Easebourne Parish Council
Planning Committee
Minutes of meeting held at
7.30pm on Wednesday 7th October 2026
at Easebourne CE Primary School

Present - D Kilty (DK) - chairman, M Noble (MN), D Pack (DP), T Baker (TB), J Green (JG)

In attendance – E. Tremaine (ET) – Parish Clerk, Francis Hobbs (FH, CDC Councillor), Andy Tate (AT), Peter Moss (PM) & Nicole Reid (NR)

1. **Introduction of New Chairman & Changes to Committee Members –** DK announced the appointment of himself as the new Chair and thanked the outgoing Chair – Colin – for all of his work over the years. He also introduced JG as a new committee member.
2. **Public Question Time**

   AT, PM & NR raised the subject of the SDNPA Local Plan Review.

   - DK went over the process so far and outlined the issues. Currently stage of SDNPA Proposed Local Plan – post Regulation 19 Consultation. The PC have met with Clare Tester (CT) at SDNPA who has agreed to uncouple Easebourne and Midhurst.
   - AT – has been working with NR at the head of Working Together For Easebourne (WT4E) – circa 220 local residents. They have been in correspondence with CT but were not satisfied with the responses received, so escalated to the Leadership Team at SDNPA, response was received from Tim Slaney and a reply was sent. They expect this to be their final escalation correspondence.
   - Main themes –
     i. challenging the evidence base for the decisions made and challenging the issues within the second consultation – cumulative growth
     ii. specifically opposing SDA24 (on the grounds that they believe it is not justified by the evidence & leaves a gateway for a case for further development)
     iii. the grouping of Midhurst & Easebourne. The separation of the settlements in the modifications proposed does not entirely remove the primary settlement grouping and the rest is not proposed to be modified.
     iv. SDNPA agreed to another modification to correct omission of KEV to bring it from Fernhurst to Easebourne (NR stated that CT had told them that this would make no difference in terms of cumulative effect).
     v. Proposed modifications to SDA24 include developing a safeguard to prevent future access to the adjacent site (this safeguard was already present in the version of the plan consulted at Regulation 18 Consultation and weakened at Regulation 19, will be returned closer to the original. NR – even if that safeguard is in place, the access is not that limited as it can be accessed elsewhere.) Also have mentioned Hazelwood Close and maintaining their parking, however the main issue is not the parking spaces but the traffic.

- DK asked what their next steps would be – they intend to draw out a final response from Tim Slaney as there were omissions in his previous reply (NR re-iterated that they have requested that SDNPA provide evidence to prove their judgements, as they continue to say they "believe" it is correct and making reference to the assessments they have done which WT4E think are not satisfactory). Have also asked for all their correspondence to be placed before the inspector.
- WT4E are asking Statutory Consultees whether they are willing to work with them as the objections have similar themes.
- WT4E will attend the next SDNPA meeting (12th November 2026) where they will ask to speak as the plan is to be approved there. They will present a document to members to draw their attention to the questions that should be asked to the authority during this process.
- FH – wanted to confirm that the PC is on board with him opposing the development. DK answered that as an elected representative FH should do as he deems appropriate.
- FH suggests questioning the scoring mechanism the SDNPA have used when approving the sites. He has written to John Cross as CDC representative at the SDNPA to encourage him to question whether all procedures have been correctly followed as the Authority could face judicial review if they have not and that is followed up. He thinks that lobbying members directly could be judged incorrectly and would be better focussing on process. He suggests asking CDC to apply pressure to ensure procedures have all been followed exactly (however notes that there is a confilict of interests as CC are looking to develop more homes inside the Park) and to look more deeply at the separation of the settlements.
- NR - When the next consultation begins they will assess what they are going to do when they see how the representations are presented.
- NR asked if EPC are liaising with MTC as both objections are similar but DK stated that it is important for each body to focus on representing their own Parish.
- FH commented that in his opinion the SDNPA should be speaking more with Parishes regarding their plans.
- AT asked what the next steps are for the PC. DK noted progress from the meeting with CT and acknowledged that there are questions to be asked about the separation of the settlements – ET will draft a letter to CT to ask for specifics about the separation as this overall seems to remain (NR specified paragraphs 5.5 & 5.47).
- AT re-iterated that there are 2 aspects regarding the grouping – is the grouping right and that this was not consulted upon (which WT4E believes is procedurally non-compliant). SDNPA have repeatedly stated that it is a presentational grouping and do not view 5.5 & 5.47 as a grouping in the same way.

3. **Apologies and Reasons for Absence –** C Sanderson for personal reasons
4. **Code of Conduct**
    - No declarations of interest
    - No dispensation requests
5. **Minutes of Last Meeting –** the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 1st September 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed. All actions have been completed. Proposed by, MN seconded by TB.
    - DK to contact Andrew Shaxson – actions from this meeting will now supersede this action.

- DK to draft letter to SDNPA members – as above.
- Street naming - ET will respond with suggestions of associated public figures as suggested – complete.
- Tile House application – the work was done before the planning permission was granted, has been reported and awaiting further correspondence.

6. Planning Applications

Number	Address	Description	Comments
SDNP/26/03420 /TCA *For ratification only, comments already submitted to adhere to deadline.*	Sycamore House Easebourne Lane Easebourne West Sussex GU29 9BN	Notification of intention to crown reduce by up to 3m (all round) on 1 no. Ash tree.	The Parish Council is resolved to raise no objection.
SDNP/26/03425 /TCA *For ratification only, comments already submitted to adhere to deadline.*	Sycamore House Easebourne Lane Easebourne West Sussex GU29 9BN	Notification of intention to fell 1 no. Sycamore tree (T1).	The Parish Council is resolved to make no objection.

7. SDNPA Local Plan Review

- As above, ET will write to CT seeking further clarity around the separation of M&E & requesting to see the proposed modifications. Will also indicate that EPC wish to be heard at the hearing as we did not receive a notification.
- NR asked who will be attending the SDNPA planning meeting on 12th November, DK confirmed that there will be representation from EPC at the meeting. All representations will be available to view a week before.
- JG asked who WT4E are and who they represent, NR replied that they represent 218 members in the local community and are essentially a residents group who have been very active around planning matters.

8. Date of Next Meeting – 7.00pm Wednesday 4th November 2026

Meeting Closed at 20.14

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Chairman