

# FRANT PARISH COUNCIL

[clerk@frant-pc.gov.uk](mailto:clerk@frant-pc.gov.uk) / 07903 661581 / [www.frant-pc.gov.uk](http://www.frant-pc.gov.uk)

## THE DRAFT MINUTES OF A PLANNING AND OTHER MATTERS MEETING HELD AT FRANT MEMORIAL HALL ON MONDAY 1<sup>ST</sup> AUGUST 2022

**Present:** Cllr Crookshank – Vice-Chair  
Cllrs Park, Macdonald-Brown, Rutherford, Howell, Steadman  
  
Mr P. Payne  
9 local residents

**1. Enquire whether anyone present intends to film, photograph and/or record the meeting.**  
None.

**2. To receive apologies.**  
Apologies were received from Cllrs Luther and Best.

**3. Declarations of Interests on items on the agenda.**  
None.

**4. Public forum (15 mins).**

Mr Payne addressed the Council and stated that he had contacted the National Association of Local Councils (NALC), the Monitoring Officer and Democratic Services at Wealden District Council and that they all said that the Parish Council must consult the community about the village sign.

*(Post-meeting note: This is wholly incorrect. Parish Councils are autonomous and there is no statutory duty on them to consult. To be clarified at the next Full Council Meeting).*

Mr Payne asked why the Council had held a consultation for the proposed pedestrian crossing lights, but not for the sign.

*(Post-meeting note: the Parish Council consulted the parish for the following reasons: the cost of the project at well over £200,000 is significant, as compared to smaller projects; it was a requirement of ESCC's feasibility study and match-funding application that consultation was carried out; the sensitivity of approximately 8 no. streetlights in close proximity to houses fronting the A267, and the potential impact on: listed buildings/structures/, the Conservation Area, the AONB and in long views across Eridge Park to the ridgeline on which the crossing is to be located).*

Cllr Crookshank said that due process had been followed. The sign was proposed on Parish Council owned land; the Parish Council had considered two options and had made a decision to have a sign to commemorate the Jubilee. He said that the views about a sign across the parish were varied and that it was proving to be divisive. He asked the assembled if they had seen Option 1. They (mostly) said they had. He asked them if they liked Option 1 and they said they did. He thus queried what the issue was. He also noted that if the Parish Council had consulted, or were to consult, there was a good possibility that the vote would be against a sign.

Mr Payne noted the cost of asking an architect to produce two options at £1,600. He asked how much the next phase of producing drawings etc for planning would cost. The Clerk responded that it was the same amount again. Mr Payne said this was a waste of tax-payers' money and he could have done it all for free.

*(Post-meeting note: The Parish Council had already agreed not to use Mr Payne for the design of the sign following his behaviour at the Annual Statutory Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022 [Minute ref: 11]. In addition, the Parish Council is not obliged to accept the lowest quote and, by extension, is not obliged to accept services just because they are being offered free of charge [Financial Regulations 11.1 i]).*

After much discussion, Cllr Crookshank **agreed** that the Parish Council would consider, at its September Full Council Meeting, whether or not to consult the parish.

- 5. To consider licence and planning applications received and make recommendations:**  
**5.1 WD/2022/1707/F – Waterdown Cottage, Bayham Road, Frant, TN3 9BP**  
**Single-storey rear extension. New first-floor dormer windows to existing house. New double garage and alterations to driveway.**

The Parish Council raised no objections to this proposal.

- 5.2 WD/2022/1497/F – 2 Lime Close, Frant, TN3 9DP**  
**Proposed single-storey rear and front extensions with internal alterations.**

The Parish Council raised no objections to this proposal.

- 5.3 WD/2022/1603/MAJ – St Marks Recreation Ground, Frant Road, TN2 5LS**  
**Construction of a 3G artificial grass pitch; erection of a storage building; construction of a cricket pavilion; provision of 76 additional car parking spaces; change of use of agricultural land to a cricket pitch and outfield under recreational use (Use Class F.2(c)); retrospective erection of a decking area and pergola.**

The Parish Council raised no objections in principle. However, it noted that the area was originally agricultural. Given this and the sensitive habitat and location within the AONB and, in part to offset the use of an artificial surface (3G), the Parish Council would like to see the planting of trees and the boundaries being re-wilded.

- 6. Approve accounts payable**

The accounts were **approved** to be paid.

- 7. Agree quotation for next phase of village sign project**

Not discussed.

- 8. Matters at the discretion of the Chairman, for discussion purposes only**

None.

There being no other business, the meeting closed at 8.15pm.