

**1.0 Thomas Peacocke site: Plutus Developments
Extension of time granted until 25 July 2018**

We are advised by Richard Wilson that

‘Finally the EA hasn’t formally commented on the Thomas Peacocke scheme but I know that negotiations direct with the applicant have resulted in required levels being established and we are expecting revised plans soon with a changed layout, taking account both the EA position and various other previous comments/requirements. I will have to decide on the scope of the changes whether to re-advertise for 14 or 21 days’.

22 August 2018 email Richard Wilson RDC “ Applicants are considering amended plans’

24 September 2018 email Richard Wilson RDC ‘ We are awaiting revised plans’

No revised drawings submitted to date

2.0 BP Filling Station

BP are appealing both refusals. I have made a further comment to the Planning Inspectorate emphasizing our opposition and restating the grounds for refusal.

Appeal held on the 25th September 2018

3.0 48 Ferry Road (former night club)

Response from ESCC regarding parking provision was frankly fatuous and I will write again particularly as the recent release of the D&SAP sets out in Policy DHG7 the need to meet the ESCC Residential provision.

(ii) Car parking and cycle storage: Provision for car parking and safe and secure cycle storage should be made in accordance with Core Strategy Policy TR4 and East Sussex County Council’s ‘Guidance for Parking at New Residential Development’ and ‘Guidance for Parking at Non Residential Development’. Its siting and design should be considered at the outset and be appropriate to the location, layout and design approach of the development, respecting and being informed by the character of the locality.

It also does not meet the emerging RNP policy T2.

4.0 Neighbourhood Plan

Version 11 (October) published and on 29 Oct, Rye TC endorses RNP V11 for Regulation 15 publication; “Plan Submission” and supporting papers will be submitted to Rother DC on 30 Oct.

V11(Oct) appears to not be consistent with the Current Version of the D&SAP (Cabinet version) in terms of housing numbers and parking policy.

V11 (October) still shows Gibbet Marsh within a revised development boundary and has the whole of Rock channel as housing site H4.

There is a limit to the extent that we can bang our head against a brick wall . If accepted by Rother for Reg 16 consultation we have to decide if we comment or just let it be the concern of others primarily the independent examiner who has been appointed.

Frankly the development sites are those identified in the 2013 SHLAA with the addition of the Thomas Peacocke site and the omission of Rye Hire and the policies are now innocuous and in the case of the housing numbers and parking may have to be amended to be in line with the D&SAP.

5.00 Bridge Point Studios.

Application awaited

6.00 La Rochelle

We objected on the grounds that Crittal metal windows were inappropriate. Consent granted subject to use of wooden windows.