



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 4, 5, 6 and 7 December 2012

Site visit made on 7 December 2012

by Frances Mahoney DipTP MRTPI IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 30 January 2013

Appeal Ref: APP/U1430/A/06/2030466

Gullivers Bowls Club, Knole Road, Bexhill-on-Sea

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Churchill Retirement Living against the decision of Rother District Council.
 - The application Ref RR/2006/2226/P, dated 2 August 2006, was refused by notice dated 12 October 2006.
 - The development proposed is the redevelopment to form 41 sheltered apartments for the elderly, car parking, landscape and access and new outdoor bowls green, indoor rink, club facilities and car park.
 - This decision supersedes that issued on 22 August 2007. That decision on the appeal was quashed by order of the High Court.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural matters

2. This appeal was first heard by way of an Inquiry held by another Inspector on 17, 18 & 19 July 2007. His decision, dated 22 August 2007, was the subject of an application to the High Court by a Rule 6 Party and, on 29 May 2008, the Court ordered, by consent, that the decision be remitted to the Secretary of State for re-hearing and determination. The Secretary of State then produced an environmental impact assessment direction screening dated July 2009, which concluded that the development was not likely to have significant effects on the environment. The screening direction was subject to a High Court challenge. However, the Court refused to quash the decision of the Secretary of State in respect of the screening. Following an appeal to the Court of Appeal the appeal was dismissed. As a result this case has now fallen to me to determine, based on the submitted evidence and all that I heard and saw at the Inquiry held on the 4 – 7 December 2012.
3. At the Inquiry, 2 sets of revised plans were proffered by the appellant company. The first was alternative elevation details of the sheltered block which, in essence, involved a change in the roof pitch and configuration; the introduction of different external finishes, along with front balconies and bay windows. The plans, dated 2009, also included the re-design of the bowls club building and indoor bowls green, which would be set down into the site reducing the ground level at the northern end of the appeal site. The second set (2012) was a comprehensive re-design of the sheltered housing building

taking a more contemporary approach, whilst still retaining the scale and mass of the original scheme. In both cases the appellant company had carried out a process of consultation with interested parties and submitted the resultant representations to the Inquiry. The first set of proposed amendments (2009) relating to the sheltered building are in the main cosmetic. The scale, massing and design configuration remaining generally unaltered from the original scheme (dwg nos CRL:20019BX:RB1, RB2, BRC1 and BRC2). In respect of the design changes to the proposed bowls club building and indoor rink, these were promoted to address the Council's concerns and had come about through discussions with the Council's officers. The Council confirmed that were the amended plans to be accepted, they no longer wished to defend reason for refusal 3 in so far as it related to the proposed bowling club buildings as specific elements of the scheme. Taking into account the minor nature of the amendments proposed in the context of the larger scheme; the extent of the consultation process undertaken by the appellant company; the comments received from third parties; and their acceptance by both the Council and the Gullivers Action Group (GAG), I consider that the admittance of the amended plans from 2009 would not leave any party significantly disadvantaged in terms of the consideration of this matter.

4. The second set of amended plans dated 2012, represented a more significant change in respect of the form, layout and elevational details of the sheltered building. Whilst the consultation process adopted by the appellant company was comparatively robust, with such intrinsic amendments proposed I am not satisfied that the process adopted would be appropriate to ensure that all parties/stakeholders would have been engaged in the consideration of the amended scheme. Therefore, the submitted plans of 2012 were rejected as being changes of more than what could reasonably be considered to be minor amendments to the original scheme.
5. Therefore, for the avoidance of doubt, I confirm that the consideration of this appeal is based on the first set of amended plans (2009) as detailed above, along with those plans originally submitted as part of the application and not then subsequently superseded.
6. Following the Inquiry in 2007, the Council confirmed that they no longer wished to defend reason for refusal 1, which relates to whether one of the bowling greens is surplus to requirements and could be used for other sports, and reason 4 which deals with the effect of the indoor bowling rink and formation of the car park to the sheltered building on neighbouring dwellings. They were satisfied that based on the submitted evidence the appellant company had proved their case in this regard. However, GAG continue to oppose the scheme on these grounds and therefore, I shall return to the consideration of these matters later in the decision.
7. A section 106 Obligation signed by the appellant company and the Council was submitted at the Inquiry. It deals with a financial contribution towards the provision of affordable housing. It serves to vary the terms of the Unilateral Undertaking (dated 12 July 2007) already connected to this appeal.
8. My attention has also been drawn to a restrictive covenant imposed on the property title relating to the appeal site (Gullivers Bowling Club). This allows for development on the Knole Road frontage, but specifies that it should be in the form of four detached dwellinghouses. However, the terms and applicability of this covenant do not restrict my consideration of a different

proposal for development on the Knole Road frontage, and I shall proceed accordingly.

Planning Policy

9. Since the proposed scheme was refused planning permission in 2006 the development plan for the area has evolved and the emphasis of Government policy has moved away from the regional base to an agenda of localism. As a result, the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 is no longer in force having been succeeded by the South East Plan (RS), as regional strategy. However, the revocation of the regional strategies is accepted as a Government intention. Nonetheless, until such time as the RS is formally revoked by Order it remains part of the development plan. That being said, the Council has relied upon the policies within the Rother District Local Plan (LP) adopted in 2006, its policies being saved in 2009.
10. The Proposed Submission Core Strategy (incorporating the focused amendments) (CS) was submitted for public examination in November 2012. At the time of the Inquiry the report of the Inspector was awaited. Taking into account the progress of the Core Strategy within the examination process, I have afforded some weight to the policies of that document.
11. National planning policy has moved on over the extended period during which this appeal has been under consideration. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published in March 2012. In general it has superseded the Planning Policy Statement documents, historically referred to in the previous proceedings relating to this case (an exception being the Historic Environment Planning Practice Guide (Companion to PPS5)). I have considered the appeal in the context of this current national planning policy and am satisfied that the development plan policies relevant to this appeal are generally consistent with the thrust of the Framework.

Main Issues

12. From the evidence before me, including all that I have seen and read, the main issues in this case are:
 - the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area, having regard to the setting of the neighbouring listed building;
 - on the living conditions of adjacent residents, having regard to outlook, privacy, sunlight, daylight, and noise and disturbance; and
 - whether the proposal would appropriately contribute to the provision of affordable housing in the district.

Reasons

Character and appearance/setting of the listed building

13. The appeal site lies just off the main promenade in an urban setting of predominantly attractive, substantial, characterising detached and semi-detached Victorian Villas which, whilst many have been converted to flats and nursing homes, still retain the elegance of a bygone age of Victorian sophistication. Immediately opposite the appeal site is De la Warr Parade, a

splendid, imposing 4 storey building (with half basement) which, in maintaining the full storey height, extends along virtually the full length of Knole Road in a curving configuration, an unbroken mass of grand Victorian, statement making architecture. It straddles the space between Knole Road and the main seafront promenade. The two resultant facades, whilst differing in design approach, are both equally important in this prominent seafront location. It is a Grade II listed building of some significance both historically and by reason of its physical presence in terms of scale, massing, height and detailed design features. It reads as one building, but is divided into a number of flats of varying sizes. The Knole Road elevation includes the flats' main entrances and adopts a more domestic style than the ornate Queen Anne façade of the sea facing building frontage. The repartition of the shallow gabled bays, one broad window wide, dominates the Knole Road façade, and this gable end projection can be seen as a repeated, characterising feature on other Victorian Villas and more modern infill development in the vicinity.

14. The appeal site is an open green space lying opposite De la Warr Parade. It consists of two outdoor bowling rinks, club car park and a group of dilapidated club buildings, including a pavilion and indoor rink. The neighbouring properties in Brassey Road, Cantelupe Road and Middlesex Road all back onto the appeal site having outlook across the bowling greens.
15. On various plans dating back to the turn of the 19th century this open space is maintained. The plan of 1894 identifies the site as being proposed garden ground. By 1930 it was being used as a Croquet Ground and by 1952 it was in private ownership and was used by the Gullivers Bowls Club. From the historical evidence submitted it seems to me that whether the appeal site, at some time in the past, had been intended as a green open square for the enjoyment of residents, it is no longer relevant in this regard as it has become an important recreational space used for organised sport by a long established sports club. This is its prime purpose and its openness is as a result of the nature of the sport played as much as any historical intention.
16. The appeal proposes the demolition of the existing bowls club buildings, their replacement with a modern club house/pavilion, indoor rink and associated facilities and the replacement of two outdoor greens by one new one. In addition, on the north side of Knole Road it is proposed to erect a four/three storey block of 41 sheltered apartments as a frontage development.
17. The proposed new club house/pavilion and indoor rink have been designed as low level buildings concentrated towards the northern end of the appeal site, at some distance from the listed building. They have been designed for purpose, including a link between the indoor rink and club house. The proposed setting down of the buildings into the appeal site would serve to minimise their visual impact in the wider streetscape. The proposal would certainly be an improvement on the existing old, poor quality, utilitarian bowling club buildings adding vitality to the appearance of the club facilities. The slightly skewed siting of the new outdoor rink and consequently the other new bowling buildings would not in reality be a particularly obvious feature. Whilst it would leave some land to the west of the club house without a clear purpose, this is not in itself a reason to count against the development.
18. The proposed sheltered housing would be sited directly facing the listed building and within its setting. However, the sheltered housing building would be of a scale and mass that would be subservient to the imposing terrace

opposite. The setting of De la Warr Parade is wider than just the open space opposite. It is centred on the complimentary Victorian buildings in the neighbouring streets, the urban grain of development, the imposing seafront buildings, and the open promenade and seafront location. The continuation of sympathetically designed development along the Knole Road frontage would not diminish the quality of the existing setting of the listed building. The appeal proposal would work as a foil to the splendour of the listed terrace, creating a sense of enclosure to Knole Road. The new building would be visible in the context of the listed building when viewed from the corner of Knole Road, Middlesex Road and Brassey Road. However, the height, scale and massing of the proposal would represent a stepping down of development from the range of the listed building to the more domestic scale of the 'villa' development in the neighbouring streets.

19. Therefore, the mass, height and scale of the proposed building would not be out of character with the surrounding area, and it would preserve the special architectural and historic interest of the listed building.
20. It was suggested that such development should be continuous along the frontage mirroring the expanse of the listed terrace. I do not agree. Such an approach would be more likely to set up a tension between the listed building and the sheltered housing building, competing in terms of visual prowess. By maintaining some sense of openness and visual permeability from Knole Road through to the bowls green behind, a visual awareness of the open space and the relationship between the open space, the listed building and the street scene in general would be maintained.
21. The Council has accepted the principle of the redevelopment of the Knole Road frontage for sheltered housing and for the reasons set out above I agree with this view.
22. However, my concern rests with the quality of the proposed design. The 2009 amended plans have gone some way to improve the external appearance of the sheltered block by introducing some changes in facing materials to lift the otherwise bland expanse of brickwork, and roof configuration to reflect the gabled bays of the listed building. Nonetheless, these changes do not go far enough. The pattern of the gabled bays would only allude to the rhythm of those of the listed building, being a poor representation of the precision and maintenance of the dominant pattern of bays. The use of bargeboards would similarly only hint at the quality of the neighbouring terrace. This poor reflection of the symmetry and stature of De la Warr Parade creates a bland, uninteresting building, particularly in respect of the rear elevation which would be visible from the playing greens and the surrounding houses and their gardens with the listed terrace as a backdrop. The use of such characterising features would not be sufficient to raise the quality of the design to a standard which would appropriately sit alongside and complement De la Warr Parade and the other Victorian Villas in the locality.
23. I appreciate the plans before me are similar to those previously accepted by my colleague in the now quashed decision of 2007. Nonetheless, time has passed and the introduction of the Framework in 2012, as a single national planning policy document dealing with all aspects of planning, has brought a more central focus on design. As one of the core planning principles of the Framework, there has been an increasing emphasis on always seeking to secure high quality design as a key aspect of sustainable development,

indivisible from good planning, and positively contributing to making places better for people. The Ministerial forward to the Framework confirms the emphasis on 'standards of design being so much higher'. I have given very careful consideration to my colleague Inspector's reasoning and conclusion on the acceptability of the proposed design of the development. However, measured against the full import of the NPPF and the Government's clear intention that standards of design will be raised, I am not satisfied that the proposed scheme, even as improved by the 2009 amended plans, merits the same conclusion as that of my colleague.

24. Therefore, to conclude, the detailed design of the proposed sheltered housing building would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area, undermining local distinctiveness, and would cause substantial harm to the setting and significance of De la Warr Parade as an important heritage asset. The provision of sheltered accommodation and the up-grading of the bowls club, as public benefits are not considered to be substantial enough to outweigh the significant harm identified to the heritage asset. In this way the terms of LP Policy GD1 would be compromised which seeks to ensure high standards of development that respect and contribute to its setting and promote sustainable development. The essence of CS Policies EN2 and EN3 are similarly reflected in the application of the LP policy as well as the statutory duty to preserve listed buildings or their settings or any features of special architectural or historic interest which they possess.

Living conditions

25. The proposed development being located within an urban area, on a site previously undeveloped, can not fail to affect the outlook of virtually all the neighbouring properties to some degree. As I saw at my site visit the new bowling rink, being close to the northern boundary of the appeal site with properties in Cantelupe Road, would be visible from their rear windows and gardens. However, the hipped roof design of the indoor rink and the proposed setting down of the building from the level of the rear gardens would minimise the impact on outlook. Views across the outdoor green and through to De la Warr Parade would still be achievable. For other properties backing onto the bowling club, little would change as separation distance would generally be maintained.
26. From the north facing windows of the flats of De la Warr Parade the proposed sheltered block would be visible. However, whilst I appreciate that many residents value the open views across the bowling green I am mindful that this is an area of an urban character where views across a street from building to building are not unusual and, if anything, are to be expected. For some flats, views beyond the new building would still be achievable. For others their view would change but not to such an unacceptable degree that planning permission could be withheld on this ground.
27. The separation distance between the proposed building and the existing flats, along with the nature of this urban area are factors which equally apply to the minimising of any loss of privacy between units of residential accommodation.
28. In respect of whether the proposed sheltered housing block would restrict daylight and sunlight to the terraced flats and, more particularly, to the 'garden flats' within the half storey below the building, I visited a number of such flats during my site visit to give me a better understanding of the point the

residents were trying to make. In respect of the north facing flats on the upper floors, I found that taking into account the proposed separation distances between the two buildings, the orientation of the flats, the wide nature of the windows to main rooms and the potential for borrowed light from the south facing windows of flats which span the full width of the building, there would be no significant loss of daylight or sunlight.

29. Turning to the 'garden flats'. The configuration of these flats may vary but of those which I visited, I noted that they were below pavement level. The kitchen window either faced east or west looking out onto the substantial retaining walls of the entrance steps and porch. The sitting room window was north facing but set down and back from the pavement level. The flat I visited was already quite dark and gloomy and the presence of large glass panels between rooms emphasised the reliance on borrowed light between rooms and from the front of the flat to the back. Anecdotally, the evidence of participants was that for much of the year it was necessary to have the lights on in parts if not all of the flat. Taking into account the distance between the windows of concern and the proposed building; the orientation of these windows; the current degree of shadowing which already affects the levels of light in the flats; and possible seasonal variations, I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal would markedly decrease the levels of sunlight and daylight achievable within the 'garden flats'.
30. I have also considered concerns relating to noise and disturbance from the new bowls club facilities as well as from the car parking areas. Noise generated by the playing of bowls on the proposed new outdoor green would not be significantly greater than is already created by playing on the existing green. In respect of noise and disturbance from the comings and goings of vehicles visiting both the new club car park and the sheltered housing car park, again this is not likely to be anymore intrusive than that existing. Were the appeal to be allowed, conditions relating to the design of the sheltered car park in respect of finished ground levels, landscaping, including boundary fencing, and surfacing materials could be imposed to preserve the amenities of the neighbouring residents.
31. For all the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal proposal would not unacceptably harm the living conditions of neighbouring residents in respect of outlook, privacy, sunlight and daylight, and noise and disturbance. LP Policy GD1, which aims to safeguard the living conditions of residents of adjoining properties, would not be compromised. The principles of the Framework underpin this aim by seeking to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of buildings.

Affordable housing

32. LP Policy HG1 sets out that in schemes involving 15 or more dwellings, 40% of the total number of dwellings to be provided shall be affordable housing for local people. Provision below that figure will be accepted where it can be demonstrated that 40% provision will make the development of the whole site uneconomic, based on the current housing market and all the costs of the development. CS Policy LHN2 reduces the overall affordable requirement down to 30%. However, where viability becomes an issue it will be expected that the proportion of affordable housing would be the most that does not undermine viability.

33. There is no dispute between the Council and the appellant that there is a need for affordable housing of the type proposed. GAG suggest that there is no need for any more sheltered flats in Bexhill, but their evidence is based on a snap-shot of sheltered units available for sale at a given time.
34. The appellant has submitted a viability appraisal which, the Council agreed, demonstrates that the provision of affordable housing whether on site or as a financial contribution would make the development of the whole site uneconomic based on the current housing market and all the costs of the development.
35. The point at issue is whether all the costs involved should include the development costs of the proposed bowls club buildings and new green as a public benefit. In essence the case is promoted by the Council and others that the provision of the new club facilities is at the cost of the affordable housing. Were a development to take place on the Knole Road frontage without a requirement to upgrade the bowls club site, the viability balance would be likely to swing in favour of providing some affordable housing.
36. The contractual arrangements between the appellant company and the bowls club are such that the sheltered housing can not be delivered without the provision of the new club facilities.
37. The Gullivers Bowling Club is a long established sports club and is the only club in Bexhill to be able to offer both indoor and outdoor greens. It has some 125 members some of whom play only indoor bowls. The social side to the club appears lively, even given the poor facilities which exist for catering. An extensive programme of fixtures throughout the year providing facilities for casual play, touring sides, competitions both internal and external is laid on. Whilst not specifically open to the public, the club does welcome visitors and encourages new members as well as those who just wish to watch. It is clear that it is of considerable value to both the bowling community as well as the wider community. The club is owned by Gullivers Bowling Club Ltd who is the landlord of the club itself. The club buildings, which I saw at the site visit, are aged, dilapidated and not fit for purpose. They also include a considerable amount of asbestos within their structure. The club owners do not have the funds to up-grade the existing facilities and it is clear to me that any grant aid which they may be able to secure would not be in the order of the sums required to carry out works necessary to bring the buildings up to a safe, modern standard to support the long established club. Such a strategy would only allow for a piece meal 'make do and mend' approach to improving the playing facilities on the site.
38. I have no doubt that over time the club facilities will deteriorate further. This would have the potential for discouraging new members as well as other clubs and competition organisers from using the club amenities. This would be to the detriment of the club itself, placing its long term future at risk, but also to the wider bowls community and the public at large. The Framework seeks to deliver social and recreational facilities in the promotion of healthy communities, enhancing the sustainability of communities and residential environments. Positive planning for the provision of sports venues and the guarding against the loss of valued facilities are particular objectives.
39. In the specific circumstances of this appeal site, I am satisfied that the provision of the new bowls club buildings and green would be an important

public benefit, maintaining and improving the existing club facility, promoting a healthy community in a sustainable location within a residential setting. In this way the costs involved in such development are considered to be legitimately factored into the overall development costs and the appellant company's viability assessment. Therefore, the conclusion of the viability assessment is sound in its inclusion of the costs of the re-development of the bowls club. The public benefits, in my view, weigh equally against the provision of affordable housing, meeting national objectives in relation to achieving healthy communities.

40. However, the appellant has recognised that economic circumstances may change over time. Should projected sales values for the sheltered housing apartments be exceeded then the S106 agreement and Unilateral Undertaking, in combination, would require that a sum be paid across to the Council in accordance with the Affordable Housing Commuted Sum calculation up to a maximum of £700,000, the sum accepted by my colleague as being appropriate in the now quashed decision. If anything, the market and the economy at best have remained stagnant since that time and so none of the parties disputed the justification for this, as a maximum contribution.
41. I also agree with the previous Inspector that a financial contribution to achieve off-site affordable provision is justified in this case, taking into account the scale of the appeal proposal; management problems highlighted by the appellant company for such a mixed tenure; and the possibility that the establishing of a community spirit within the scheme could be undermined if mixed tenure were to be imposed.
42. In conclusion, it is accepted that it has been demonstrated that the provision of affordable housing as a financial contribution would make the development of the whole site uneconomic based on the current housing market and all the costs of the development, including that relating to the re-development of the bowls club. I also consider that it would not be practicable to include affordable housing within the proposed scheme. Therefore, the appeal proposal would generally accord with the terms of LP Policy HG1 and CS Policy LHN2, and with the execution of the legal undertakings should more favourable economic circumstances arise, appropriate provision for affordable housing would be made.

Other matters

Loss of the second bowling green as a recreational facility/open space

43. The Gullivers Bowling Club currently has two outdoor bowling greens. The lower one, closest to Knole Road, is regularly maintained and played upon in the outdoor season. The top green has not been used for many years due in part to the heavy financial cost of maintenance. It would be upon this top green that the indoor bowls rink would be built. This would reduce the outdoor playing area available to the club to one green. However, I heard from Mrs Stanley, the club treasurer, that in providing competition facilities, normal day-to-day match playing and practice sessions, the second green had not been missed and the club was well able to accommodate all their playing requirements on the existing lower green.
44. In considering alternative sporting uses for the top green I am mindful of its limited size, as well as its sensitive residential setting where other sports such

as tennis could change the nature of the use of this area, particularly in respect of noise and disturbance to neighbouring residents. The possibilities of using it for more tranquil uses would be difficult to accommodate in conjunction with the existing bowls club use.

45. Whilst the number of greens would be reduced on the appeal site the up-grading of facilities, including the indoor bowling rink, would be such as to safeguard the existing bowling club as well as offering improved facilities to the wider bowling community. New indoor facilities would help increase participation in bowls and would be more significant than the evidence of need for alternative outdoor sports which could be reasonably accommodated on this site. In addition, close by there is a large area of open space along the Promenade which offers considerable recreational opportunities. Therefore, the terms of LP Policy CF2 would not be compromised in this instance.
46. In reaching this view I have taken account of the appellant company's sport assessment, the contents of the Council's Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study and the support of Sport England for the indoor bowls element of the scheme.

Flooding

47. At the Inquiry I heard anecdotal evidence relating to the flooding of gardens and cellars/boiler rooms in the immediate vicinity of the appeal site. I also saw some of the green ditches partly full of water. However, the appeal site has not been identified by the Environment Agency as an area susceptible to flooding. Nonetheless, I understand the fear of residents that the new development may change the pattern of water run-off and may lead to increased levels of flooding. However, no substantive evidence was submitted to support this assertion. Southern Water was satisfied that the arrangements for dealing with and disposing of both surface and foul water could be dealt with by condition. I have no reason to question their assessment in this regard.

Conclusion

48. Notwithstanding my positive conclusions in respect of the effect of the appeal proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents, and on the provision of affordable housing in the district, I find that the detailed design of the proposed sheltered building would cause substantial harm to the setting of De la Warr Parade, a heritage asset of significance in the locality. In addition, the proposal would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Therefore, the appeal should fail.

Frances Mahoney

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Richard Humphreys of Counsel Instructed by Kate Barnes Solicitor to the Council

He called

Diane Russell BSc
(Hons) Dip Arch PgDip
Arch Cons

Conservation & Design Officer

Andrew Rowland BA
(Hons) MRTPI

Major Applications and Appeals Manager

Anne Fennessy BA
(Hons) MA

Head of Housing

Kate Barnes

Solicitor to the Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Neil Cameron of Counsel Instructed by Planning Issues Ltd

He called

John Shelbourn Dip
Arch(Hons) RIBA

Group Design Director , Planning Issues Ltd

Richard Young BA(Hons)
Dipl Arch (Oxford)

Director Gilmore Hankey Kirke Limited

Peter Joyce DipILAM MA
MISPLA

Managing Director SES Ltd

Andrew Burgess BA
(Hons) MRTPI

Managing Director Planning Issues Ltd and a
Director of Churchill Retirement Living Ltd

FOR GULLIVERS ACTION GROUP (GAG) – RULE 6 PARTY:

Paul Stookes Solicitor Advocate Richard Buxton Solicitors

He called

Anne-Marie Loader

Local Resident

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Against the development

Christine Madeley	Local Resident
Geoff Howard	Local Resident
Philip Cottam	Local Resident
Anna Selby	Local Resident
Cllr Deirdre Williams	Member for Sackville Ward

Supporting the development

Tina Standing	Treasurer Gullivers Bowls Club
---------------	--------------------------------

DOCUMENTS

- 1 Site Notice and consultation letter relating to the amended plans 2012, along with the third party responses - Appellant
- 2 Drainage Assessment - Appellant
- 3 Extract from Site Layout Planning for Daylight and Sunlight – A guide to good practice – bre trust - Appellant
- 4 Recent flooding – 12 Cantelupe Road, Bexhill-on-Sea - GAG
- 5 Committee Agenda and Minute relating to reason for refusal 2 and the change in the Council’s stance - Council
- 6 Supporting text to Proposed Submission Core Strategy Policy EN3
- 7 Site Notice and consultation letter relating to the amended plans 2009, along with the third party responses - Appellant
- 8 Philip Cottam’s proof
- 9 Tina Selby’s proof
- 10 Extract from Planning Issues Ltd’s submission on the provision of affordable housing submitted with original planning application in 2006 - Appellant
- 11 Written Ministerial Statement – Communities and Local Government – Housing and Growth – 6 September 2012 - Appellant
- 12 Extract from Proposed Submission Core Strategy (incorporating the focused amendments – July 2012 – 3.Portrait of Rother District and 4. Main Issues
- 13 Extract from Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study – Rother District Council – Quality Standard – Value assessment - Council
- 14 Collection of property details of retirement flats for sale within Bexhill - GAG
- 15 Christine Madeley proof
- 16 Update of Tab 11 Fred Andress Proof 2009 – Thornes Valuation and Site Appraisal report dated 28 September 2009 – para 7 – update on current value of the Bowls Club site – dated 5 Dec 2012 - Appellant
- 17 Comments of Sport England dated 23 April 2007 - Appellant
- 18 Letter from Planning Issues dated 11 July 2005 dealing with the principles of redevelopment with accompanying Initial layout plan dated 20 June 2005 - Council
- 19 Geoff Howard’s proof
- 20 Land Registry extract – sets out restrictive covenant - Appellant
- 21 Extract from the Story of Bexhill by L J Bartley - GAG
- 22 Extract from Sports England, Get funding web site

- 23 Tina Stanley's proof
- 24 Email Correspondence with Sport England by the Appellant Oct/Nov 2012
- 25 Summary of Sheltered units for sale in Bexhill produced by the Appellant -dated 5 December 2012
- 26 Type 3 Survey for Asbestos - Appellant
- 27 Extract from Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development A/RES/42/187 GAG
- 28 Extract from the Consultation on a Strategy for Bexhill Town Centre November 2012 and the Local Action Plan Version One 2010 - GAG
- 29 Statement of Nick Boles dated 6 December 2012 - Minister: goal is 'beautiful new urban landscapes - Council
- 30 Transcript of speech delivered by Nick Boles on 29 November 2012 - beautiful urban landscapes and affordable homes - Council
- 31 Proposed Submission Core Strategy (incorporating the focused amendments) - July 2012 - Council

PLANS

- A Historic plan circa 1894 of street layout, plot division and proposed garden ground
- B Details of road construction - Town Surveyor 1894
- C Site layout planning Daylight and Sunlight - CRL:20019BX:EX03 A