

Easebourne Parish Council

Planning Committee

Draft Minutes of Meeting held at 7.30pm on Monday 10th July 2017 at the Refectory (behind St Mary's Church).

Present: T Baker (TB), H Grantham (HG), A Keeling (AK), D King (DK)

In attendance: S Hurr (Clerk) (SH), S Lloyd (Parish Councillor attending as a resident), D Pack (Parish Councillor attending as a resident) and 24 members of the public

To Note: Agenda taken out of order to accommodate an increased Public Question Time.

1 Apologies and Reasons for Absence: Apologies from J Hines due to a prior engagement.

2 Code of Conduct:

- a. Declarations of interest on items included on the agenda: TB declared an interest in planning application SDNP/17/02051/HOUS as the applicant is a personal acquaintance.
- b. Dispensation requests: None received

3 Minutes of last meeting: The minutes of the meeting on 12th June, 2017 were proposed as a correct record of the meeting as proposed by HG, seconded by AK, agreed by all present and signed by the Chairman.

4 Matters arising not already covered by the Agenda: None

5 Public Question Time: Summaries of questions, comments and responses regarding the Cowdray Estate Pre-applications for the three sites -

| | |
|------------------------------|--|
| Question/Comment Response | With the twenty potential houses for Egmont Road, how many have to be for the local community? SDNPA require 50% of building allocated for social housing of which 75% has be retained for rent and not sold. |
| Question/Comment Response | We have the King Edward VII development. The King Edward VII development is outside the settlement, so does not count regarding allocations in Easebourne. |
| Question/Comment Response | Who is really the 'Planning' Authority SDNPA or Chichester District Council (CDC), submissions and issues seem to be passed back and forth? Allocations are decided by SDNPA. SDNPA delegate to CDC as required. SDNPA confirmed it would anticipate dealing with any of the applications brought forward |
| Question/Comment Response | Could we ask again? Yes. |
| Question/Comment Response | What is the criteria for major development? In excess of ten or more buildings. These three separate sites are looked at as a major development. |
| Question/Comment Response | Would the three sites be looked at together? Cowdray Estate wants to treat the three sites as one, SDNPA see them as separate and the Parish Council also want them to be viewed as three separate sites. |
| Question/Comment Response | What is the view of the Parish Council? We need to decide based on residents' views, but the Parish Council have previously stated that greenfield sites should not be built on. SDNPA had advised Cowdray Estate not to submit pre-applications, before housing allocations had been approved. We have met with Cowdray Estate and have been directed to the consultation. |
| Question/Comment Response | The Egmont Road site would require access through Conifers School car park, Conifers should move to the old school site, then the Conifers School site could be built on. This has been raised. |

| | |
|------------------|--|
| Question/Comment | We live in Easebourne Street and there are issues with no paths, poor lighting and current traffic is too fast. We have a mix of families and older people which is good but health and safety needs should be paramount. Access to houses by emergency services is now often difficult or not impossible. One plan had included private drives directly onto Easebourne Street, we have asked about these drives but just been told they will be sufficient for the size of the properties, but people will just park on Easebourne Street. |
| Response | The school site should be excluded from potential development. |
| Question/Comment | Would the old school site have to have a 'change of use' from a school to housing? |
| Response | A request for development would include 'change of use'. |
| Question/Comment | SDNPA talked about two houses onto street, SDNPA suggested a space in the middle as a viewing corridor, new plans do not show this. Cowdray Estate will say whatever and agree to whatever regarding traffic. The traffic assessment by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) does not raise any fundamental objections to the Estate's proposals. |
| Response | Highways consultants were present at the consultation and spoke about highways issues and said they would be dealt with as part of consultations. The chair of the PC highways committee attended the consultation |
| Question/Comment | Cowdray events block up the roads, plus tractors and trailers need access. This is a rural community, therefore it would be thought that SDNPA would value green space, but we are now doubting this. |
| Question/Comment | Larch Pond in the old school site is there to prevent flooding, what will happen with this? |
| Response | Officials say there is not a flooding issue. |
| Question/Comment | The old school site boundary on the plan does not seem to relate to anything, did the old school acquire extra land? |
| Question/Comment | You can see where the boundaries are from WSCC information, which is not as large. |
| Question/Comment | For the Egmont Road proposals, car parking is not going to be sufficient. |
| Response | This was raised at the consultation, SDNPA do not have a specific policy regarding number of associated car parking spaces. |
| Question/Comment | Could there be a one way system of 'in and out'? |
| Response | This will be raised. |
| Question/Comment | Where will the water come from for these houses, there are no reservoirs for serving the community? |
| Response | We will raise the 'bigger picture'. |
| Question/Comment | Midhurst and Easebourne cannot take additional traffic. |
| Question/Comment | What will be the role of Easebourne Parish Council? |
| Response | This is to be discussed. |
| Question/Comment | For Egmont Road, twenty houses seems excessive, could there be less? |
| Response | In 2015, 14 houses were talked about |
| Question/Comment | There will be infrastructure problems, with GP's and parking. |
| Question/Comment | How big are the houses in Egmont Road supposed to be? How high? How many windows and where will they face? |
| Response | This is at first stage, more details will have to be added. SDNPA are not keen on flats. The Egmont plan seems to include flats and two/three bedroomed houses. |
| Question/Comment | Will they be kept for local people or end up for people from London? |
| Question/Comment | Will our queries go to the source? |
| Response | We have received a very detailed letter from a resident which has been widely circulated and we are also speaking to our District Councillor who is also speaking to SDNPA. There is some frustration from |

SDNPA, particularly with these pre-applications and they won't accept three sites as one, because then you can share out requirements, and focus some on one site.

Question/Comment Response Are there other major applications, is this new?
King Edward VII broke new ground. There is a site which has been mentioned in Lewes, which we could look at. We do feel like we are playing catch-up. We are trying to deal with unpublished plans. A recent Midhurst application was turned down. SDNPA consider this a race to get to the finish. For Cowdray Estate it makes commercial sense to maximise opportunities but there is no sense that 'strings are being pulled'.

Question/Comment Response Regarding the Works Yard, what are the commercial uses?
An artisan bakery is being considered, and the Estate Office would be moved. We did ask but any further plans are yet to be confirmed.

Summing up of the discussion and further Comments from the Chairman:

At the open day held by Cowdray Estate, the consultants did not seem sufficiently prepared to respond to questions and would not do so on the day and stated would only respond to written questions however, there was no confidence that they would respond.

Regarding Conifers playing fields, it would be better if there was one scheme for the works site and playing fields, but this has not been put forward, Conifers could then move to Easebourne Street.

People should respond if they want to.

The Cowdray Estate plan consultations with the Parish Council have been non-existent.

With regard to the three sites, the Works Yard is most suitable site for development but thought needs to be given to the issue of traffic.

Easebourne Street should be objected to, as it is a greenfield site. If a school is required it should be retained as a school. There should be no boundary creep and no change of use.

Egmont Road is too dense, there are too many parking issues and houses would be too close to listed buildings, and the school would be less viable with access through the car park which would also be inappropriate.

At the present time, infrastructure issues would not be the appropriate matter to respond with.

With regard to the Cowdray Estate 'consultation', there has been a general lack of consultation, so we are now in a hiatus, the Estate are cherry-picking the old local plan, sites must be looked at separately, the proposals to date do not support mixed housing and the Estate have not engaged with the Parish Council. There are access issues, highway issues and issue around the supply of services and with listed buildings.

The Chairman explained that members of the public were welcome to remain for discussion regarding other planning applications or leave as they wish. All members of the public then left the meeting.

6 Planning Applications:

SDNP/17/02764/HOUS

Lansdown House, Vanzell Road, Easebourne

Single storey rear and side extension, change use of loft space to habitable accommodation and replacement garage.

On a proposal by the Chairman of the committee it was RESOLVED and agreed to make no objection.

SDNP/17/02648/PA16

Transmitting Station, Highstead Lane, Bexley Hill, Lodsworth

Proposed telecommunications installation upgrade and associated works.

On a proposal by the Chairman of the committee it was RESOLVED and agreed to make no objection.

7 External Correspondence: None

8 Date of Next meeting to be arranged as required by the submissions of planning applications

Meeting closed at 8.45pm

Signed by Committee Chairman:..... **Date:**.....
Holly Grantham