



**Easebourne Parish Council
Planning Committee
Minutes of meeting held at
7.00pm on Wednesday 5th August 2026
at Easebourne CE Primary School**

Present - C Sanderson (CS) – chairman, M Noble (MN), D Pack (DP), D Kilty (DK).

In attendance – E. Tremaine (ET) – Parish Clerk

- 1. Public Question Time** – no public in attendance
- 2. Apologies and Reasons for Absence** – T Baker for personal reasons
- 3. Code of Conduct**
 - No declarations of interest
 - No dispensation requests
- 4. Minutes of Last Meeting** – the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 1st July 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed. All actions have been completed. Proposed by MN, seconded by DK.
- 5. Planning Applications**

Number	Address	Description	Comments
SDNP/25/04504 /FUL	Land South of A272 Easebourne Lane Easebourne West Sussex	Creation of car park with associated soft landscaping scheme	The PC stands by their initial comments made in December 2025 and makes no objection.
26/00894/LAPR E	Cook The Tile House Easebourne Lane Easebourne Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9AZ	New Premises Licence	Ratify objection submitted, see appendix 1. Have been invited to hearing on 20/8/26 and asked whether to uphold or withdraw objection – uphold. MN to attend.

6. SDNPA Local Plan Review

- Meeting with Clare Tester attended on 24-7-26 to discuss next steps, see notes in appendix 2.
- DK is going to contact Parish Representative at SDNPA (Andrew Shaxson) asking him to raise points in EPC's representation when the Plan comes to be reviewed by the SDNPA members – **ACTION**.
- DK to draft a lobbying letter to the other members on the SDNPA – **ACTION**.

7. Date of Next Meeting – 7.00pm Wednesday 2nd September 2026

Meeting Closed at 19.48

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Chairman

Easebourne Parish Council strongly objects to this licensing application for several reasons. Multiple concerns have been raised by Parishioners, which the Council shares.

There is no requirement for an additional alcohol or tobacco products/vapes retailer in this rural village. The M&S food store at the BP garage directly opposite sells these items and is open from 6.30am until 10pm daily. The Village Shop on Easebourne Street also sells the same items and there are several retailers a short walk away in Midhurst. The applicant has not demonstrated why additional vape, tobacco product and alcohol availability is necessary in a village that is already served by two outlets within a five minute walk and more within ten minutes.

The Parish Council believes that the four statutory objectives of the Licensing Act 2003 have not been met by this application.

- **Prevention of Crime and Disorder** – there is a limited police presence in this small rural village, the Parish Council believes that having an additional licensed premises will increase enforcement pressure (unnecessarily, as the shop is surplus to requirements) and will increase the cumulative risk of crime and disorder. These types of convenience stores are nationally known to be common targets for shoplifting, robberies and underage purchases. There are already issues with crime, with the garage opposite being targeted regularly by thieves (the most recent of these occurrences in the last month). The Licensing Act requires the applicant to demonstrate how they will reduce crime risk, which is missing from this application.
- **Public Safety** – there is no easily available parking other than within the garage opposite. On street parking is always busy, as the residents of Easebourne Lane generally do not have driveways or designated spaces. The Parish Council believes that users of this shop will park on the garage forecourt and cross over the busy road without a safe crossing point, creating a safety issue. The applicant has not demonstrated how public safety risks will be mitigated.
- **Prevention of Public Nuisance** – the addition of a third convenience retailer is likely to increase littering, loitering and noise in a densely populated residential area. The applicant has not provided sufficient controls to prevent this.
- **Protection of Children from Harm** – the cumulative availability of vapes, tobacco products and alcohol in a small village setting increases exposure to and normalising of such products for children. This shop is on a popular route for children walking to the local secondary school in the neighbouring parish and there is a primary school and playground nearby. The Licensing Act requires applicants to demonstrate robust measures to protect children from harm which are not evident in this application.

On this basis, the Parish Council strongly objects to this application and urges the District Council to reject this and any future similar applications for this unsuitable location.

Meeting with SDNPA 24-7-26 10am

SDNPA - Clare Tester & 1 x planning officer

EPC - Dan Kilty, Colin Sanderson, Mike Noble, Emma Tremaine (Clerk)

DK – strong opposition to grouping of Midhurst and Easebourne. Mistakes (putting KEV in Fernhurst rather than Easebourne). Emphasis on outcome of residents meeting – strong opposition.

CT – now looking at all representations, back to Planning Committee in Nov and full SDNPA in Dec before going forward with a list of proposed modifications. Then it will be up to the Inspectors to decide whether to take the changes forward. Minor & major changes, Inspector will mostly only look at the major changes, minor changes left to the Authority. They are putting forward as a minor modification to separate the settlements. Will then also reflect KEV.

MN – why group them together

CT – presentational

DK – argues that it is not presentational.

MN – asked how the scoring system works if they are separated

CT – scoring system done from settlement assessment. Talked about how that works. Happy to correct the exclusion of KEV. No real answer to the question.

DK – talked about possible manipulation of data by combining the Parishes.

MN – talked about how the infrastructure and movement of people between settlements has not been considered.

CT – transport study – takes KEV into account.

DK – argued that the transport study was conducted at the other end of Midhurst so does not reflect Easebourne. Also looking at how many homes based on existing development, fundamentally disproportionate.

MN – emphasised that we are still a village, connectivity between Midhurst and Easebourne is not ideal particularly by car due to the bridge.

CT – every community is coming up with similar arguments. They are under pressure from other Councils and Government to build. Unlikely to get any sites dropped.

CS – when traffic problems are examined are they taking into account EVs with additional weight, the bridge will then not be able to take weight etc.

CT – looking at how to make places easier to travel around, walking etc. Again, no real answer to the query.

DK – asked how that can be developed for Easebourne when nothing can be done about the bridge. Seems like Easebourne has been chosen as an easy target without consideration of the important infrastructure constraints.

MN – talked about how at Petersfield everyone can get in to access needs but Easebourne & Midhurst not the same.

CT – those places score higher on settlement assessments. Have to look at sites that are available. Not taken other needs into account at this stage.

MN – how does the Budgenor Lodge site score highly?

CT – that information is available in the assessment.

MN – when trying to look at numbers for a settlement why can the Pitsham Rd site not take more.

CT – that site has been limited by WSCC Highways.

CS – is the farmer considered re losing land on that site?

CT – no. That's down to landowner

CS – surely an objective of the park to sustain local farming?

CT – yes but cannot control that through the planning system.

MN – clarified published timescales.

CT – the inspector will come up with the changes they want to accept and then another consultation, then will be the final plan.

MN – so there's nothing to be done to influence. Are all these sites minor changes?

CT – yes they are considered to be minor, they won't force those changes but leave it up to the Authority.

DK – wording – 2/3 of KEV is occupied. That's not mostly

CT – disagrees that it is mostly. When looking at commitments (drs etc) they are taken into account.

MN – noted that the high-level approvals for that sort of thing are made from an office, decisions are not based on reality but paper based. Needs to be a better way to look at the data and to challenge the decisions.

CS – people label it as box ticking, SDNPA surely should be protecting the park.

DK – sum up – really good to ungroup Easebourne and Midhurst and to properly include KEV in the settlement of Easebourne. Some way to go in looking at infrastructure.

CT – Sept planning committee will be looking at infrastructure planning – keep an eye out. Looks at needs for Local Plan.

ET – how likely will development be if sites are accepted?

CT – based on previous experience with the same landowner, highly likely.

MN – when plan goes to members can they look at the concerns and say they don't want to send it on which will then go back to the drawing board?

CT – govt changing system so would need to go back to beginning under the new Government framework for local plans. Members can also ask for sites to be removed.

DK – of the 3 sites in Easebourne, they are all different. 2x green 1x brown. Could the care home site be changed if there is evidence that the site is needed for healthcare?

CT – site put forward by NHS so they see it as surplus to requirements.

CS – access for lorries etc for building would make the surgery difficult to access.

ET – has there been an assessment of need for the care home given that one closed down not that long ago due to lack of demand?

CT – need for the care home has been assessed in the policy for housing, assessed by demographic.

Meeting closed 10.50am.