Councillor Shing.
[KATIE (OFFICER)] Councillor Glynn White.

379
00:43:08,234 --> 00:43:14,640
[CLLR GLYNN WHITE] I'm confused now.
Can you [KATIE (OFFICER)] We're we're

380
00:43:14,640 --> 00:43:20,800
voting on the motion to again go against officer
recommendation which is to refuse this proposal.

381
00:43:20,800 --> 00:43:27,920
Uh, I'm against that motion. [KATIE (OFFICER)]
Councillor Gadd [CLLR GADD] for the motion

382
00:43:27,920 --> 00:43:35,022
to refuse.[KATIE (OFFICER)] Councillor
Redmond.[CLLR REDMOND] against the motion

383
00:43:35,022 --> 00:43:37,680
[KATIE (OFFICER)] Councillor Fairweather
[CLLR FAIRWEATHER] for the motion to

384
00:43:37,680 --> 00:43:48,160
refuse. [KATIE (OFFICER)] And finally, Councillor
Allison Wilson [CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] against.

385
00:43:48,160 --> 00:43:54,000
[KATIE (OFFICER)] So

386
00:43:54,000 --> 00:43:58,400
as we've received a equal split of votes

387

00:43:58,400 --> 00:44:06,560

um please can I refer to our
chair to have our casting vote on

388

00:44:06,560 --> 00:44:14,960

[CLLR WILSON (CHAIR)] um I'm against
this um this motion to um to refuse

389

00:44:19,760 --> 00:44:27,440

So that motion has um has that sorry
that application has been approved.

390

00:44:27,440 --> 00:44:40,480

So thank you um all who attended um will

391

00:44:48,960 --> 00:44:57,120

I'm sorry, but we need to move on.

392

00:44:57,120 --> 00:45:04,160

So, we need to move on now.

393

00:45:07,680 --> 00:45:13,760

So we'll move on to our last
item um which is item nine