

Minutes of a Special Meeting of the Town Council held at the Town Hall, Rye, on Monday 25 July 2011

PRESENT Councillors Lord Amptill, Granville Bantick, John Breeds (**Mayor**), Jonathan Breeds, Mike Eve, Bernardine Fiddimore, Heidi Foster, Sonia Holmes, Nigel Jennings, Jo Kirkham, Ian Potter, Shaun Rogers (**Deputy Mayor**), Adam Smith, Mary Smith, Sam Souster

IN ATTENDANCE Richard Farhall - Town Clerk; Andy Hemsley – *Rye Observer*, 32 members of the public

The meeting commenced at 7.26.

50 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence – and the reason logged with the Clerk – were accepted from Cllr Gemma Blumire.

51 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Cllr Shaun Rogers *personal* **item 52** Ferry Road resident

The Mayor adjourned the meeting for up to 30 minutes for contributions from members of the public in respect of item 52 (See Appendix).

The meeting reconvened.

52 PLANNING APPLICATION (AMENDED)

RR/2011/506/P Former Thomas Peacocke Lower School site, Ferry Road, Rye

Construction of A1 class retail food store of 3,451sqm gross external floorspace, service yard, customer car park, landscaping improvements and a new access from Ferry Road. Demolition of Queen Adelaide Public House and 25 Ferry Road.

Applicant: Sainsbury's Supermarkets, 33 Holborn, London

Members were invited to consider the (amended) application and determine the Council's response to the Planning Authority (*RTC deadline: 26 July*).

RESOLVED To suspend Standing Order 28(j) (not speaking more than once).

Cllr Mary Smith requested that any votes taken during this item be recorded.

The Clerk read out the Council's current position:

RESOLVED (9 for – 2 against) To support approval of the application – subject to:

(a) No objections from the Highways Authority and Network Rail in respect of the proposed site access arrangements;

(b) The applicant addressing, as far as is possible and practical, the concerns of the occupants of properties neighbouring the site – particularly in relation to the height of the proposed store, illumination levels, noise and landscaping;

(c) The Planning Authority's Environmental Health Department considering whether air pollution issues associated with vehicle movements on the site need to be addressed.

He explained that, because this decision had been made within the last 6 months (18.4.11), Members could not rescind it. In order to do this 9 Members would have to request that a special proposal for resolution be placed on a future agenda. Members would, therefore, need to focus on the amendments that had been made since the application was last considered by the Council.

Many Members had the same concerns as those expressed during consideration of the amended Tesco application at the preceding meeting.

A proposal to defer consideration of this application pending the receipt of further information from Network Rail and the Highways Authority was withdrawn when it was realised that it was likely that RDC would give conditional approval to the application on Thursday (28th July).

A proposal to reject the 'amended plans' was withdrawn because the Planning Authority could reasonably request the reasons for the refusal – and the amendments were not particularly 'significant'.

Cllr Fiddimore observed that the applicant appeared to have gone some way towards addressing RTC's 'approval conditions' and suggested that a large number of parishioners would be disappointed if Rye ended up without a 'second supermarket'.

It was agreed generally (with Cllrs Amphill and Souster abstaining – and Cllrs Fiddimore, Foster and Potter registering their unease over the proposed course of action) to accept the Clerk's suggestion that he should submit the comment following to the Planning Authority:

Although the majority of Members in attendance [at tonight's meeting] were minded to revoke the Council's previous decision (conditional support approval – 18.4.11) – and support refusal of the application for the reasons set out in the Council's latest response to RR/2010/2570/P (the Tesco application) – for procedural reasons the Council was unable to do so formally prior to the meeting of RDC's Planning Committee scheduled for 28 July 2011.

53 URGENT ITEMS

There were no urgent items to consider.

The meeting ended at 8.07.

Date Chairman

Adjournment for public comments on item 52: summary

- This application exceeds the Retail Needs Analysis floor space 'deficiency' by 1,963sqm – and the development could be rejected on these grounds alone
- The Highways Authority's safety audits were inadequate
- What was the point of the Rye District Councillors attending the meeting if they intended to abstain from voting? District Councillors should not be permitted to sit on the Town Council.

Cllr Souster stated that because he could not attend Thursday's RDC Planning Committee meeting he had contemplated not attending tonight's meetings – but the Clerk had suggested Members might find his presence useful.

- Will the views of ESFR be taken into account in relation to Fire Station access?

Cllr Ampthill advised that ESFR had been invited to comment but had not done so. Cllr Adam Smith had met recently with the Station Commander to discuss the applications. ESFR had commented, when approached, in 1999 – and had formulated an innovative 'traffic light solution' to ease access. However, it would comment further if one (or both) of the planning applications was granted conditional planning consent.

- An appropriate traffic light system should be made a planning condition
- RTC should insist that it be consulted on – and should approve – any proposed s106 'planning gain' conditions