

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

**Meeting of the Plans Advisory Committee held on Thursday 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2023  
at 7:00pm in the Henfield Hall.**

**Present:** Cllrs R Shaw (Chairman), D Grossmith, E Goodyear, A May and G Perry.

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

**MINUTES**

**1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were none.

**2. APOLOGIES**

Were received from Cllr J Jones.

**3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 5<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2023**

These were approved save for one change where "Councillor May stated that she would have objected to the decision 'not to comment' on the Tanyard Barn application, had she known that she was able to do so."  
The Chairman agreed to sign and date the Minutes at the next meeting.

**4. MATTERS ARISING**

There were none.

*The Chairman adjourned the meeting*

**OPEN FORUM**

There were six members of the public present and five of those were there in relation to Planning Application DC/21/2013 - Land at 521036 117082 Parsonage Farm. They expressed concerns at the increase in number of dwellings from 205 in the original Neighbourhood Plan (NHP) to 235 now, an increase of 15%.

They also had concerns that the two and a half storey dwellings which had been proposed to be built on lower lying land in the NHP but were now proposed to be built on higher lying ground.

They had concerns about access to site and that there would be farm vehicles also using these residential roads. They lived on Deer Park and were worried that many of their roads would become busier with traffic heading to the new development and they doubted that the proposed bollards would prevent traffic driving between the two developments

They felt that there were some misleading statements suggesting that there are already two and half storey houses in Deer Park when in fact the one shown in a photo was in Borrer Drive

There were concerns about the additional sewage that would be generated and how it would be dealt with citing the problems that were caused at Sayers Common.

The Chairman confirmed that the NHP had been democratically voted and that HPC are an advisory body and that HDC do not always agree with HPC. He also said that this committee had agreed to the increase in number of dwellings to 235 in 2021 as it was felt that a higher number at this development would be offset against total development numbers.

One of the members of public said that the developers from previous developments had still not completed their obligations under the agreement. He mentioned that the additional 30 houses would equate to an additional £15,000,000 for the developer.

There were also concerns over Water Neutrality.

Cllr Goodyear confirmed that whenever a new statement comes in from a consultancy body (like WSCC who had commented on footpaths in this application), HDC have an obligation to send back to HPC whilst looking like there had been little change in the plan. The Chairman said that this should not stop HPC giving an opinion.

Cllr Goodyear confirmed that this was purely an outline plan and it was likely it would be received back again by HPC many times before work was commenced.

The members of the public had concerns about the pressures on medical centre, schools and other services in the village. The Chairman indicated that, typically, to access funding to substantially alter infrastructure and services, the increase in housing would need to be very substantial. He also said that HPC would get some funds in the form of a proportion of CIL.

Cllr May asked that if this development more matched what was agreed on NHP would members of the public be more inclined to support it? They were not able to confirm because they also felt they would want to know the style and quality of the building although they were pleased with the green spaces and they confirmed they realised that there was a need to develop this site.

Another member of the public suggested there was a mismatch between what Southern Water suggests is needed and what developers are suggesting.

Cllr Perry asked what the residents thought of the ancient woodland, the cycle track, the green space and possibility of another Common. All agreed these were positives and that anything that will reduce traffic and speed on the roads would be beneficial.

When asked about where CIL money might go Cllr Goodyear confirmed that over £1,000,000 of the CIL generated by HPC in the past had gone directly to WSCC, that potentially this could have been spent on services elsewhere in the County. Cllr Grossmith said that by agreeing the NHP meant that HPC would receive a higher percentage of the CIL money at 25%.

Responding to a question, the Chairman said that the trend for new estates seemed to be that they would be privately maintained, not adopted by HDC.

It was not yet known who the building developer might be but Cllr Goodyear said that this committee had previously made it clear to Welbeck that they should appoint/sell to a good builder who would build houses sympathetic to a village setting.

#### *The Chairman reconvened the meeting*

The Chairman said that this committee had supported the increase in numbers subject to those numbers being offset elsewhere in the NHP and in the village in 2021. He also said that two and a half storey houses should not in his view be sited near the existing housing stock but in the middle of the development and on lower lying land. Cllr Goodyear said that this committee had accepted the extra houses and thought it was likely that additional homes would be "forced" on HPC because the local plan currently being developed by HDC would have to cover the period to 2040, several years beyond Henfield's Neighbourhood Plan.

Cllr Grossmith said he was disappointed that there was so little change on this plan from Welbeck but felt that layout was sympathetic to the area and there was a sensible density of houses although he thought the two and a half storey houses had been sited inappropriately.

Cllr Goodyear said there was a need to re-iterate the need for restrictions on the roads to prevent access where it was not wanted and reminded all of the problem between Benson Road and the new development and how the bollard had been vandalised.

Cllr Perry said that this committee's concerns about sewage need to be submitted.

Cllr Perry said that the developers should be looking at innovative trends for the environment and there was full agreement that final plans, when submitted, would need to pay attention to HPC's 'Climate Change; Planning Application Acceptance Guidance'

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

There were none.

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

DC/21/2013

Land at 521036 117082 Parsonage Farm Deer Park Henfield West Sussex BN5 9QR

Outline planning application for up to 235 dwellings, including 35% affordable housing, with an improved vehicular and pedestrian access via London Road, the provision of public open space and associated infrastructure and landscaping with all matters reserved except access.

Welbeck Strategic Land II LLP

### **Objection – all agreed.**

- 1) This committee believe that Welbeck have ignored elements of the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan in the Design statement; in particular that the 2.5 storey houses are not on lower-lying ground but actually at the highest point opposite the existing housing in the Deer Park estate. As such, HPC deemed that this application was contrary to Horsham District Planning Framework:  
Policy 33.2 as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property;  
Policy 33.3 as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings.  
Policy 33.4 in that it does not respect the character of the surrounding area and buildings.**
- 2) In addition, the committee do not believe that there are sufficient barriers to prevent access from the existing estate to the new estate and that access to Parsonage Farm would be better routed through the new estate that has wider roads to accommodate tractors etc rather than through Deer Park with a permanent separation of the two estates to avoid 'cut throughs'. A moving bollard separation is deemed insufficient.**

As such, HPC deemed that this application was contrary to Horsham District Planning Framework:

**Policy 40** as it does not maintain or improve the existing transport system; nor is located in an area where there is a choice of local transport; and there is no sustainable transport to the site.

**Policy 41** as it does not demonstrate adequate safe and secure parking, and highway safety.

Since the original application was submitted, Henfield Parish Council has adopted Climate Change: Planning Application Assessment Guidance with reference to renewable energy and would wish plans to incorporate measures to adopt renewable energy, water recycling etc This committee also notes and supports West Sussex County Council's comments regarding footpaths and access to the Downs Link by cycles.

*5 members of the public left the meeting at 8.02pm*

SDNP/23/02843/HOUS

Millbrook Horn Lane Henfield West Sussex BN5 9SA

Erection of ancillary outbuilding for purposes incidental to the use and enjoyment of an existing dwelling  
Mr P McNie

**Object – all agreed – This committee deemed that this application was contrary to Horsham District Planning Framework:**

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

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

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

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

**Policy 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; and

**Policy 25** as does not protect, conserve or enhance the landscape or townscape character of the District; or as does not protect, conserve or enhance the setting of the South Downs National Park

**Policy 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

**Policy 33.2** as there is loss of amenity to the neighbouring property; or the design is not sensitive to surrounding buildings

**Policy 33.3** as the scale and massing and appearance of the proposal is out of keeping and unsympathetic with the built surroundings.

*The other member of the public left the meeting at 8.18pm*

## **7. APPEALS**

- 1 HDC – Appeals Decided 15-21.9.23 – This was noted.

## **8. CORRESPONDENCE**

- 1 HDC - Compliance Complaints Received 2-8.10.23 – This was noted.
- 2 HDC - Monthly Planning Compliance Team statistics for September 2023 – This was noted.
- 3 HDC - Local Plan Review Newsletter - October 2023 – This was noted.
- 4 Brookside Flood plain – email from resident – This was noted.
- 5 Parish Workshop – Site Assessment Workshop in November – This was noted.
- 6 Parish & Neighbourhood Council Training Slides from 19 October – This was noted.
- 7 SDNP - Local Plan Review West Sussex Parishes Workshop - 7th December – This was noted.
- 8 Request for a 5 day notice to deal with a dangerous protected Tree on Henfield Common – This was noted.
- 9 SDNP - Planning Committee Agenda 9.11.23 – This was noted.
- 10 Pump Track location – email from Cllr J Potts – This was noted.

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

Cllr Perry recently found out about Sussex Planning Network for Nature and the website is <https://sussex-planning-network-for-nature.org.uk/>

Cllr May said that she was unsure of the council's stance with developments and its engagement with HDC and Cllr Goodyear said that the Parish Council had been very active with fighting against the Mayfield Proposal. The Chairman said that Cllr Morgan had said that he would find it useful to receive details of planning applications in advance of PAC Meetings. It was agreed that PA would send him the agenda when circulating to the committee.

**10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

Thursday 16<sup>th</sup> November at 7.00pm

The meeting closed at 8.32pm.