

**HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE**
**Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee held on
Thursday 4th May 2023 at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.**

Present: R Shaw (Chairman), D Grossmith, M Eastwood, E Goodyear, D Jemmett and G Perry.

In Attendance: 24 Members of the Public and Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator - PA).

MINUTES

1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were none.

2. APOLOGIES

Were received from Cllr Stevens.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 20TH APRIL 2023

These were approved and the Chairman confirmed that he would sign them when he is next in the Parish Office.

4. MATTERS ARISING

The Chairman confirmed that the submission had been sent to the Planning Inspectorate in connection with the four appeals at Pear Tree Farm.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting.

OPEN FORUM

The Chairman welcomed everyone and explained that he would allow five minutes for the first speakers and invited a spokesman to begin; the first member of the public said that there had been a meeting of over 100 people on the green outside Southview Terrace of residents as well as residents from King James Lane, Nep Town Road and other local roads after details had been revealed of what was proposed for the Planning Application (DC/23/0463) most had been horrified and despaired that someone would contemplate doing this. He also said that it was not just the thought that their view would be ruined, it was that the building did not fit in with the Victorian slate rooved houses of the Terrace He also said that Southview Terrace was a focal point for a wider area within the South Downs, it would spoil the enjoyment of many people from walking around the area and was likely to decimate the local wildlife and scar the landscape. He said that the size of the building although judged to be a dwelling for a single family was as wide as ten houses on Southview Terrace and is in fact over two storeys although there were no details on the plans of the height of the building and that the proposed solar panels would need to be angled at 30 degrees He felt that the building was disproportionate to others in the surrounding area. He noted that there were already 129 submissions objecting to the building and he felt it was contrary to the HDC Planning Framework numbers 2, 3, 4, 25, 26, 32, 33 and 34. He also said that it was contrary to the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) numbers 1, 10 and 12.

A second speaker said that it was contrary to the National Planning Framework number 78 in relation to rural housing that this did not support or reflect local needs and would not create sustainable housing.

The third speaker said that if this was allowed then more houses might be developed in the south side of the village.

The fourth speaker thought that the building was right up against the Conservation area.

A fifth speaker who lives on the corner of Weavers Lane and Nep Town Road said that the refuse trucks already using these small road already cause some damage and that the lorries and trucks needed to build the house would be even larger and likely to create more damage over a sustained period. She reminded everyone of the sink hole in Weavers Lane. She thought that the building would be likely to take two years and with Cranes and diggers needing access the surrounding roads would not cope.

Another speaker asked about Henfield's current NHP, Cllr Eastwood explained that the NHP had been made and was put in place for 20 years and that if planning applications go to appeal the inspector is required to take note of the NHP but that this is slightly lessened if the NHP had been made over 2 years previously. He also said that it was used by this Committee when looking at planning applications. He also pointed out that the NHP made much of the views going into and out of the Village and particularly the vista as seen from the South Downs. Cllr Eastwood explained that HDC's Local Plan had been put on hold because of Water Neutrality which had been raised by the Government as well as Natural England. Work is ongoing to look at water reduction in house and the use of grey.

The Chairman said that there was a risk of speculative development due to the lack of a Local Plan currently and had made their views known to HDC but he felt that Henfield's NHP shows a responsible attitude to new and sustainable housing. Cllr Eastwood also said that the development of ten houses or more were considered within the NHP. The Chairman explained that the committee would discuss this application and make a recommendation which would be sent to HDC but that they would make the final decision. The members of the public were encouraged to go along to HDC when this application was being considered and give their opinions in person.

All members of the public left at 7.56pm.

The Chairman reconvened the meeting

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were none.

6. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/22/2092

Oreham Manor Farm Oreham Common Henfield West Sussex BN5 9SB

Removal of existing dwelling known as 'The Stables' and other buildings on site and erection of a replacement single storey dwelling.

Andy Barrott

This Committee could not see any changes to this Application since the last submission. There have been many applications on this site and previously HDC officers have referenced that this is over development in a rural location when considering planning Application DC/15/2389 for this site. Planning Applications DC/15/0088, DC/21/2039 and DC/20/2360 all relate to this site.

DC/23/0463

Land Southview Terrace Henfield West Sussex BN5 9ES

Erection of a detached dwelling with attached car port.

Miss S Hammond

Objection – 4 agreed. (Cllrs Eastwood and Perry declined to vote or express a view since they were standing for election as District Councillors and, if successful, may be on HDC Planning Committee). This Committee deems that this application is contrary to HDPF policies:

1 - as it is not a strategic site in the Local Plan

2 - as it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan

3 - as it is not within an existing built-up area

4 - as the site is not allocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, and does not adjoin and existing settlement edge

10 - as it does not maintain the quality and character of the area; does not contribute to diverse and sustainable farming enterprises; or promote recreation;

23 - as the site cannot be served by safe and convenient vehicular and pedestrian access;

25 - as it does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the District;

26 - as the site lies outside built-up area boundaries and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry; does not enable the extraction of minerals or disposal of waste; or provide for quiet informal recreational use or enable the sustainable development of a rural area

30 - as there will be an adverse impact to the natural beauty and public enjoyment of the landscapes of the High Weald AONB and the adjoining South Downs National Park

32 - as it does not complement the distinctive characters and heritage of the area

33 - as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings, as the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings and in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area.

This committee also feels that this site would not adhere to the notion that Henfield is Village on a Hill. It would be unsympathetic to the South Downs Nation Park views on Dark Sky. It is contrary to the principles covered in Section 78 (Rural development) of the National Planning Framework.

In Henfield's Neighbourhood plan Design Statement there is a desire to preserve the conservation area and this building is not in keeping with Victorian Slate rooved houses in the surrounding area. This Committee also wishes to note that the nearby Nep Town Road has been part of the Village since the sixteenth century.

The Committee noted that the attendance at the meeting and the number of objections made to Horsham in writing was unprecedented for an application for a single dwelling.

DC/23/0526

Jandola New Hall Lane Small Dole West Sussex BN5 9YH

Erection of an outbuilding to the rear (Retrospective).

Eddie Spencer-Smith

No Objection – 4 agreed. (Cllrs Eastwood and Perry declined to vote) Subject to it remaining ancillary to the main building, this committee notes that this site is too far from the main development to be a permitted development

DC/23/0612

Chanctonbury Wheatsheaf Road Henfield West Sussex BN5 9AT

Erection of a detached garage.

Josh Funnel

Objection – 4 agreed. (Cllrs Eastwood and Perry declined to vote) This committee deems that this application is contrary to HDPF policy 33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding buildings.

DC/23/0639

Pear Tree Farm Furners Lane Woodmancote West Sussex BN5 9HX

Erection of commercial storage building (B8 use class).

Mr S Tingey

Objection – 4 agreed. (Cllrs Eastwood and Perry declined to vote) This committee deems that this application is contrary to HDPF:

1 - as it is not a strategic site in the Local Plan;

2 - as it is not a nominated site in the Neighbourhood Plan;

3 - as it is not within an existing built-up area;

4 - as the site is not allocated in the Local Plan or Neighbourhood Plan, and does not adjoin and existing settlement edge;

19 - as it is not a proposal for park homes or caravans to meet a local housing need.

21 - as this is not a strategic allocated Gipsy and Traveller site.

22 - as it is not an existing Gipsy or Traveller site: there is no objectively assessed need; nor is it an extension to an existing site.

25 - as it does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the District.

26 - as the site lies outside built-up area boundaries and does not support the needs of agriculture or forestry; does not enable the extraction of minerals or disposal of waste; or provide for quiet informal recreational use or enable the sustainable development of a rural area.

32 - as it does not complement the distinctive characters and heritage of the area

33 - as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings, as the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings and in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area.

39 - as there is no assessment of the likely infrastructure requirement or its provision.

40 - as it does not maintain or improve the existing transport system; and there is no sustainable transport to the site.

It was noted that the application for development appeared to be justified on the basis of 'the lesser of two evils' ie storage of tyres etc in the open air versus an enormous shed that was inappropriate in a rural location.

7. APPEALS

There were none.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

- 1 HDC - Compliance Complaints Received between 17 and 23 April – This was noted.
- 2 Planters outside Greenfield House - This was noted.
- 3 Upgrade FP 2540 to RB and to add a RB - DMMO Application (CC803.15670) – It was agreed that this route should allow horses to access and should be a restricted Byway. It was confirmed at the Recreation & Open Spaces Committee Meeting that horses have been using this route since the 1970s. This Committee would ask that WSCC put in place some architectural street furniture to prevent trail bikes and motorised vehicles using this route by making it unattractive to use, whilst allowing horses free access.

ACTION POINT: PA to prepare an email for Chairman's approval to be sent to WSCC.

- 4 HDC - Monthly Planning Compliance Team statistics for April 2023 – This was noted.
- 5 CPRH Objection to DC/23/0463, Erection of a detached dwelling with attached car port, Land Southview Terrace Henfield West Sussex BN5 9ES – This was noted.

9. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

Cllr Goodyear brought to the Committee's attention that there is land for sale in West End Lane.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

7pm on 18 May 2023 in the Henfield Hall.

The meeting closed at 8.19pm.