

# KINGSTON PARISH COUNCIL

[www.kingston-pc.gov.uk](http://www.kingston-pc.gov.uk)

Julie O'Donnell  
Clerk to Kingston Parish Council  
Kingston Community Pavilion  
St Pancras Green  
Church Lane  
Kingston  
BN7 3LN  
e-mail: [clerk@kingston-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@kingston-pc.gov.uk)

17<sup>th</sup> August 2023

Minutes of the Kingston Parish Council meeting held on 9<sup>th</sup> August 2023 at 1900 hours in Kingston Community Pavilion.

Present: Cllr Douglas, Cllr Hoare, Cllr Parnell, Cllr Fry, Cllr Bewick, Julie O'Donnell (Clerk)

10 members of the public were present.

## Minutes

**1. Apologies and reasons for absence**

No apologies were received.

**2. The Chairman will invite Councillors to declare any interest they may have in the following agenda items.**

No interests were declared.

**3. Public Forum:** A period not exceeding 30 minutes is available for the public to express a view or ask a question on relevant matters on the following agenda.

**Many members of the public wished to speak regarding agenda item 4.1.**

**A summary of the comments is detailed as follows –**

- Inappropriate development site for what is being proposed.
- Listed building within 10 metres so will impact on the heritage asset.
- No impact statement regarding noise has been submitted, neighbouring properties will be greatly impacted with guests arriving and departing, deliveries, staff.
- Only one entrance passing two private dwellings.
- Encroaching on neighbours' privacy and right to enjoy their home.
- Poor visibility at the entrance of the site

Name

Signed

Date

- The Street has no pavement, limited parking and is a narrow lane where two vehicles cannot pass.
- Inaccurate traffic report submitted; The Street is in fact a 20mph road not 30mph as stated in the report.
- Trip survey seems dubious for a family venue, large groups arriving by car together
- An assumption that guests will arrive by foot, bike or public transport, no proof of this.
- No detail submitted as to what the final plans for the site are.
- Potential contamination risk due to previous agricultural use. Probably asbestos roofed barns on site.
- Flood issue with underground springs, neighbouring property often has a marshy garden in the winter months.
- Hardstanding could exacerbate these issues and create flood problems.

It was recommended that residents copy in Stella New, Claire Tester and Tim Slaney at SDNPA with their comments.

#### 4. Planning application for consideration

##### 4.1. Application: [SDNP/23/02776/PA3R](#)

Location: Kingsbrook Farm, The Street, Kingston, East Sussex, BN7 3NT

Description: Prior Approval for a part change of use of agricultural buildings to Hotel (Class C1) and Recreation and Function Room (Class E(d)) under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class R of the General Permitted Development Order .

**Kingston Parish Council response:** The council agreed unanimously to submit the following response.

Kingston Parish Council would like to object to the proposed change of use under permitted development as outlined in the application SDNP/23/02776/PA3R. We are mindful that this is an unusual approach to development and that the four categories on which prior approval will be gauged would not be revisited if a planning application is made at a later stage.

#### **Transport**

The Transport Statement Contains several inaccuracies and claims which require clarification.

2.5 The transport statement incorrectly state that The Street has a 30mph speed limit whereas it is 20mph and is accessed from the C324 which is subject to a 20mph zone for c 100 m in both directions from the junction with The Street.

3.11 The transport statement states that “5 full-time staff that work at Kingsbrook farm at existing” (sic). Section 4.6 states that 5 staff members were to have been employed including a stockman. The farm has no livestock as far as is known to KPC and the small market garden is unlikely to generate sufficient income for five members of staff. This assertion appears erroneous and unless it can be justified, using costings, should not feature in the decision-making process.

3.15 states that it is the intention for the scheme to be car-free. There is no reason to believe this will be the case and no rationale has been provided to suggest why this would be the case. It is highly likely that the proposal will generate substantial amounts of additional traffic.

3.5 states that access is from the A272. At its closest point the A272 is c 8 miles from the site entrance in a straight line.

3.19 This section contradicts itself and section 3.15 by stating that it unlikely that all visitors will arrive by car”..... It is likely that 2-3 guests will arrive by car at any one time and are likely to car share”. There is no reason to assume this, and no assessment appears to have been conducted.

Name

Signed

Date

3.6 The Transport Statement claims that there are “adequate passing points for vehicles”. There are no parking restrictions and for much of the time parked cars render The Street a single-track road with no passing places. Kingston has no village car park and residents, patrons of the pub as well as walkers who come to Kingston to walk in the countryside, park here so it is regularly presents this way. There is no definition of “adequate “in addition to the contradiction of the proposed change of use not generating any additional traffic. Moreover, there is no footway along this part of The Street, between the junction with the C324 and Barn Close, in which the entrance to Kingsbrook Farm sits and all pedestrians walk in the middle of the road, including parents with school-age children walking to and from Iford and Kingston School.

Section 1.1 states that the Transport Statement is drawn up for the applicant and cannot be relied upon by any third parties in connection to this proposed development. It is full of assumptions and mistakes and fails to provide mitigation for worst-case scenarios if all or most people arrive individually by car. There is no provision to deal with potential traffic generation by visitors and suppliers of deliveries to service the guest accommodation and function room. Therefore, it could be argued that it not relevant to this application.

### **Noise**

Because of the lack of detail in the application it is difficult to assess the amount of noise that will be generated by users of any subsequent development. However, as the building for which the change of use would be class C1 it is probable that guests would use outdoor space for recreational purposes. There is no information about how such activities would be managed to minimise impact on immediate neighbours. It is to be noted that the rear of the building for which C1 change of use has been sought is withing 4 metres of neighbouring properties.

The large open span buildings are open on one side, i.e. enclosed on three sides thus acting as acoustic enclosures amplifying the noise generated. As the walls are designed to face the prevailing weather, the open sides face North and East, which are the directions in which most neighbouring homes are located.

### **Contamination**

As a former dairy farm, it is possible that residues of agricultural chemicals persist in the soil surrounding the buildings for which a change of use has been sought.

For example:

- Herbicides, to control broad-leaved weeds in grassland
- Insecticides, particularly persistent organo-phosphate, for example to control warble fly
- Fertilizers
- Fuels and oils
- Cleaning chemicals, eg acids and alkaline cleaning agent associated with dairy hygiene.
- Cement-bonded asbestos

Other contaminants should also be considered, and a full survey and testing regime should be reported to planners before approval is given.

### **Flooding**

There are several seasonal springs which arise at the foot of the downs in the vicinity of Kingston and while none has been observed close to the site, given the ephemeral nature of their appearance a hydrological survey should be undertaken before additional infrastructure is installed. There is a nearby example of a development taking place which has resulted in a seasonal spring causing problems which should have been addressed prior to the development of the site in 2013 and which now causes problems on Wellgreen Lane and the footpath leading onto it.

Name

Signed

Date

## Agricultural use

The requirements for permitted development stipulate that the buildings in question have been in agricultural use within time limits set out in the legislation. No evidence has been produced to confirm conformity with these requirements.

## Conclusion

Kingston Parish Council feels that a coherent plan for the site could benefit the owners, the community and enhance The National Park while at the same time addressing some of the concerns of local residents. Many of the assertions and omission contribute to a sense of anxiety about how the site might evolve. KPC believe a full Planning Application, without the preamble of a change of use, is the best route to assuage these fears and provide a durable development which provides some benefit to the community.

## **5. Financial Matters**

- 5.1.** To approve and authorise accounts payable for August 2023 (as detailed on the payment list).  
Resolved: The accounts payable were approved and authorised. A total of £2834.89 agreed and paid by electronic banking. The clerk advised that the insurance was due and the invoice for £2122.76 needed to be paid by 20<sup>th</sup> August. The council unanimously agreed for the clerk to arrange payment.
  
- 5.2.** To acknowledge the RBS reports circulated by the Clerk – Summary Receipts and Payments and Cash and Investment Reconciliation.  
**Resolved:** The RBS reports were acknowledged, and no questions were raised

- *The next parish council meeting is 13<sup>th</sup> September 2023 at 7.00pm Kingston Pavilion, St Pancras Green.*

Name

Signed

Date