

Dr Chidlow, District Councillor gave Mr Ian Howard's apologies, as he was attending a meeting at the District Council. Mrs Vickers would be arriving late.

P145/01/12 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Apted said that he must declare a personal interest in DC/11/1394, the Berkeley Strategic application, as the proposed site was behind his house. He would conduct the debate, but would take no part in the debate.

Mrs Varley declared an interest in DC/11/1394, the Berkeley Strategic application, as she had signed the Keep Southwater Green petition.

P146/01/12 MINUTES

It was proposed by Mr Jackman seconded by Mr Buckley and agreed by all present that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Thursday, 8th December 2011 be accepted as a true and correct record of the meeting.

P147/01/12 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Mr Apted had no announcements.

P148/01/12 CORRESPONDENCE

The Deputy Clerk referred Councillors to the weekly memos circulated in relation to correspondence received, and asked if there was any item on which a Member required clarification, but there was none.

She advised Councillors that it had been agreed at last night's Finance & General Purposes Committee meeting to cease issuing these memos, and to supply all Councillors with the information via email only.

P149/01/12 HORSHAM DISTRICT PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Strategic Planning Advisory Group – 12th January

The Clerk is attending this meeting on behalf of the Council. However, the papers relating to this meeting have been issued.

The District Council will be consulting on possible housing figures within the district for the next twenty year period.

Under the new Localism Act, regional planning documents such as the South-East Plan will be removed, and the onus will be on local councils to determine local housing requirements.

The figures proposed by the District Council are based on a number of background studies such as the Strategic Housing Market Assessment, Local Generated Means Study and Interim Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment.

It is estimated that an average of 256 new homes are required every year to house the District's existing population as a result of people living longer and in smaller

households. However, this figure would not allow for any economic growth.

For comparison, the South-East Plan proposed 650 houses per annum, or 13,000 total for the period 2006 to 2026, and the Core Strategy 2007 proposed 622 per annum, or 10,574 total for the period 2001 to 2018.

This period is from 2011 to 2031.

The Options to be considered are as follows:

Option A

590 per annum, or 11,800 over the 20 year period.

Option B

635 per annum, or 12,700 over the 20 year period

Option C

670 per annum, or 13,400 over the 20 year period

Option D

730 + per annum or 14,600 + over the 20 year period

All of the above options imply different rates of growth which are detailed in the report.

Of the total numbers, 6,300 houses have already been identified, that is sites with planning permission, such as West of Horsham and West of Crawley. The proposed site North of Horsham for 4,500 as detailed in last week's County Times, is not included in these figures, as no decision has yet been made to include it in the Planning Framework.

The draft consultation document is to be considered at tonight's SPAG meeting, and will then for to Cabinet on 26th January. It is anticipated that the public consultation period will run from mid-February to the end of March.

Further consultations will take place throughout 2012 and 2013 on the Preferred Strategy and the Proposed Submission with the Examination in Public being Spring 2014. Should this be successful, then the document will be adopted in the Summer of 2014.

It is likely that the nine sites that have already been considered under the Interim Statement, will be considered again during this consultation period. At that time, Southwater was identified as possibly taking 2750 houses.

The Deputy Clerk reported that she had found discrepancies in the Annual Monitoring Report. She would be supplying a full report on all of these documents for Councillors, but she strongly advised that they all read the original documents.

P150/01/12 PLANNING OBLIGATIONS PANEL

Section 106 Agreements

The Clerk is still experiencing difficulties in obtaining information from the District Council in relation to where monies allocated to Southwater have been

spent.

Going by the Parish Council's records of expenditure, there are several "pots" of money still available, but according to the District Council these have been spent, without consulting with the Parish Council.

The Clerk has involved Southwater District Councillors in this issue, but may have to make a Freedom of Information request in order to ascertain where the monies have been spent.

DC/10/ 2554 – 44 dwellings at Martindale Farm

The Section 106 agreement has been signed for this application, without proper consultation with the Parish Council.

Councillors will recall that a footpath was proposed to run from the new development to the Worthing Rd, to allow pedestrian access to the nearest bus stops, which would make the site more sustainable.

The Parish Council asked that this footpath be lit with low level lighting bollards, and that the surface of the existing path be tarmaced.

However, the Section 106 agreement only states that a specification for the footpath should be agreed on or before the Occupation Date. The owner will be responsible for the ongoing maintenance of the improved path. It could be that the specification of the path falls below the expectations of the Parish Council.

DC/11/1394 – Draft Section 106 Agreement

This application to build c550 houses to the west of the Worthing Rd in Southwater is to be discussed at tonight's meeting.

The Parish Council was asked to supply details of what requirements it wished to be included in a Section 106 agreement, should the application be permitted by the District Council. This was discussed at the December Planning Committee meeting.

The Deputy Clerk asked Emma Parkes, the Planning Officer for this application, for a copy of the draft Agreement, which had been supplied by Berkeley Strategic to the District Council.

For some reason, the District Council treated this request as a Freedom of Information request, and formally refused it, stating "as the document is a draft for discussion and comment, it could be subject to a substantial amount of change, so withholding the information outweighs the public interest of disclosing the information".

It seems that the District Council is only willing to release the document once it is finalised, by which time it will be too late.

This is despite all assurances at pre-application meetings with the District Council and Keep Southwater Green, known as Reference Group meetings, that the Parish Council would be included in Section 106 agreements discussions at the outset.

One of the proposals put forward by Berkeleys is to provide a skateboard park. However, Southwater already has one of the biggest skateboard park in the south east, so this is not thought to be necessary. If the Parish Council were to be involved in Section 106 discussions, what facilities would best be provided instead of a skateboard park could be debated and agreed.

The Deputy Clerk will be writing to the District Council to protest in the strongest terms, that access has been denied to this important document, and that the District Council has reneged on a course of action previously agreed by all parties.

P151/01/12 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS & AND OTHER TREE MATTERS

Tree Survey

The Deputy Clerk reported that the second tree survey has now been received relating to “twitten” areas not included in the original survey. The work identified in this survey will now go out for tender.

P152/01/12 PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

Memorial Bench in Larkspur Way play area

This bench was requested by local residents, to commemorate the lives of two ladies in Larkspur Way who sadly died recently. The residents paid for the bench, and the Parish Council paid for its installation.

The bench is due to be delivered tomorrow, and the residents of Larkspur Way will be present when it is installed.

Leisure Centre Play Area

Mrs Flores-Moore reported that the underside of the slide at Southwater Leisure Centre has some rough edges from recent welding. The Deputy Clerk said that all play areas were checked weekly, but she would get this attended to.

P153/01/12 HIGHWAYS, DRAINAGE, STREET LIGHTING, STREET NAMES, FOOTPATHS AND RIGHTS OF WAY

Street Sign

Mr Jackman reported that the road sign at the corner of Cripplegate Lane and Cedar Drive was damaged. The Deputy Clerk will report this.

P154/01/12 NEW APPLICATIONS

DC/11/1394 – application to build c550 houses to the west of Worthing Rd, Southwater

The Deputy Clerk summarised the main changes in the plans as follows:

- The site for the school has been enlarged slightly, with some housing being removed from the southern side of the school boundary to allow for this.
- The layout of the new road coming westwards off the existing Cedar Drive roundabout has changed slightly
- Additional buffer planting included around the proposed staff car park opposite the Junior Academy.

- Proposed housing to the south-west of Great House Farm has been reduced in area, to give more space around this listed building.
- Smaller football pitches on the sports site
- Changes in landscaping around the railway bridge to retain features
- Tree locations between proposed football pitches and proposed MUGA on sports site amended
- Additional car parking for the proposed new sports pavilion on the sports site
- Vehicular access removed from overflow pond area north of Village Hall, west of Worthing Rd
- Blocks of flats changed for housing in two locations in housing area west of College Rd
- Planting buffer retained between College Rd and housing area to the west
- Amendment to layout of overflow pond area to the south of housing to west of College Rd.

The amendments in the layout of the proposed housing means that the numbers have decreased from around 550 houses to around 513 houses.

With regards to the possibility of anthrax being present on part of the site, it seems that this is not insurmountable in development terms. The Health and Safety Executive publication “Anthrax – Safe Working and the Prevention of Infection” when considering the development of contaminated land states “Appropriate soil sampling and laboratory testing may give an indication of spore population, and their distribution at a site. It is, however, better to adopt a precautionary approach..... and assume that anthrax spores are likely to be present although probably at low numbers which would not put the worked at significant risk. Appropriate assessment needs to be taken of the intended use of any site being redeveloped and any remedial action thought necessary.”

The District Council Public Health department also refers to the HSE document and recommends that a condition be imposed on any planning consent to address any contamination, which should include a preliminary risk assessment, site investigation, detailed risk assessment, remediation strategy if necessary and verification and validation of these steps once completed.

In addition, the Deputy Clerk advised Councillors that Berkeleys as an employer has a duty of care towards its employees and contractors to ensure that steps are taken to ensure that they do not come into contact with any hazardous materials whilst on site.

In general policy terms, the Deputy Clerk reminded Councillors that a recent appeal in Billingshurst for 150 dwellings south of Groomsland Drive, had been allowed on appeal, with the Inspector stating

“Although the site lies outside the defined settlement boundary of Billingshurst, and so its development would be contrary to local, regional and national policies for the protection of the countryside for its own sake, there is an overriding need for housing development in the Horsham District, and for affordable housing in particular to be constructed before the production of the revised Core Strategy which this development would meet”.

This implies that should the District Council refuse this application and it were to go to appeal, then it is likely that the Inspector will allow it.

However, an appeal has just been dismissed on Muggerridge Field behind Athelstan Way in Horsham, whereby the Inspector stated that despite the need for housing, the proposal to build 70 houses, would “be achieved by at the considerable expense of the loss of an attractive area of open countryside where the impact of the proposals would be significant”.

However, the consultation papers issued at the District Council’s SPAG meeting need to be properly assessed, together with the monitoring report which will show how many dwellings have been built in the District over the past year, against those proposed.

Mr Apted as Chairman asked Councillors if they had anything which they wished to say at this point.

At this point, the Chairman proposed the suspension of Standing Orders in order to allow members of the public to speak. This was seconded by Mr Jackman and agreed by all.

Mr Apted said that fifteen minutes was allowed for the public session, with each speaker being allowed three minutes to address the meeting. Three speakers had registered with the Council prior to the meeting, and he would take those persons first.

He would then allow questions from the floor for the remaining six minutes. Whilst he had no desire to stifle the debate, questions which were repetitive, covering issues already raised, would be disregarded, in order to allow as many views as possible to be heard.

Adrian Brown – Berkeley Strategic

Mr Brown thanked the Council for giving him the opportunity to speak at tonight’s meeting. Berkeleys remain committed to delivering a package of facilities promised at the pre-application stage. It is passionate about the project and is keen to work with the Council. This development will bring benefits to the community, bringing jobs to the area.

The proposals are now for 513 homes, including affordable homes, land for a secondary school, new facilities for the Parish Council and the Sports Club, which is a £16.1 million packages.

Berkeleys would like to involve the Parish Council in Section 106 discussions.

The revised plans have come about as Berkeleys has addressed concerns raised in the consultation process.

Berkeleys is committed to working with the community and with the Council. It aims to start the build this year, and predict it will take six years. Berkeleys will ensure that disruption from construction would be kept to a minimum.

Mr Brown asked that the Parish Council re-considers its previous objection to the

application and to support it.

Peter Kindersley – Keep Southwater Green

Keep Southwater Green request that the Parish Council stand by their objection of the 8th September, in which it considered that the application did not comply with Development Control Policies – poor Countryside Protection, loss of Landscape character, urbanisation of the village and poor housing mix – and the Core Strategy Policies – Landscape Character, not Brown Field development, and not enhancing the limited existing public transport.

Also as the Parish Council pointed out then, the Facilitating Appropriate Development Policy, put in place to address alleged housing shortfalls, specifically limits such additional developments to around 150 dwellings.

The revisions to the application in November address none of these issues, and the policies have not changed.

Mr Kindersley said that he had read somewhere that the offer of the land for a Secondary School may only be for 5 years – if not built by then it would revert – but the slow planned build out of this area and the areas West of Horsham means a new school may not be justified within that period. What is clear is that the value of the land offered will be offset against the contributions from the development, so it is not an extra benefit – it is instead of other benefits.

So there is still no obvious major benefit to the village of the development beyond those that you would have to have in any new development, and a lot of concern over increased congestion around the schools on Worthing road and rat-racing out down Bonfire Hill to escape it. Even the crossing over the A24 at Hop Oast has quietly been forgotten in the application. Replacing existing countryside with relocated and new recreational areas surrounded by housing is not a great step forward.

Mr Kindersley asked that the Parish Council continues to oppose this development.

Robert Stranks – resident of Cedar Drive

Mr Stranks said that he was speaking as a Southwater resident. He said that the District and Parish Councils had no legal basis on which to permit this application.

They must take the Development Plan into consideration, and go with it.

The decision can be distilled into its essence, which to ask what is in the Development Plan. The regional strategy is not dead.

In the Development Plan, there is no reference to this land, and Southwater is not mentioned.

Development Control is not Opportunity Knocks – it must be determined on the basis of the Plan. It is not a Dutch auction, whereby the one who gives the most in Section 106 monies wins the prize.

Questions as to whether it would be won or not on appeal are irrelevant. There is

nothing hopeless in this, and we should not surrender.

Mr Apted asked if there were any questions from the public.

Mr Paul Day from Eversfield asked Mr Brown if he would be prepared to work with the community if the application were refused by the Parish Council. Mr Brown said that he would.

Mr Peter Sheppard from Church Lane, said that the possibility of a Free School was the only benefit. The feeling of the community was overwhelming – it does not want this development.

Mrs Flores-Moore, Parish Councillor, asked what percentage of affordable housing was Berkeleys offering.

Mr Brown said that it would be more than 20% and less than 40%. The final figure would be agreed with the District Council as part of discussions in relation to the package of benefits as a whole.

Mrs Flores-Moore said that anything less than 40% was not acceptable. She would rather have 40% affordable housing than a new football pitch.

Mr Brown said that if permission was not granted, there would be no affordable housing at all. 40% affordable housing is a target, set by the District Council in 2007, and times have changed since then. The percentage is different for each site, subject to its viability.

Mr Jackman, Parish Councillor said that Mr Brown, in the article published that day in the County Times, had stated that 513 homes is modest. However, for Southwater, 513 homes is not modest, it is a large percentage increase in housing. Mr Jackman felt that this 513 was only the start of 2750 homes. Could Mr Brown give assurances that if this application was permitted, then Berkeleys would not be back in the village?

Mr Brown said that he could not say that. All housing numbers are still to be discussed at the District Council and that further housing is not inevitable in Southwater.

Mr Jackman said that the only economic benefit of the development was for Berkeley Homes. It would not bring work or jobs.

Mr Brown said that the development would stimulate the local economy and provide local hobs. It would provide business for local shopkeepers and businesses. It would bring economic development during these austere times.

A lady resident asked where the secondary school would be sited. She asked if the children would have to be housed in portacabin classrooms until the school was built.

Mr Brown replied that Berkeleys would transfer land for a secondary school. The delivery of the school itself would be carried out by the promoter of the school. It is understood that Oasis are putting in a bid for funding, by the end of February.

Berkeleys feel that it can work with Oasis in facilitating a secondary school Mr Brown identified the site as being to the northern end of the proposed development area.

The resident said that this is where it is believed that the anthrax pit is located.

Mr Brown said that he was not at liberty to say if this information was correct or not.

The resident said that she was concerned that the children would be in portacabins until the school building is completed.

Mr Brown said that the school would need committed funding before it can go ahead.

Mrs Purton from Two Mile Ash said that little had been said at tonight's meeting about anthrax, which is a life-threatening disease. The anthrax site is where children will be playing at the school. She said that she felt very strongly that it was not worth the risk.

As anthrax is not common, people visiting their doctors did not have the disease properly identified, and had died as a result.

The Deputy Clerk said that the information booklet produced by the Health & Safety Executive, "Anthrax – Safe Working and the Prevention of Infection" to which she had already referred, stated that since 1981 there have been 17 human cases of anthrax notified in the UK, and no fatalities.

Mrs Purton said that she was surprised by this information.

Standing orders were reinstated.

Mr Apted asked Councillors if they had any comment to make, but there were none.

The Deputy Clerk advised that the Committee must decide on what recommendation to make on this application.

Mr Apted and Mrs Varley took no part in the vote, as both had previously declared an interest in this application.

It was proposed by Mrs Flores-Moore, seconded by Mr Jackman and agreed by Miss Duncan, that the Parish Council would object to the application. Mr Buckley was against this motion.

The Deputy Clerk reported that the majority view was to object to the application.

She suggested that the objection should be on the following grounds:

- **There was no material change in the application which addressed the principal of development to the west of the Worthing Rd.**
- **The Parish Council objected to development west of the Worthing Rd**

as this would be contrary to General Development Control Policies, contrary to Core Strategy Policies, and contrary to the Facilitating Appropriate Development Supplementary Planning Document.

In addition, the Parish Council has continued concerns highlighted in previous meetings in relation to the following:

Section 106 Proposals

- Ongoing concerns in relation to “giving” a large area of land to the sports club, which is a private organisation
- Pre-application discussions included moving the existing foot bridge at Farthings Hill roundabout, which will be redundant, and re-siting it over the A24 at Hop Oast roundabout, to provide pedestrian and cycle access to Horsham town. However, this has been withdrawn from proposals.
- A new skateboard park is proposed, which is not needed.

Highways

- The road layout and traffic calming proposals for Worthing Rd are still not clear. Mention is made of “squares” which seem to be some sort of pavements in the road, but this has not been clarified.
- The single, narrow entrance/exit road to the housing area west of College Rd seems insufficient to allow for the amount of traffic that will be using it. This road will be the sole access to this housing area
- The entrance/exit for the sports club car park is near a bend on Church Lane, which affects the visibility
- Parking proposals around the Junior Academy are not clear.
- New bus shelters are proposed, some of which are already on order using monies from RSPCA.

Sustainability

- Southwater has no railway station, and there are existing parking issues at both Christ’s Hospital and Horsham stations
- Bus services are due to be cut in Southwater, with no services for the 98 bus after 7pm on Saturdays and none on Sundays, after 1st April 2012, and with the 86 bus being stopped completely. There are no bus services proposed to run through the new development. Some housing areas, e.g. to the far west (halfway between Worthing Rd and Marlpost Rd) and to the west of College Rd are a long way from existing bus stops, which will mean that car use is a necessity.
- The areas mentioned above are also some distance from local amenities in Lintot Square.
- The pavilion at the sports club is in the corner furthest away from Church Lane, so is a considerable distance from the nearest bus stop outside the village hall. Berkeleys argue that the pavilion can be accessed on foot/cycle via the Downslink, although this will not be lit.

This wording was agreed by Mrs Flores-Moore, Mr Jackman and Miss Duncan.

All members of the public, including District Councillors Dr Chidlow and Mrs Vickers left the meeting. Mr Brown left the meeting.

One member of the public arrived at the meeting.

Mr Apted said that there were other plans on the agenda that now needed to be considered.

Application	Applicant	Reason	Recommendation
DC/11/1394	Berkeley Strategic Land Ltd Land West of Worthing Rd Southwater	Residential development of up to 550 dwellings with associated vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access, drainage and landscape works, provision of land for a new secondary school and sport/recreation facilities (Outline)	Object as detailed above
DC/11/2605 Mr Buckley	Mr A. Emmings, 14, Woodlands Way Southwater	Garage extension to front of property	No objection
DC/11/2613 Mr D. Scozzafava	Castlewood County Primary School Castlewood Rd Southwater	Continued siting and use of temporary classroom unit	As Mr Scozzafava was not present at the meeting, the Deputy Clerk presented the proposals to the committee. No objection
DC/11/2670 Mr Apted	Mr & Mrs M. McGrath, Andrews Rd Southwater	New pitched roof over whole dwelling creating habitable space and replacement conservatory	No objection, but ask that the roofline is hipped or dropped as per the VDS
DC/11/2681 Mrs Varley	The Co-Operative Store Lintot Square, Fairbank Rd Southwater	Installation of additional plant to rear of the store in the service yard	No objection
DC/11/2698 Mrs Alway	Mr M. Warwick, Land to the side of 17, The Gables Southwater	Surgery to three oak trees	As Mrs Alway was not present at the meeting, the Deputy Clerk presented the proposals to the committee. No objection
DC/12/0002 Mrs Flores-Moore	Mr G. Snowdon, Beech House, Salisbury Rd Horsham	Permission to erect car part	No objection, but ask for that building should not be used for residential or commercial purposes.

P155/01/12 PLANNING APPEALS

The following appeal has been lodged:

Application	Applicant	Reason
DC/11/1553 & DC/11/1554	Mr R. Good, Kings Farm, Coltstaple Lane, Horsham	Demolition of existing detached annexe and construction of replacement annexe with link to house, new porch, shower room on landing at 1 st floor level and replacement of existing front door with window, original front door to be re-used in proposed porch.

The following appeal has been decided:

Application	Applicant	Reason	Decision
DC/10/2495	Thakeham Homes 27, Millfield	Demolition of existing house and erection of five dwellings	DISMISSED

P156/01/12 DISTRICT COUNCIL DECISIONS

Application	Applicant	Reason	Decision
Dc/11/1961	17, The Copse	Two-storey side extension	PERMITTED
DC/11/2174	High Winds, Reeds Lane	Freestanding garage	PERMITTED
DC/11/2258	31, Leeds Close	Two-storey and single storey extensions	PERMITTED
DC/11/2270	95, Camelot Close	Front extension to garage	PERMITTED
DC/11/2284	Land opp the Boar's Head	Erection of BT cabinet	APPROVAL NOT REQUIRED
DC/11/2303	10, Reeds Land	Orangery extension	PERMITTED

Application	Applicant	Reason	Decision
DC/11/2309	8, Cornflower Way	Two storey side extension	PERMITTED
DC/11/2376	26, The Fieldings	Surgery to one oak tree	PERMITTED
DC/11/2397	27, The Fieldings	Surgery to one oak and one maple	PERMITTED
DC/11/2398	29, The Fieldings	Fell one ah and surgery to one oak and one maple	PERMITTED
DC/11/2400	28, The Fieldings	Surgery to one oak tree	PERMITTED
DC/11/2405	10, Fletchers	Surgery to one ash tree	PERMITTED
DC/11/2411	10, Turners Close	Single storey rear extension	PERMITTED

P157/01/12 PLANNING COMPLIANCE ACTION

1, Andrews Rd, Southwater

The car part which has been erected at this site does need planning permission. The householder has been advised

Northover Fuels, Butlers Ghyll, Jackerells Lane

This company has been advertising the sale of oil from this site. Planning permission is required, and the company has been notified.

P158/01/12 DATE OF NEXT MEETING –

The date of the next meeting is Thursday, 9th February 2012

The meeting closed at 8.35pm