



## **HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

### **Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee on Thursday 19th February 2026 at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.**

**Present:** Cllrs R Shaw, (Chairman), M Andrews, F Ayres, M Chandler, E Goodyear, D Grossmith and J Jones.

**In Attendance:** Eighteen members of public and Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator – PA).

#### **MINUTES**

**1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were none.

**2. APOLOGIES**

There were none.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD 5<sup>th</sup> FEBRUARY 2025**

These were approved. They were signed and dated by the Chairman.

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

There were none.

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting.*

#### **OPEN FORUM**

All members of the public said they were attending in relation to Planning Application DC/26/0006.

The concerns raised were:-

- The Planning application was not following what was agreed by Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) which was agreed democratically and specified up to 10 houses, single storey, and ideal for elderly, those downsizing and those with limited mobility
- Concerns over access to the new development for construction traffic as well as residents once complete
- Concerns over parking on the development
- Daisycroft is a private road, maintained by residents' association and bowls club, none of whom feel they were consulted by developer. The Daisycroft has not been adopted by HDC and so residents pay for lighting and repairs
- The other development being proposed nearby also has Furners Mead as access route, this road suffers from parking and has pinch points making passing problematic.
- Concerns over the size of the dwellings; single storey buildings had been anticipated so that views from Henfield Common and Daisycroft would be maintained
- It was felt that the Reed Bed near Henfield Common was an iconic view and would be harmed by the height of this development.
- Concerns over sewage as the plan indicates that this would be directly into the Daisycroft sewer. Also concern for the houses in Henfield Common North with run-off water as it is down hill towards houses that already have a flooding problem.
- There are two mature oak trees on site with TPOs in place and there were concerns over how these would be protected
- The entry point narrows to 3 metres and this would cause problems for emergency service vehicles and refuse lorries
- Bowls club only has 3 visitor parking spaces and there were concerns that these would be insufficient.
- Concerns over safety with vehicles on narrow roads and children or elderly walking on footpaths
- The houses being considered were family homes not retirement homes
- Daisycroft was built in 1985, and the road is a blocked paving, which is unlikely to cope with increased traffic, especially heavy construction traffic.

Cllr Perry said that this application would not be heard at HDC Planning committee until all reports have been received. The Chairman said that Henfield Parish Council were statutory consultee as were WSCC and Highways agency and the fire brigade and Southern Water. Cllr Goodyear recommended that any comments on access should be submitted to WSCC as well as HDC

The Chairman added that the Council's priority was to make sure that the NHP is delivered as agreed for up to 10 single storey homes but as specified in the Plan and that the plans for this development were quite different to what had been envisaged and voted upon.

Cllr Grossmith said that he felt it was over-massing, would add to the problems of access, because of an increase in cars. Cllr Goodyear said she was very surprised that the landowners or developers had not spoken with Council before submitting this application. She added that it does not meet NHP requirements and is not designed for older people. She added that sites over 0.5 hectares (which this was) have to have 35% affordable housing and there was none. She also said that the site only allows for 8 bins when there would be at least 9 properties and that the collection point would be quite a distance from some houses so recycling would not be easy for residents. The Chairman said that it was important for the Residents Association to submit comments as well as individuals. He added that additional traffic during the building stage would need to be managed as well. He also noted that the HDC conservation officer raised no objection to this development although there were concerns over the style of roof.

*The Chairman reconvened the meeting.*

*All the members of the public left the meeting at 7.50pm.*

## **5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were none.

## **6. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

DC/26/0006

Land South Of the Bowling Green the Daisycroft Henfield West Sussex BN5 9RN

Erection of 9no. detached dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, hardstanding, access and associated works.

Mr Chris Maunders

**Objection – all agreed.**

**This committee deems that this development does not accord with the policies as detailed in Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) :**

**Policy 2.4**

**a The design for the proposal demonstrates an understanding of the elements which contribute to the character of the landscape and these inform the design and layout of the site. Any proposal should be of an appropriate scale and massing in keeping with the character of the surroundings.**

**b. The proposal preserves or enhances the historic significance of the setting of the Henfield Conservation Area, in particular the proposal must preserve the nearby listed building and its setting. This will include a green buffer zone in the south west part of the site.**

**c. The proposal comprises single storey dwellings suitable for older and downsizing households to meet local need.**

**d. The proposal takes account of the amenities of adjoining residential properties.**

**e. The proposal takes account of visibility and key views, in particular provides mitigation against its visibility from the south**

**f. The proposal maintains and enhances the site's rural character, retaining existing field boundaries where appropriate and enhancing with native species.**

**g. A full ecological and biodiversity assessment should be submitted as part of the application. Any reasonable mitigation proposed by the assessments must be implemented in full.**

**h. Vehicular access into the site is provided from Furners Mead and in a way which does not have an unacceptable impact on the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent residential properties.**

**This committee deems that this application is contrary to the following policies in HD planning Framework:-**

- **1 as it does not accord with the policies of the NHP**
- **10 as it does not demonstrate that car parking requirements can be accommodated within the immediate surroundings of the buildings**
- **16 as it does not provide 35% of dwellings to be affordable, which is required of sites providing 15 or more dwellings, or on sites over 0.5 hectares**
- **23 as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular access**
- **32 as it does not complement locally distinctive characters and heritage of the district and does not contribute a sense of place both in the buildings and spaces themselves and in the way they integrate with their surroundings**
- **33.3 as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings. The proposal consists in reality of 3 x 3 bed properties and 6 x substantial 4 bed properties. Of the 9 properties only 2 are single storey**
- **35.5 as it does not include measures which reduce the amount of biodegradable waste sent to landfill. This proposal by design is inaccessible for refuse lorries. Therefore, residents will be moving up to 4 recycling bins over up to 100 metres on a weekly basis. The consequence will be less willingness to recycle**

**Based on typical municipal guidelines and health and safety standards, residents should not have to push or pull their recycling bin for more than 15 to 25 metres (approximately 50 to 80**

**feet) to their storage point to the edge of the public highway or designated collection point. The ideal location is that bins should be placed at the edge of the property, right where it meets the public pavement or road.**

## **7. APPEALS**

HDC - Notification of planning appeal - DC/24/1932 – comments by 9<sup>th</sup> March – likely date of hearing 28<sup>th</sup> April – It was agreed that representation would be made and that appropriate statement would be prepared.

**ACTION POINT: The Chairman would liaise with PA over wording and ensure that HDC were notified of speaker details.**

## **8. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

Henfield Neighbourhood Plan Review 2026 – progress and renewed clarity – The Chairman said that if everyone was happy with the latest update, he would circulate to all councillors before next full council meeting and if agreed he would send to the senior Planning Officer at HDC whose input had already been valuable. He added that he felt the review may need to go to an examiner but not a referendum. This was agreed by all.

Cllr Goodyear said that once the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published she felt that greater importance would be from that rather than NHP.

**ACTION POINT: The Chairman would circulate to all councillors and ask to add to the next full council meeting agenda.**

## **9. CORRESPONDENCE**

- 1 HDC website - planned maintenance – 15<sup>th</sup> February – This was noted.
- 2 HDC - new draft NPPF National Planning Policy Framework from Cllr Perry – This was noted.
- 3 Meeting Place - Taylor Wimpey Presentation – This was noted.
- 4 HDC - Planning committee - DC/21/2013 (Land at 521036 117082, Parsonage Farm) – This was noted.
- 5 HDC - TPO/1585 - Broomfield Road – This was noted.
- 6 Further details of Local plan - email from Cllr Goodyear – This was noted.
- 7 WSCC/00426 – Further details on transportation - Cemex – email from Cllr Noel – Cllr Goodyear said that many residents are concerned about the volume of traffic that this will generate, likely to be 27 lorries a day (54 Journeys) coming from the south for the next seven years – It was agreed that Chairman would draft a response to WSCC to support the principle of greater coverage of the landfill but would raise concerns about travel to the site through Henfield and restricting times when the lorries would travel.

**ACTION POINT: The Chairman would prepare a response for WSCC, and it would be sent from the Clerk.**

- 8 HDC -NPPF Consultation – This was noted.
- 9 HDC - Council announce re-opening of Local Plan examination – This was noted.
- 10 HDC - Unlocking local assets: strategy and process training for 2026/27 – This was noted.
- 11 DC/23/0189 Sandgate Nursery, Henfield – letter from CPRH - This was noted.
- 12 Notes on Land South of Bowling Club ( LSBC) Planning application – from resident – This was noted.
- 13 Planning application DC/26/0006 - from resident – This was noted.

## **10. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS**

There were none.

## **11. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> March 2026.

The meeting closed at 8.17pm.