Easebourne Parish Council
Planning Committee
Minutes of meeting held at
7.00pm on Wednesday 4th November 2026
at Easebourne CE Primary School

Present - D Kilty (DK) – chairman, M Noble (MN), T Baker (TB).

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

1. **Public Question Time –** Nicole Reid in attendance from Working Together For Easebourne (WT4E).
    - NR stated that North Mill Bridge has been struck again. There was a short discussion about suggesting a different solution to try and prevent more repairs and traffic consequences as a result.
    - Noted email from Tom to South Downs National Park Authority regarding the Local Plan Review, specifically the transport/highways issues but also addresses grouping.
2. **Apologies and Reasons for Absence –** J Green & D Pack for personal reasons.
3. **Code of Conduct**
    - Declarations of interest – TB to SDNP/26/03407/HOUS – neighbouring property.
    - No dispensation requests
4. **Minutes of Last Meeting –** the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 7th October 2026 were agreed as a correct record and signed. Proposed by MN, seconded by TB.
    - ET to write to SDNPA for clarification around the separation of Midhurst & Easebourne and the process for speaking at the hearing – complete, to be discussed under item 6.
5. **Planning Applications**

Number	**Address**	**Description**	**Comments**
SDNP/26/03407 /HOUS	The Willows 17 Vanzell Road Easebourne West Sussex GU29 9BA	Proposed rear first floor extension over existing kitchen.	The PC is resolved to make no objection, but draws attention to the recommendations made regarding wildlife by Liz Annalls.
SDNP/26/04097 /TPO	Lower House Dodsley Grove Easebourne West Sussex GU29 9BE	Crown reduce by up to 2.5m (to previous pruning points) and remove epicormic growth from stem on 1 no Beech tree (T6), subject to 78/00406/TPO.	The PC is resolved to make no objection.

6. **SDNPA Local Plan**
    - DK updated the meeting on progress.

- Email was sent to Claire Tester on 25th October (see appendix). Response received on 2nd November directing to papers for planning meeting. Addressed concerns about coupling but not infrastructure. It was noted that Easebourne will no longer be represented with Midhurst as a primary settlement.
- There is an error in the infrastructure report, all three Easebourne sites are represented as within Midhurst. There are also issues around the minimisation of the cumulative impact on the local area, even after correcting the population figures that were inaccurately represented. EPC are thinking of a complaint which ET has drafted. The view has been taken that when all of the issues are combined this goes further than simple errors or oversights. **It was resolved that DK and ET will work on the complaint letter and send the final draft – ACTION**.
- CDALC meeting last week where DK raised that EPC & local residents are dissatisfied with the treatment of the Parish in the Local Plan Review, it was confirmed that issues raised around Easebourne have been discussed at a Members workshop. NR has requested the details of this from SDNPA, awaiting reply.
- WT4E are putting together a briefing for members ahead of the meeting on the 12th. Aiming to send that the week before the meeting.
- SDA24 – NR stated that Hazelwood Grove access belongs to the housing association (Home Group) and has not been granted and they have no intention of selling the land to enable. NR following this up to confirm. WT4E believe this makes deliverability and access at this site now highly questionable.

7. **Date of Next Meeting –** 7.00pm Tuesday 8th December 2026

Meeting Closed at 19.39

Signed: _____ Date: _____
Chairman

Appendix

Good afternoon Claire,

I hope this email finds you well.

I am writing on behalf of the Planning Committee of Easebourne Parish Council to follow up on the meeting held on 24th July regarding the proposed Local Plan.

At that meeting, the members of the Committee outlined concerns about the soundness of the proposed Local Plan, in particular:

· The grouping of Easebourne with Midhurst without any consultation

· The failure to include the King Edward VII estate or the properties being built there, leading to subsequent errors in population numbers

· The Council's objection to all three sites in Easebourne

You agreed to ungroup the settlements and properly include the KEVII Estate in the plan and that these would be fully reflected in the modifications to the plan.

Since then, the Parish Council understands from a local resident group that they have already been provided with sight of the proposed modifications due to be considered by the SDNPA on 12th November and, if approved, subsequently submitted to the Inspector. As a stakeholder, the Parish Council requests access to these documents as soon as possible.

The Committee expects the proposed modifications to remove **all** references to Midhurst and Easebourne as a grouped settlement, whether described as "presentational" or otherwise, so that the two Parishes are represented separately and accurately throughout the Local Plan. The Committee has been advised by the residents group that this is not be the case (with specific reference to paragraphs 5.5 and 5.47 within the Proposed Submission (Regulation 19) May 2026), which would be inconsistent with the assurances given to the members at the July meeting and would therefore be a matter of significant concern. As part of this, the infrastructure report also requires modification, as statements such as "Midhurst contains a range of employment opportunities" and "Midhurst is served well by buses" appear erroneously in the Easebourne assessment. The transport report for Easebourne should also be removed. The report, which uses the far end of Midhurst as a proxy, is inappropriate as it does not reflect the unique transport challenges that Easebourne faces, particularly the criticality and vulnerability of the North Mill Bridge.

The Committee also expects to see that the incorrect placement of the King Edward Estate, together with associated population figures, have been removed from Fernhurst and accurately attributed to Easebourne.

Secondly, as you know, the Parish Council submitted their comments at the Regulation 19 Consultation via email (which was a permitted alternative to navigating the complexities of the online portal). It has now become apparent that the automatic acknowledgement issued to portal users included instructions for registering to speak at the examination hearing. As the Parish Council's submission was sent via email, no such instructions were received. **The Parish Council wishes to attend and speak at the hearing**. Please investigate this matter as a priority and confirm the process by which the Parish Council can register to participate and speak at the examination hearing. As the Parish Council was not provided with the relevant instructions issued to those

submitting representations via the portal, it would not be reasonable or procedurally fair for participation to be restricted or refused on the basis of a deadline or other procedural requirement that it had no opportunity to meet. Treating respondents differently depending on the channel that they have used to respond would appear to be another failure in the consultation process.

Should any of the above be unclear, please do let me know. The Committee looks forward to hearing from you and would appreciate a response at the earliest opportunity.

Many thanks,

Kind regards,

Emma Tremaine
Clerk to Easebourne Parish Council
Tel: 07342 166 188
E-mail: parishclerk@easebourne.org