

Mr. Chapman advised that he was the Chairman of the Southwater Community Partnership which was sometimes known as Southwater Action Team, and the committee progressed actions in alignment with the Plan adopted by the Parish Council and the District Council in 2009. They had held their Annual Meeting on the 13th September and they had elected a new committee consisting of Chairman, Treasurer, Secretary; four representatives from the Parish Council had volunteered, but this was subject to being ratified. A number of other people worked with them to deliver the Plan. Mr. Chapman was once more the Chairman. They reported on the Walks Leaflet; in the early part they had delivered the Parish Design Statement which was adopted by the District Council and held the Business Show on the 18th September.

What they were looking to do going forward was to extend the number of walks being offered, undertake a hedgerow survey and 'Wheels to Work' to provide motorized transport for 16 and 17 year olds that need transport in order to get to work or to education. This was mopeds. They would also be checking whether the public were respecting the speed limits and seeing if traffic was speeding through the village and the lanes and they would participate with others in the District Partnership relating to industrial areas and retail outlets. They were also discussing how they could limit their liability as a partnership, where this leads to becoming a company limited by guarantee or changes to their Constitution, as this did work in other places. Mr. Chapman would come back to the Parish Council with recommendations in due course. They were going cautiously.

The Chairman mentioned to Mr. Chapman that there was a possibility that the Parish Council would be proposing to take action and have some type of event within the Parish to celebrate the Queen's Diamond Jubilee in 2012. He wondered whether it would be worth considering the Parish Council and the Community Partnership doing something in partnership. Something like using the Leisure Centre field and trying to have a village lunch and have roundabouts and swings for the youngsters and if a farmer would co-operate to bring hay bales in possibly and have a Barn Dance.

Mrs. Marshall showed the meeting the Queen's Diamond Jubilee Beacons information and explained that it was hoped to have 2,012 beacons being lit across the UK and around the globe on the 4th June, 2012. It was thought the Glebe Field would be a good location for this. There was also the suggestion of having a Jubilee Woods project.

Mr. Chapman stated that this topic was going to be discussed at the Horsham Rural Towns Forum next month, but he agreed that the parish should not let this event go past without doing something.

Mrs. Alway mentioned that it might be a good idea to replace the Oak that was cut down in Church Lane and this could then be called the 'Jubilee Oak'.

It was felt a bonfire had value and something should be done to bring people together. Some ideas should be put together. A Queen's Diamond Jubilee Working Party should be formed and Mrs. Varley, Mr. Mackay, Mrs. Alway and Mr. Bull volunteered. Mr. Chapman and representatives from other local organizations should be included.

Standing Orders were reinstated.

Mrs. Vickers reported that in her capacity as Chairman of Horsham District Council

she had officially opened Hatties Home Bake yesterday and wished them every success.

F68/09/11 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Dr. Chidlow, Mrs. Day, Mrs. Flores-Moore and Mr. Jackman. Mr. Ian Howard, District Councillor and Mr. Brad Watson, County Councillor also sent their apologies.

F69/09/11 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest at this point.

F70/09/11 MINUTES

It was proposed by Mr. Everard seconded by Mr. Apted and agreed by all present that the Minutes of the Full Council meeting held on Wednesday, 27th July, 2011 be accepted as a true and correct record of the meeting.

F71/09/11 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Her Majesty the Queen's Diamond Jubilee June 2011. This matter had been dealt with under Public Participation.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the memo that had been sent round from the Clerk on the subject of Data Protection and he earnestly requested everyone to read this. He pointed out that if Members took notes of the meeting, it should be borne in mind that these can be requested under Freedom of Information at a later stage. Be careful and inform yourself on this legislation.

F72/09/11 CORRESPONDENCE

National Planning Policy Framework Consultation.

Mrs. Marshall reported that the Deputy Clerk was concerned that the Parish Council had not to date made any comment on the National Planning Policy, which is currently out for consultation until 17th October.

The Government states that the purpose of the new Framework is to make the planning system less complex and more accessible and to promote sustainable growth. Comments are required on this document, especially about how it might be improved, via a multiple choice questionnaire.

Mrs. Marshall said that copies of this questionnaire are in the Councillors' packs for this evening's meeting and should the Council decide that it wished to respond, the Deputy Clerk had requested that these be completed and returned to her as soon as possible in order that she might correlate these responses and use them to return a majority view to the consultation.

The Chairman felt that this consultation was like a British Airways questionnaire that you get on long haul flights, where there are so many questions that are vague that the answers are not going to be worth the paper they are written on. He urged Members to put something together, preferably in a shorter form, perhaps half a dozen key bullet points. Mrs. Vickers stated that Horsham District Council had responded and suggested that Barbara Childs be contacted in order to obtain a copy. Members were concerned because they thought that the whole document was supposed to simplify the

system, but it appears to make it more complicated.

It was agreed in principle by all that the Parish Council should respond to the National Planning Policy Framework document, and agreed that this matter should be placed on the Planning Agenda, but if possible to produce a draft in the interim.

Remembrance Day Service 2011

The Holy Innocents Church has written with preliminary arrangements for this year's Service in November. The Deputy Clerk responded by saying that the Council was under the impression that the service would be conducted by Holy Innocents and the Methodist Church alternately, and it is thought that this year it is the Methodist Church's "turn".

Rev. Kath Jones of the Methodist Church says that although this was the intention, there is no agreement in place.

The Deputy Clerk has asked Mrs. Marshall to seek the Council's understanding of the situation.

Dr. Cash considered that this should be arranged alternately. There had been a debate as to whether this should be a civil ceremony or a religious one. The Parish Council erected the memorial and it is its duty to maintain this, but not the service. The Churches came together and said they would do it alternately. Mr. Chapman had organized the first one.

Mr. Apted Proposed; Seconded Mr. Mackay and all **AGREED** to suspend Standing Orders in order to allow Mr. Chapman to speak.

Mr. Chapman confirmed that he had organized the first Remembrance service and was involved in the physical arrangements on the day and Roger Coombes came to handle the worship side of the event. His understanding was that as the established church, Holy Innocents would lead and conduct the worship, but always invited the Methodists and United Reform to be part of it. Somebody had to take the initiative and put in controls, design the service, print leaflets and organize the marshals. His understanding was that Holy Innocents was going to organize it again this year.

Dr. Cash stated that he remembered the discussion that took place following the last event. The minutes would show that a clear and precise arrangement needed to be in place; in fact, he had offered to assist the Council in doing it so that all the churches could get together and the fighting about it would cease. There was a standard format that could be downloaded. He did not think you needed to have a first and second place, but an established service was needed at which all the faiths, and those of little faith, can take the opportunity to remember those that gave a great deal for freedom and peace. He did not think it fair to leave it to one church every year to do. Both Mr. Buckley and Mr. Apted stated that this was also their understanding.

The Chairman asked Members what they thought would be a reasonable way of going about it, providing the churches can agree. Mr. Mackay felt that the Council should ask the churches to talk to each other as this was a solemn event that deserves respect. Kath Jones had written to the Vicar, but had not had a response. Mr. Chapman stated that he would ensure that she got a response to anything that had been written to the Vicar and if this could not be found would get this re-sent.

Standing Orders were reinstated.

F73/09/11 COMMITTEES

Finance & General Purposes Committee

It was proposed by Mr. Apted seconded by Mr. Scozzafava and agreed by all, that the Minutes of the Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting, including the Confidential Minutes, held on 7th September, 2011 should be approved as a correct record.

Planning Committee

It was proposed by Mr. Buckley seconded by Mrs. Varley and agreed by all, that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 8th September, 2011 should be approved as a correct record.

F74/09/11 ACCOUNTS

Mrs. Marshall presented to Members of the Council the Financial Information contained in the Councillor Meeting pack as of 28th September, 2011.

Bank Reconciliation –28th September, 2011
Income & Expenditure – 28th September, 2011
Financial position as at 31st August, 2011

It was proposed by Mr. Bull seconded by Mr. Scozzafava and agreed by all, that the accounts were noted and they approved the current financial position of the Parish Council.

F75/09/11 PROPOSED CHANGES TO COUNCIL AGENDAS

Some Councillors have expressed the opinion that the format of Council agendas should be changed in relation to the planning section.

Previously the planning section of meetings has been brought forward to accommodate members of the public, but it is not legally correct to change the order of business once an agenda has been published. A member of the public could arrive towards the end of a meeting to hear the discussions on a particular planning application, only to find that it had been already discussed.

It has been proposed that plans are considered at the beginning of the meeting rather than at the end. This would easily be incorporated into the Planning Committee agenda, but a decision would need to be made for the format of the Full Council agenda.

There are two options –

- To have a separate planning meeting prior to the Full Council meeting, similar to having a Leisure Centre Management Committee meeting prior to a Finance & General Purpose meeting. The disadvantage of this option would be that if there were only a few applications, then there would be “spare” time before the start time of the Full Council meeting.
- To have planning applications at the beginning of the meeting. This would

mean that all Councillors, not just those on the Planning Committee would be eligible to consider plans, and give their views.

The Chairman did not think that putting the planning meeting first would work because the Chairman of that committee found it difficult to get there for 7.30 p.m., so it would be even worse if it started at 7.00 p.m.

Mr. Buckley considered that the order should be left as it is otherwise it would be almost pointless in having a Planning Committee. The Chairman said that on exceptional occasions it would be possible to alter the order of the agenda, providing this was done correctly after agenda item 6 as the Council must approve the minutes before it can go to any other business. Therefore on a special occasion the Council could reserve the right to bring one item forward for consideration.

It was proposed by Mr. Buckley seconded by Mr. Everard and agreed by all that the agendas should remain unaltered.

F76/09/11 SOUTHWATER ACTION TEAM

The report on this matter was given by Mr. Chapman under Public Participation.

F77/09/11 REPORTS BACK FROM REPRESENTATIVES ATTENDING OUTSIDE MEETINGS ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL

NALC Communities in Action Conference, 22nd September, 2011. Dr. Cash attended this Conference in London. There were presentations by John Findlay, Chief Executive of NALC, the Rt. Hon. Oliver Letwin and he was given a brochure about Affordable Rural Housing. Dr. Cash had two copies of Caring for Places of Worship and he suggested one should be kept in the main office for people to read. There had been a tremendous presentation from a farmer in Devon; this Council had been struggling with affordable housing and farming and he was a breath of fresh air. There had been many dissenters regarding building on farm land and some within the community had the view that some people did not deserve to be given the opportunity to live in the affordable housing because they did not 'come from round here' but had good local connections.

Dr. Cash recommended that this Council keep links with Mr. Ken Browes of Halberton Parish Council; he came to the city from his local town with no experience at all of the urban sprawl and he thought that they had problems. When he heard what other councillors had to say, with councillors leaving because of the feelings of constituents and unpleasant exchanges of correspondence on planning, he could not believe it. Dr. Cash thought that this gentleman was a beacon of experience when he spoke.

They had held a 'Vision Day' when they got the whole parish together and brainstormed the advantages and disadvantages that the parishioners saw and recorded them independently. You consult, but not for long, and consult with concise messages on what people were in favour of and against. Then get together with the Housing Associations and farmer with a very clear and direct aim based upon your Parish Plan. Because they did not have a very cogent and developed Design Statement, they had been writing a plan to get them where they wanted to be. Dr. Cash pointed out that this Council had a Parish Design Statement, but was not sure that it had a concept of a 'Vision Day'.

The Chairman said that the concept was forward thinking, but this Council did have the Five-Year Rolling Plan. Therefore it was embodied in that and the Community Action Plan. He felt that this Council had done this whilst considering the developments that are overshadowing it at the moment; there had been public meetings, and had experience of this type of thing. In his view and where possibly he disagreed with everyone else was that the Council did not hear from the silent majority in the village. That was possibly different in a small Devonshire village. The problem was getting people engaged at the time and obtaining their views. The Chairman would like to have a chat with this gentleman who could be contacted via NALC. Perhaps the least we can do is get copies of his agenda and minutes and see how they dealt with the issue. Mr. Browes gets congratulated by people in the street with comments like 'my son or daughter would not have a home or job, thank you and the Council for what you have done in this parish.

Dr. Cash stated that there had been so much conflict with a third of the village wanting to ostracize the new comers and to exclude them from what was going on. They had a battle, but they were not in an urban sprawl between Crawley, Horsham and Billingshurst and so on, but they had their challenges.

The Rt. Hon. Oliver Letwin had been challenged on when we would get the Localism Bill, are we going to get any money? He provided a very well prepared and precise politicians answer.

There had been a presentation on the Equality Act. It had been a very interesting and informative day. Dr. Cash had had reservations about this beforehand, but it was an opportunity and he thought that the Council would benefit greatly from the information in the pack.

Copies of all relevant papers within the pack should be circulated to Members.

Senior Persons Council. Mrs. Varley reported that she had attended a meeting of the Senior Persons Council recently, but not a great deal came out of it.

SALC Training Course. The Chairman had attended the recent course at Reigate together with other councillors, Mrs. Alway, Mr. Everard and Mrs. Varley and he felt that it had been a good day. Mr. Everard gave a brief resume on the Power of Wellbeing and the differences of this between Section 137. Trevor Leggo had emphasized the importance of having training for Clerks and Deputy Clerks and their obtaining qualifications. It was pointed out that the Clerk already had the Gloucester University Certificate in Local Policy and the Deputy Clerk was currently working on CiLCA. Mr. Everard asked whether the Council was forward planning and thinking of other members of staff over the next year or so who might like to be going through training succession. It was **AGREED** that this was something that the HR Committee should take on board.

Dr. Cash stated that he had witnessed the staff whilst doing the accounts and their competences matched and in certain areas exceeds what he had seen within the public sector.

The Power of Wellbeing would enable the Council, once it meets the necessary criteria, to raise additional money for special projects which are not within its normal mandate,

i.e., keep a village shop open, re-open the pub and things like that. This would be a cost on the Precept and Council would have to be careful as to its intentions and carry the parish with it. The Annual Report would need to include a paragraph on the Power of Wellbeing giving details of what had been done and considered during the year under this heading. It only takes ten electors to call a poll which would cost this parish £10,000 to organize and then the parish can ignore the outcome. Mr. Buckley said that this would be expensive and Mr. Apter said that this was rubbish.

There is an opportunity to raise funds by borrowing from the Public Works Loan Board where you would be looking at 15 or 20 years at a set rate, but this was relatively cheap. It was possible to borrow up to £500,000 at a fixed rate of 4½% for up to 50 years. This was for information in case there were projects that required financing.

There was a requirement that two-thirds of the Parish Council must be elected (not co-opted) in order to qualify, but 80% of councillors had to be trained.

Horsham Rural Towns Partnership. Mr. Bull attended a meeting recently, but he was disappointed that he was now probably the only parish councillor to attend. They are looking at local businesses and retailers to see what they are doing as they will be drawing up a plan in order to go forward with other projects in due course.

F78/09/11 COUNCIL PREMISES AND LAND

Mrs. Marshall reported that it had been necessary to tender for fire safety equipment during the August recess. This action had been authorised by Mr. Bull and Mr. Buckley as Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Council, together with the Clerk. The contract has been awarded to Initial Facilities-Fire as follows:

Beeson House - four visits per year for Fire Alarms and Emergency Lights @ £95.00 per visit. 27 Extinguishers (includes small consumable parts, i.e., o-rings, tamper ties, gauge patch, etc.) @ £4.50 per unit. Attendance Fee £15.00.

Southwater Leisure Centre – four visits per year for Fire Alarms and Emergency Lights @ £85.00 per visit. 28 Extinguishers (including small consumable parts, i.e., o-rings, temper ties, gauge patch, etc.) @ £4.50 per unit. Attendance Fee £15.00.

Easteds Barn – four visits per year for Fire Alarms and Emergency Lights @ £65.00 per visit. 3 Extinguishers (including small consumable parts, i.e., o-rings, temper ties, gauge patch, etc.) @ £4.50 per unit. Attendance Fee £15.00.

In addition they were asked to arrange to commission the following :-

Beeson House – 2 Kg Carbon – Kitchen area; 1.8 x 1.8 Fire Blanket; 5 Kg Carbon – Boiler Room.

Southwater Leisure Centre – 6 Ltr Pressure Foam – Tractor Store; 1.8 x 1.8 Fire Blanket.

Easteds Barn – Fire Panel.

Whatever the contract period, if after the first year it appears that the service level has not been achieved based on the quotation received, the Council would reserve the right to seek mediation and if necessary terminate this contract.

Dr. Cash stated that in order to avoid having a conflict of interest, the Clerk acted by

dis-identifying all the responses she had to the tender and put these on a spreadsheet so that he was not aware who had put in questions and also acted entirely correctly in giving information in order that he could give her advice from which she made her decision. She asked very direct questions of suppliers. You have what represents best value and good custom and practice, worked out fairly and equitably judged. This was more than adequate and the Clerk dealt with the fire risk assessment. A clause had been included that would keep the contractor on their toes.

Dr. Cash handed Mrs. Marshall a Fire Safety – The Facts – training disc for staff training.

It was proposed by Mr. Mackay seconded by Mr. Apted and agreed by all that the decision made over the August recess to award the Fire Safety Equipment for all premises to Initial Facilities-Fire be duly ratified.

F79/09/11 LEISURE CENTRE

New Gym Equipment

The new equipment is due to arrive on 26th October. The Gym will be closed from Monday, 17th October to midday on Thursday, 27th October to allow for internal building and electrical works to take place.

Some of the equipment, such as treadmills, cross trainers, exercise bikes and wave machines will be moved into the café next door during the gym closure. Steve Brew, the Leisure Centre Manager, has written to all gym customers advising them of the closure, and introducing a temporary booking system for this equipment to ensure that it is used fairly by all.

The equipment will be moved by TechnoGym technicians, with the permission of the leasing company.

The contract for the internal works has been awarded to Fowlers, at a cost of £6,785.00. Mr. Buckley advised that the Council would receive the sum of £9,500 from the lease, therefore these costs were covered. The work needed to be done.

F80/09/11 ACCOUNTS FOR PAYMENT

Mrs. Marshall referred members to the payment schedule dated 28th September, 2011 totalling £29,966.72 which would require approval and asked whether members wished to raise any questions.

It was proposed by Mr. Mackay seconded by Dr. Cash and agreed by all present that the payments schedule dated 28th September, 2011 in the sum of £29,966.72 be approved for payment.

F81/09/11 PERSONNEL **

Mrs. Marshall said that there were no matters to report.

F82/09/11 DATE OF NEXT FULL COUNCIL MEETING – Wednesday, 26th October, 2011.

This section of the meeting closed at 8.36 p.m., and those members not on the

Planning Committee left the meeting.

F83/09/11 PLANNING MATTERS

Present Were: **Mr. A. Bull**

Mrs. S. Alway **Mr. L. Apted**
 Mr. P. Buckley **Mr. D. Scozzafava**
 Mrs. B. Varley

Clerk: **Mrs. I. Marshall, with Miss R. Dickie.**

County Councillor: **Apologies**

District Councillors: **Apologies**

Members of the public: **4 Members of the Public**

Press: **Not present**

As Mrs. Day had sent her apologies for this meeting, Mr. Bull, as Vice-Chairman of the Planning Committee, took the Chair.

DC/11/0657 – Erection of 131 dwellings on land east of Turner Close and south of Millfield.

Mr. Bull said that the proposed number of dwellings on the site has been amended from 133 to 131. A parking court to the south-east of the site had been removed on police advice, which has led to a change in layout of the housing in this section, and an overall reduction in the number of car parking spaces as a result.

It is proposed that there will be 79 dwellings for private sale, and 52 affordable homes, which equates to a percentage of 39.7% affordable homes. The affordable homes range from two-bedroomed flats to four-bedroomed houses.

The density of housing is 29.4 per hectare for the 4.45 hectare site.

The pinch point just inside the junction about which the Council had concerns in the original application has been re-located to further into the development.

Will Jones, the District Council arboricultural officer, had commented on the height of the existing trees on the western boundary, some of which are 20 metres high. He is concerned that there would be requests to fell once the houses are occupied. He has objected to the amended proposals.

A draft Section 106 agreement has been drawn up, according to the formula supplied by the District Council. It is envisaged that the Parish Council will take over the play area and surrounding open space, with the remaining areas of open space, the gated area and the acoustic fence being the responsibility of a management company. The Parish Council would expect to receive a commuted sum to assist in the maintenance

of the play area in future years.

It was proposed by Mr. Scozzafava seconded by Mr. Apted and agreed by all that Standing Orders should be suspended to allow Mr. C. Rees of Savills, agent for Bovis to speak regarding this application.

Mr. Rees explained that there had been minor amendments to the original application. The original application was still submitted and these were formal amendments. There had been a reduction in the number of car parking spaces, but there were still more than two per unit.

Mr. Bull had visited the site and had looked at the trees that were close up against the boundary with Turners Close and the Council's area of green. He had not appreciated that there was going to be a footpath all the way down the back of this and there would be a buffer area for the housing and their back gardens before you get to these woods and this was going to be fenced off and gated, therefore he could not see that anyone would go in there. His main concern with this was that there was the danger that the occupiers of the houses would start tipping rubbish across the footpath and into that area and it would be a shame if that did occur, but it would not be possible to do anything about that. The trees were Oaks.

Mr. Rees stated that there were fifteen houses that back onto that tree belt and if he was going to buy a house he would make a conscious decision as to whether or not he would trust these trees which are not in the back gardens, they have no control there as this would be maintained by a management contract. Mr. Apted asked Mr. Rees what the spread was of the trees and Mr. Rees advised that the trees varied in size. Subject to Will Jones at Horsham District Council, these trees should all be protected. In terms of fencing this would give a management area that was not generally open to the public; it could have trellis fencing and people would be less likely to tip. They had thought about these issues. There had been only one objection to this application at the moment. Mr. Bull had thought that this area faced west, but in fact it was north-west therefore he did not think that the houses would lose light mid-afternoon. Mr. Apted felt that due to the spread of the trees people would want them lopped. Mr. Rees stated that the trees were far too far away for that (at least 6 or 7m away). The Council was more than happy with the RPI protection.

The general feedback had been positive and it was a mix of housing that was being promoted. There would be affordable housing and the applicant was happy that there should be a local connection clause in the S.106 agreement. There would be mixed tenure and shared equity as well to enable people to get on the housing ladder at a lower level by purchasing 50% and when they wish to move on, they sell that as a percentage and somebody else can benefit. There would be different types of tenure throughout the scheme. They were trying to move the S.106 forward and open to discussion, but would like to see the public open space transferring to the parish.

The acoustic fencing would have a maintenance clause so that the management company would be required to look after this and Environmental Health had submitted a clause about long-term maintenance. It was a case as to whether the Parish Council would want to take that on. Mr. Buckley had concerns about the management company as there was a need to make sure that they would be getting the funds in, otherwise the works might not get done. Mr. Apted stated that the Parish Council would only take it on if it received the necessary funding.

Mr. Bull asked whether once the dwellings had been purchased, would there be a covenant that meant that the residents had to contribute to the management of the fence so that it was legally binding. Mr. Rees stated that everyone would have to sign a contract that stipulated that they had to contribute.

Mr. Buckley asked who would be going to run the management company. Mr. Rees stated that they would use a professional management company and would tender for the management and the Environmental Health Officer had stipulated the critical noise attenuation measures, therefore there would be serious conditions about on-going maintenance of the fence. Those planning conditions would have to be adhered to.

Mr. Bull raised the matter of the fence that runs on the inside of the existing foliage that backs onto the by-pass and on the inside of the fence there was a 1m strip for a new sustainable drainage system that would be dry for 90% of the time. The question was asked whether 1m wide was sufficient and this would be 2.5m from the high fence so if you want to cover up that fence a 1m strip for planting is quite narrow. Mr. Rees stated that this was a point that was made previously and therefore had been included in the amendment, it had been added in.

Mr. Bull asked whether the S.106 agreement was going to be legally binding. Mr. Rees confirmed this. There would be a new hedge on Mill Straight and this would be native, possibly Hawthorn.

Mr. Bull stated that looking at the other boundary by Millfield, these houses are exposed. Mr. Rees said that the orientation of the houses were east and west with others north and south so they did not orientate the windows so that they look at each other. There will be gaps between the houses as they are to be offset. The main issue raised were the distances and how to treat the boundary. They had moved the houses away and put garages down, which moved the two-story element of the houses further away. The closest house would be 5m away and this increased to 12m. This was a residential area and therefore would expect to see housing, but you cannot hide the scheme. It was designed to limit the impact on Millfield where fencing already existed. Mr. Bull stated that mainly this was a picket fence. Mr. Rees stated that they had been asked to introduce a new native hedge, so they would look at the height of the trees interspersed. The trees would be under the control of the management company, but some sections of the hedge would be the responsibility of residents. Mr. Bull asked if some of the hedge was under the control of individual properties, could they take it out? Mr. Rees said that it was not in their interest to do so. It was very difficult to plan for all possibilities. Mr. Bull pointed out that the existing houses were going to lose their view across a lovely field and beyond the by-pass.

Mrs. Varley stated that the gardens at one end were quite short and at the end of one resident's garden there would be the new brick wall of a new dwelling. Mr. Rees stated that this part of the site had been subject to most changes and they had tried to change this around in order to limit the impact. Mr. Bull said that on H.D.C's website there had been 36 objections in July and 26 since August of a similar vein to that point of view. Mr. Rees stated that 90% the comments were from Millfield, there had been very little from elsewhere in the village, but they had had a good attendance at the exhibition last year.

Mr. Bull reminded the meeting that the last time the Parish Council considered this it

had not objected but suggested a number of amendments, but these had now been taken into account. In his view he did not think that the Council had any alternative other than to recommend the planning application. This was not one of the reserve areas contained within the Horsham Core Strategy. Southwater was ham-strung over the whole application as a result. Had the Council have objected, it would have been passed on appeal, which was the problem we had. The County Times described a recent case as “it would not appeal against it because it was indefensible”. Mr. Rees stated that Horsham had been proactive as they were lacking in the housing side and had produced a list of criteria and if land complied being adjacent to development area, 40% affordable housing. This application complies with that Council document. This was a short-term measure introduced by the District Council. A resident asked with a criteria based approach, presumably that would be approved. Mr. Bull stated that he was being devil’s advocate when he said that. He thought it would be approved by H.D.C., but he could not speak for them. The resident stated that it was his understanding that the Parish Council could only take advice on these matters from your own officers; therefore your officers had given you that advice? This was confirmed.

Mr. Apted proposed Mr. Buckley seconded the Standing Orders be reinstated.

Mrs. Varley felt that the access was very near to the roundabout. Mr. Bull had looked at that and in fairness, if you stand on the site, it is misleading from that point of view, you think it is half way along, but it is about a third of the way along so there was a reasonable gap between coming off the A.24 roundabout. It is not too close. The main concern was that for people living there, the access to the village; basically everyone will have to come out this way as there was no access through Turners Close.

Mr. Bull asked Members whether they were happy to approve this application now that the amendments had been made in full. **Vote: 5 in Favour; 1 Against.**

Mr. Bull asked Mr. Rees when they were expecting to start building. Mr. Rees replied that they were hoping H.D.C., would consider this application in November, it would take approximately 4 months to ensure the conditions were discharged and then there would be an eighteen-month building programme. The works around the site had been undertaken at the instructions of the ecologist to prevent species coming on site.

Mr. Rees was thanked for attending this meeting. He left the meeting at 9.10 p.m.

Mr. Apted proposed Mr. Buckley seconded the Standing Orders be reinstated.

Application Number	Applicant	Reason	Recommendation
DC/11/0657 <i>AMENDED PLAN</i> Mrs Day	Bovis Homes, Land to the east of Turners Close and south of Millfield, Southwater	Erection of 131 residential dwellings with associated access parking, landscaping infrastructure	There was no objection.
DC/11/1756 Mrs Alway	Mr M. Austin, 18, Little Bridges Close Southwater	Surgery to one ash tree	There was no objection.
DC/11/1794 Mrs Varley	Mrs A. Marchant, 2, Beechwood, Southwater	Conversion of garage	Objection as to build over the garage would completely overshadow No. 4 Beechwood and alter the street scene and would be over intensification of the site.
DC/11/1800	Mr N. Blanch, Roundstone Caravan Park,	Surgery to ten oak trees	No objection to surgery to T9 and T10, T6, T7 and T8, require

Mrs Alway	Worthing Rd Southwater		trimming around power lines only. Object to surgery to T1, T2, T3, T4 and T5.
DC/11/1803 Mr Buckley	Mrs Dowling, Wisteria Cottage, The Fieldings, Southwater	New dormer window extension	There was no objection.
DC/11/1869 Mr Jackman	Mr S. Ross-Fry, 18, Andrews Rd, Southwater	First floor side extension with bedroom and en-suite	Objection. The land registration plan supplied did not show the development to the allotments known as Tree Tops. No. 1 is directly next door and set back behind the building line of 18 Andrews, but increasing the first floor brickwork and pulling the roof across by approximately 7ft would be too stark and enclose the street scene.
DC/11/1881 Mr Apted	Mr J. Mercerox, Ryelands Farm Bonfire Hill, Southwater	Attic conversion alteration and new external decking to exterior	No decision – leave to H.D.C.
DC/11/1888 Mrs Alway	Mr N. Meyer, 45, Woodlands Way, Southwater	Fell one oak tree	Strong Objection – the tree being requested to be felled was an Oak whereas the report as to what was causing the problem stated a ‘Lime’, but there was not a Lime tree on site. The Oak was 15m away from the house. Felt subsidence would have been caused by the clay soil.
DC/11/1891 Mr Bull	Mr Tyerman, 4, Porchester Close Southwater	Ground floor rear extension	There was no objection.
DC/11/1899 Mr Scozzafava	Mr L. Waters, 98, Bluecoat Pond, Christ’s Hospital	Erection of a conservatory	There was no objection.

The Chairman proposed a vote of thanks to the acting Clerk and Projectionist for their services this evening.

The meeting closed at 9.43 p.m.