

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

**Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee held on Thursday 18th  
November 2021 at 7:00pm in the Garden Room, Henfield Hall.**

**Present:** Cllrs N Stevens (Chairman), A Donoghue, M Eastwood, D Grossmith, E Goodyear, G Perry and J Potts.

**In Attendance:** Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator) and two members of the public.

**MINUTES**

**1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were none.

**2. APOLOGIES**

Were received from Cllr Shaw.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 4TH NOVEMBER 2021**

These were approved and signed by the Chairman.

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

Cllr Grossmith said that he had attended a training course on planning, which he had found very interesting, he agreed to circulate the slides to the members of this committee when he received them. He mentioned that biodiversity was a big topic and that developers can get Biodiversity credits.

**ACTION POINT** – Cllr Grossmith would circulate the slides from the Planning Course he had attended to Committee Members.

The Chairman said that he was increasingly worried about the Parsonage Farm development as CPRE and others had contacted him to point out that the application was not identical to the Neighbourhood Plan and he asked that DC/21/2013 could be revisited at this meeting. Cllr Donoghue and Goodyear said that members of the public needed to be given three days' notice and as this application was not on today's agenda it could not be discussed today. After some discussion the Chairman requested that it be put on the next meeting Agenda. This proposal was seconded by Cllr Grossmith.

**ACTION POINT** – The Parish Administrator would make sure that the details of DC/21/2013 – Parsonage Farm would be included in the next PAC Agenda.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting to allow the two members of the public to speak.

**OPEN FORUM**

Both members of the public were from the Campaign to preserve Rural Henfield (CPRH) and wanted to raise their concerns about the development at Parsonage Farm namely:

- They had a support base of 500 residents.
- They had put in an objection to the 235 houses suggested at Parsonage Farm proposal because they had concerns over the style of the development being a strong urban character rather than a farm yard feel.
- They felt that 205 would be the right number of dwellings on the site not the increase to 235. (HNP Policy 2.1.1)
- Accepting that this is only an outline planning application they were concerned that although the NHP had allowed for some two and a half storey homes on the lower lying ground of the site, the developers were looking at putting these on some of the higher ground and that it would make a considerable impact upon surrounding homes. (HNP Policy 2.1.1c)
- They felt that the developers looked to be taking away open space to make room for bigger houses.
- They were also concerned about precedents set for other proposals - Lovells (Wantley field), Backsettown, Taylor Wimpey which may be for 800 houses and 50 houses behind Hollands Lane industrial estate.
- They wanted to make sure that any developments allowed align with the NHP.

- They felt that it was important as a social policy to get it right and not undermine what Henfield was trying to achieve.
- They said that CPRH would be very happy to assist HPC and would be happy with increased numbers as long as the developers meet all the criteria.

Cllr Eastwood said that the NHP had been arrived at after much discussion. Various site combinations were considered. The NHP Steering Committee had stuck with four sites and 205 homes at Parsonage despite Enplan our professional advisers stating that 255 dwellings could be built on Parsonage site and that this and the Wantley site could deliver the required 370 homes from two sites. When we met with them the Land Agents for Parsonage said it could deliver 270 homes but submitted an outline application for 235 homes. Therefore we shouldn't be surprised that slightly higher numbers were being submitted. We should also remember that an additional 100 homes would be needed in the future as part of Horsham's Local Plan and we may be able to reduce the number of additional sites if these 30 homes are added at Parsonage.

One of the CPRH Members said that getting the balance right between the houses needed and preserving the village character are important. He also said that with the Natural England situation and levelling up agenda the Government may change their plans and the additional 100 homes might not be required.

The Chairman reiterate that the PAC would look at DC/21/2013 again at next meeting and that he would also contact Norman Kwan at HDC to check on the impact of this application on the status of our NHP; and also to find out what "wiggle room" we had in assessing the application. He did not think that another judicial review would be in the interests of the village.

Members of public left the meeting at 7.28pm.

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

There were none.

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

DC/21/1140

Hascombe Farm Horn Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9SA  
Erection of a two-storey detached office building (Use Class E).  
Mr Ralph Gilbert

**Objection – All agreed.** This committee deems it important that all applications for this site DC/21/0917, DC/21/0938 and DC/21/1707 should be linked and viewed as a whole. This committee also deems it is contrary to HDPF Policies:

- Policy 26.3 as the site does not provide for quiet informal recreational use.
- Policy, 33.2 as there is unacceptable harm to the amenity of occupiers/users of nearby property and land.
- Policy 29.2 as the proposal is not appropriate in scale and level of equestrian use; nor is it in keeping with its location and surroundings adjacent to the South Downs National Park, or its relationship to existing buildings.
- Policy 24.1 as it does not address the issues of land contamination.  
This committee is aware that Woodmancote Parish Council have objected to this application on the grounds of over development of the site; and light pollution as the site is close to the South Downs National Park.

Cllr Perry left the meeting at 7.30pm.

DC/21/1489

Angela Cheung Ltd Unit 9 Henfield Business Park Shoreham Road Henfield West Sussex BN5 9SL  
Change of use from business and general industrial (Use Class B2) to a gym (Use Class E).  
Aaron Le-Flay.

**No Objection – All Agreed.**

DC/21/2473

Red Oaks The Hooks Henfield West Sussex BN5 9UY  
Surgery to x1 Lucombe Oak  
Andrew Cheek

**No objection – All Agreed.** Subject to the tree officer's approval.

**7. APPEALS**

There were none.

**8. CORRESPONDENCE**

1. HDC - Compliance Complaints 8-14.11.21 circulated 15.11.21 This was noted.

**9. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS**

Cllr Eastwood said that he was concerned in regard to an email that the Chairman had sent on 17th November, detailing his concerns about the Parsonage Farm, and the Wantley Site and the fact that the Chairman had suggested that the Councilors on the Plans Advisory Committee had got it wrong. This email had also been copied to a member of the public who represents 500 people as part of CPRH and that the two CPRH representatives were here tonight.

The Chairman said that we have to be open.

Cllr Eastwood said that his concern is that that was all done outside of PAC. The email was openly critical of fellow Councilors who have made decisions that are properly documented and have voted on.

There is Corporate responsibility to back up those decisions even if we don't personally agree with them. We can come back and revisit them and we do that as part of PAC, not with an email outside this meeting. Cllr Eastwood was very annoyed that this had happened.

The Chairman stated he always acted openly on this and if PAC disagreed, the action is take it to the Standards Officer at Horsham.

Cllr Eastwood said that he was trying to have the discussion before the matter went that far.

Cllr Donoghue and Cllr Goodyear challenged the Chairman's stance and Cllr Donoghue pointed out that the Chairman had been acting as a Councillor and using a Council email address to express a personal opinion.

Cllr Eastwood said that the Chairman needed to respect the Councillors in this room who vote and make decisions based on the evidence before them and act in a mature way. He asked that the Chairman apologise to Councillors and retract the incorrect items in the email because they have gone out to the public domain.

The Chairman refused

Cllr Donoghue agreed with the issue being raised and asked again if the Chairman was willing to retract it and apologise.

The Chairman refused and said that he had acted openly at all times.

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

7pm on 2nd December 2021 in the Henfield Hall.

The Meeting closed at 7.45pm.