

**Minutes of a Meeting of the Planning & Townscape Committee
held at the Town Hall, Rye on Monday 11 April 2011**

PRESENT Councillors John Breeds (Mayor), Bernardine Fiddimore, Lorna Hall (Deputy Mayor), Paul Osborne, Frank Palmer (**Committee Chairman**), Shaun Rogers, Sam Souster

IN ATTENDANCE Richard Farhall – Town Clerk; Cllrs Sonia Holmes, Paul Osborne, David Russell and Mary Smith; County Cllr Keith Glazier; Andy Hemsley – *Rye Observer*; 5 members of the public

The meeting commenced at 7.31pm

138 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence – and the reasons lodged with the Clerk – were accepted from Cllrs Jonathan Breeds, Jo Kirkham and David Wright (Committee Vice Chairman).

139 DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

There were no disclosures of interest.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting for public questions/comments. There was none and the meeting was reconvened.

140 MINUTES

RESOLVED That the Minutes of the Planning and Townscape meeting of 28 March 2011 (PT23) be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

141 MATTERS ARISING

Page 1

Adjourned section (making representations to RDC concerning the lack of full size hard copies of plans at Rye CHP) The Clerk advised that he had observed correspondence between a District Councillor and the Head of Planning and RDC's Customer Services – and had just received an email from the Director of Resources – and all responses took the same line: hard copies of planning applications at the CHPs had been accessed by the public infrequently. As a cost saving measure it had been decided to withdraw the facility – except in the case of applications for large/sensitive developments.

It was agreed generally to leave the new Council, to decide how to take this issue forward.

61 Town Hall Cottage – installation of mini satellite dish (seeking informal advice from the Planning Authority – having firstly obtained photographs of the property) Outstanding.

142 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED That the comments following be submitted to the Planning Authority:

- | | |
|---|---|
| RR/2011/260/P
RR/2011/261/L
(Del)
<i>Retrospective</i> | 1 High Street, Rye.
Change of colour to exterior paintwork to Farrow & Ball London Stone eggshell.
<i>Applicant: Miss Harminder Gill, Ellis Bros (Ironmongers), 1 High Street, Rye</i>
SUPPORT APPROVAL |
| RR/2011/453P
(Del) | 70 Fishmarket Road, Rye.
Erection of satellite dish to front of house.
<i>Applicant: Paul Williams, 94 New Winchelsea Road, Rye</i>
SUPPORT APPROVAL |
| RR/2011/2162/P
RR/2011/163/A
(Del)
<i>AMENDED</i> | Farrells of Rye, 22 Winchelsea Road, Rye.
(a) Proposed new opening hours (not highlighted previously)
(b) Addition of clock, car wash canopy and canopy fence
<i>Applicant: Farrells of Rye, 22 Winchelsea Road, Rye</i>
SUPPORT APPROVAL |

143 BUS SHELTERS

Members noted that:

- (a)** The new shelters were selected by a local working group and ordered and installed by RDC;
- (b)** Observation/Feedback had shown that the shelters do not provide adequate protection during wet and windy conditions;
- (c)** RTC suggested that RDC's solicitor be consulted on pursuing a 'not fit for purpose' complaint;
- (d)** RDC's solicitor appears not to have been consulted;
- (e)** RDC's response was:
Bus shelters vary considerably in design and therefore in the degree of protection offered. They range from simple canopies to almost fully enclosed structures. As this design with this degree of shelter was the type selected, the supplier has supplied what we requested and I don't think we can now argue that they are not enclosed enough.

The Clerk added that the shelters were fully installed around mid-December

and he alerted RDC to the problem, suggesting obtaining guidance from its solicitor, in late January.

Comments made (including those from Members in the Gallery) during the ensuing discussion included: it was not obvious from the shelter images that the design would not keep out rain; it was reasonable to assume that a shelter would afford just that (shelter) – and would protect the occupants from the elements; there were many gaps in the shelters; the graphic of the shelter on the supplier's web site did not suggest 'gaps'; RDC officers did not query the choice of shelter; the Working Group had focused on aesthetics and (with guidance from the Police) ensuring that it would be possible to view occupants from all directions; RTC had been under pressure to act quickly to ensure shelters were installed before the weather deteriorated; there had been many complaints from bus users; the shelters were particularly ineffective; it had taken a long time for the RDC officer to advise that he thought nothing could be done in terms of complaining to the supplier; the Town Council adopted the Working Group's recommended design; RTC should accept that a mistake was made and focus on rectifying the situation.

Speaking from the Gallery, Cllr Holmes added that she would talk with RDC's solicitor. Cllr Russell suggested that RDC was not at fault – it had ordered the model of shelter requested – and he advised that the former Head of Amenities had stated that the shelter did not appear to be sufficiently 'robust'.

RESOLVED To approach the manufacturer to establish if the shelters could be modified. Clerk

The meeting ended at 7.59pm.

Date.....

Chairman.....