

Worth Parish Council

Minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee Meeting

June 20th 2016 at 19:30 hrs

Present:

Cllr Gibson (Chairman)	Cllr Curzon (Vice Chairman)
Cllr Coote	Cllr Cruickshank
Cllr Field	Cllr Hitchcock
Cllr Lord	Cllr Phillips
Cllr Scott	Cllr Webb

Assistant Clerk, Miss Vaughan

29. Apologies: Cllr Anscomb – personal, Cllr Blakemore – personal, Cllr Dorey – personal.

30. Absent: Cllr Allen, Cllr Larkin.

31. Declaration of Pecuniary and Other Interests: None.

32. Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held June 6th 2016.

The minutes of the June 6th meeting were signed as a true and correct record.

33. Update on MSDC Planning Committee Meetings:

- Planning Committee A** – Next meeting, June 21st. Item DM/16/1597 is on the agenda, recommended for approval. Case: Land parcel 534942-139212, Furnace Farm Road, Furnace Wood – *Demolition of outbuildings and existing 'Furnace Bungalow', and their replacement with a single dwelling (use class C3) together with associated infrastructure and landscape works.* It was noted that WPC supported this application.
- Planning Committee B** – Next meeting, July 7th. No documentation available.
- District Planning Committee** – Next meeting, July 14th. No documentation available.

34. Planning Decisions from Mid Sussex:

Reference	Address	WPC	MSDC
DM/16/0644	Pinewood, 2 The Bungalows, Station Road, Crawley Down	Object	Approved
DM/16/1026	28 Brookside, Copthorne	Support	Approved
DM/16/1192	17 Bricklands, Crawley Down	Noted	Approved
DM/16/1452	Glenwood, Cuttinglye Lane, Crawley Down	Support	Approved

- It was noted that DM/16/0644 was approved by Mid Sussex District Council (MDSDC), without any contact from the Planning Officer.
- It was **agreed** that Cllr Gibson would write to MSDC, to remind them to consult with Worth Parish Council, to discuss conflicting issues, before approving applications.

Reference	Address	Appeal Decision
AP/16/0011	Development Site to rear of Tiltwood House, Gage Close, Crawley Down	Allowed

It was noted that WPC objected to the application, as layout includes a central store which looks certain to become a separate dwelling. Refusal was for design – MSDC had already approved a revised design.

35. Highways Issues

A Cllr reported that the road signs in the Parish, were dirty, or obscured by overgrown foliage and that the condition of roads within the parish, is deteriorating.

- a. It was agreed that the Clerk would write to Richard Speller of West Sussex County Council, to notify him of the condition of the road signs.
- b. It was agreed to find out the results of the previous letter sent to Richard Speller, by the Clerk.

36. Progress on Neighbourhood Plans

- a. Copthorne
 - i. A Cllr noted that the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan was entering its final draft.
- b. Crawley Down
 - i. It was noted that there was a meeting in Crawley Down, on June 16th, to inform Members of the Public of call-ins.
 - ii. It was noted that Worth Parish Council had received advice from legal counsel. It was agreed to instruct the solicitor to issue a *Statement of Case*.
 - iii. It was noted that a *planning consultant*, may be needed.
- c. A Cllr noted that Parish Councils had been invited to submit two members for a briefing on the *Mid Sussex District Plan*, on July 8th.

12 PLANNING APPLICATIONS LISTED

It was **resolved** that the observations contained in the attached to be conveyed to the District Council.

<p><u>DM/16/1546</u></p> <p><u>9 Burleigh Way, Crawley Down, RH10 4UA</u></p> <p>Two storey side extension. Revised site plan received on the 20.05.2016</p>	<p>SUPPORT - The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDHP) Area. The CDNP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. The NPPG mandates that the balancing exercise must be fully documented and available for public inspection.</p> <p>WPC are the authors of the CDNP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above without discussion with WPC.</p>
<p><u>DM/16/2272</u></p> <p><u>8 Erica Way, Copthorne, RH10 3XQ</u></p> <p>Proposed demolition of existing conservatory and erection of two storey side extension.</p>	<p>SUPPORT: The site is in the Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan (CNP) Area. The draft Plan will shortly begin its Regulation 14 consultation, so it cannot be given much weight.</p>
<p><u>DM/16/2251</u></p> <p><u>Merrow Cottage, Cuttinglye Lane, Crawley Down, RH10 4LQ</u></p> <p>Removal of existing rear and side extensions. Erection of part two storey part single storey side extension, single storey rear extension with terrace and single storey porch to front. Replace front fence with wall and gating. (Amended 7/6/16) - The description has been slightly amended to include the proposed porch and replacement wall and gates.</p>	<p>SUPPORT - The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDHP) Area. The CDNP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. The NPPG mandates that the balancing exercise must be fully documented and available for public inspection.</p> <p>WPC are the authors of the CDNP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above without discussion with WPC.</p>

<p><u>DM/16/2372 & 2377 (LBC)</u> <u>The Grange, Sandhill Lane, Crawley Down, RH10 4LB</u></p> <p>Single storey side extension containing new kitchen/breakfast room, downstairs toilet and boot room.</p>	<p>SUPPORT - The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDHP) Area. The CDNP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. The NPPG mandates that the balancing exercise must be fully documented and available for public inspection.</p> <p>WPC are the authors of the CDNP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above without discussion with WPC.</p>
<p><u>DM/16/2330</u> <u>Land South Of Hazel Close, Hazel Close, Crawley Down</u></p> <p>Outline application for the approval of Access details for the development of up to 30 dwellings, or which 30 percent will be affordable with associated landscaping and car parking.</p>	<p>STRONGLY OBJECT: The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDHP) Area. The CDNP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. The NPPG mandates that the balancing exercise must be fully documented and available for public inspection.</p> <p>The applications is contrary to CDNP policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 05 Control of New Developments (parts c, i, j, k, l, and m) 08 Prevention of Coalescence (a and c) 09 Protect and Enhance Biodiversity (parts a, b, and c) 10 Promoting Sustainable Transport (part a – access onto a cycle route) <p>WPC are the authors of the CDNP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above without discussion with WPC.</p> <p><u>PROPOSE</u> that this application is called in – <u>NOTE</u> recommendation of CDNHP Sub-Committee on 16th June.</p>

Meeting closed 19:55

Chairman: _____

Date: _____