

Worth Parish Council
Minutes of the Planning and Highways Committee Meeting
January 16th 2017 at 19:30 hrs

Present:

Cllr Gibson (Chairman)	Cllr Hitchcock
Cllr Allen	Cllr Anscomb
Cllr Blakemore	Cllr Dorey
Cllr Coote	Cllr Curzon
Cllr Field	Cllr Lord
Cllr Phillips	Cllr Scott
Cllr Webb	
Mrs J Nagy (Clerk)	4 Members of the Public

161. Public Question Time

The members of the public present did not want to address the Council

162. Apologies:

Apologies were NOTED from Cllr Cruickshank

Absent: None

163. Declaration of Pecuniary and Other Interests:

There were none at this point of the meeting.

164. Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting

It was RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meetings held on January 4th 2017 be APPROVED as a true and correct record of the meeting, after the correction in 161: Planning Applications, DM/16/5489, from "cycle lings" to "cycle links".

165. Chairman's Announcements

Cllr Gibson had no announcements

166. Correspondence

The Chairman asked Councillors if there was any item of correspondence on which they required further clarification, but there was none.

167. Update on MSDC Planning Committee meetings:

- a. District Planning Committee – next meeting: January 19th 2016 at 14:00 hrs. No items relating to Worth Parish Council on the agenda
- b. Planning Committee A – next meeting: January 26th 2016 at 19:00 hrs. No documents on the website
- c. Planning Committee B – next meeting: February 2nd 2017. No documents on the website.

168. Planning Decisions from Mid Sussex District Council:

Reference	Address	WPC	MDSC
DM/16/4260	Land Adjacent To Mardi Lake View Road, Furnace Wood	Refer to Tree Officer	Approved
DM/16/4635	19 Knowle Drive, Copthorne	Support	Refused

DM/16/4635 – the application was refused on the grounds that the proposed development is unacceptable in respect of its impact upon the character of the area.

Mid Sussex District Council

Councillors will recall that that the Clerk wrote to Development Manager Nick Rogers as to why the Parish Council was not notified when a decision was contrary to the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan. He has now responded as follows:

The role of the Parish Council on planning applications is to provide the District Council with a local view. It is a consultee only. The District Council is the Local Planning Authority and decision maker. There is no requirement for the case officer to discuss applications with the Parish Council on those occasions when differing views are held.

The views of the Parish Council are taken into account when the planning merits of applications are assessed, as are the views of individual residents. The District Council will also need to take into account the views of other consultees in the planning process such as the Highways Authority, for example, when relevant.

When the District Council reaches a different view from the consultee, the reasoning for the decision will be explained in its report. These reports are published on our online planning register when the decision is made.

Cllr Coote said that Nick Rogers is a senior officer at Mid Sussex District Council, and he is right in stating that there is no requirement for the District Council to re-consult with the Parish Council if views differ. When applications come before the District Council Committees, the District Councillor do sometimes go against their officers' recommendations.

Cllr Field suggested that when an officer's opinion differs from the Parish Council, perhaps the application should be considered at a District Council Committee meeting.

Cllr Coote said that if the Parish Council finds a potential conflict with its recommendation and the planning officer's view, then it can ask the District Councillors to ask for the application to be considered at a District Committee, rather than being decided via the delegated powers of the planning officer.

Cllr Field asked if this could happen automatically if the officer's recommendation was contrary to the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan; this has been queried, and is not possible.

Cllr Gibson suggested that the Clerk could take Mr Rogers' email to the next Cluster Group meeting for discussion. Cllr Coote questioned the reasoning behind this, saying that planning is not a democratic process, and the rules cannot be changed.

Cllr Dorey reiterated that there is the opportunity for the Parish Council and/or residents to ask District Councillors to have the application discussed at District Council Committee.

The Clerk advised that if the Council felt strongly about a particular application, then the request to have it considered a District Committee could be made at the time that the recommendation was lodged.

169. Planning Compliance Action

Wychwood Place

Parking – the developers have been informed that the car parking area needs to be removed, and enforcement action is being pursued.

The Clerk was asked to request that the background ecological evidence of harm being caused is shared with the Council.

House Numbering – the issue was raised that there is a gap in the numbering of the new dwellings, which would seem to imply that further development is planned. The Planning Department has given assurances that any new development would be determined on planning merits

Bat and Bollard lighting – the form of lighting was not specified, so the conditions are formally discharged. The developer is being asked there is any scope for them to be changed.

Hours of Work – there have been no further reports of out of hours working on the site

Councillors were asked if there were any other possible breaches to report, but there were none.

170. Appeals

AP/16/0073 (DM/15/5048) - Land parcel at Gibbshaven Farm, outline application for up to 30 dwellings

This appeal has been dismissed; the Clerk passed the Inspector's report to Cllrs Gibson and Hitchcock in case any information could be extracted for use in the up and coming Inquiry.

Cllr Gibson noted that the Inspector had noted the impact on the countryside, and perceived coalescence but lack of infrastructure such as sufficient doctors at the Health Centre had not been taken into account.

171. Progress on Neighbourhood Plans:

a. The emerging Cophthorne Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr Phillips advised that a date for the next meeting is to be agreed imminently.

b. The adopted Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan

Cllr Hitchcock advised that the Inquiry is now two weeks away. Proof of evidence has been exchanged and the Council agreed in the previous meeting that he and Cllr Gibson, together with Mr Alan Brooks would represent the Council as witnesses.

The Inquiry commences at 10am on 31st January and is scheduled to run until 3rd February, then recommence on 7th February to 10th February. It is hoped that it will finish earlier than this, however. It will be held at Mid Sussex District Council offices. It is not likely that the Inspector's recommendation to the Secretary of State will be known until April; the Secretary of State will then make his decision.

It was suggested that the Council should publicise the Inquiry via a leaflet or similar, to encourage residents to attend and support.

It was RESOLVED that the Clerk would draft an information leaflet to go to local shops and community centres, as well as on the website and notice boards, this to be approved by Cllrs Phillips, Anscomb, Gibson and Hitchcock prior to publication

172 Progress on the Mid Sussex Local Development Framework

The Clerk apologised that she had not had the opportunity to provide a briefing paper on this item.

At the initial Examination Hearing for the Local Plan, the Inspector indicated that the proposed housing numbers of 800 dwellings per annum should be increased. The District Council has reviewed the housing numbers to 850, 900 and 1000 homes. This information was being considered by the Inspector at a Hearing which took place last week.

Previously, Mid Sussex was designating strategic sites of those accommodating 500 dwellings or more, but it cannot meet increased housing targets with this designation. It is therefore revisiting the SHLAA, or Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, to review all sites which were previously considered to be less favourable based on capacity. This will impact upon several sites within Worth Parish.

Previously excluded sites will also be re-evaluated.

Cllr Dorey pointed out that Mid Sussex District Council is negotiating the housing figures with the Inspector, and no target has yet been agreed.

It was noted that once the LDF is adopted, the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan may need to be reviewed as a consequence.

173. Highways Issues:

The Clerk had nothing to report.

174. Planning Applications:

It was RESOLVED that the recommendations contained in the following to be conveyed to the District Council:

<p><u>DM/16/5554</u> <u>20 Aviary Way Crawley Down Crawley West Sussex RH10 4XR</u> Demolition of double garage serving no. 20; erection of 2 x 4 bed detached dwellings with associated parking, extension of existing drive and provision of replacement garage and parking for no. 20.</p>	<p>Object, as this is contrary to Policies C1 and C2 in the current Local Plan, and is outside the BUAB. This objection could be overcome if the development made a contribution to the Crawley Neighbourhood Plan target of one and two bedroom dwellings.</p>
<p><u>DM/16/5595</u> <u>Wakehams Green Farm Copthorne Road Copthorne RH10 3PD</u> Variation of conditions 2, 3 and 4 relating to planning application 12/01020/FUL</p>	<p>No objection, on the grounds that no construction work is commenced until the bus stop is moved.</p>
<p><u>DM/16/5620</u> <u>Tiltwood Coach House East Hophurst Lane Crawley Down RH10 4LL</u> New 3 Bedroom detached chalet bungalow with attached double garage.</p>	<p>Object as contrary to Policies C1 and C2 in the current Local Plan, contrary to Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan Policy CDNP 10 a) as concerns over shared access onto Hophurst Hill and is outside the BUAB</p>
<p><u>DM/16/5679</u> <u>Land Parcel At 530910 139253 Westway Copthorne</u> Holly, Hazel and Cherry Laurel (G1) clear all to 4m from boundary fence. One Silver Birch and one Mountain Ash (G2) fell. Silver Birch (T3) fell to ground level. Silver Birch (T6) fell to ground level. Alder (G8) fell and remove stumps. Goat Willow (T9) fell and remove stump. Poplar (T10) fell and remove stump. Prunus spp (G11) clear. Cherry Laurel (G12) fell and remove stumps. Blackthorn (G13) clear.</p>	<p>Refer to tree officer, but would raise concerns that the work would not reduce tree cover to an extent that would make the area open space</p>
<p><u>DM/16/5681</u> <u>3 Brookside Crawley Down RH10 4UU</u> Replace a conservatory at the rear of the property with a single storey extension.</p>	<p>Support</p>
<p><u>DM/17/0055</u> <u>7 The Martins Crawley Down RH10 4XU</u> Single storey rear extension.</p>	<p>Support</p>

160 Date of the next meeting

The date of the next meeting will be Monday, 6th February 2017.

Meeting closed 20.30hrs

Chairman: _____

Date: _____