

**Notes on the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee of the Worth Parish Council on
12th September 2016 at 19:30 hours**

Present: Cllr. Hitchcock (Chairman)
Cllr. Gibson
Cllr. Field
Mr Alan Brooks

Peter Carr (Acting Clerk)

Suspension of Standing Orders:

Eight members of the public were present at the meeting.

Mr. Mike Adams of 17 The Martins (Neighbourhood Watch) spoke regarding his concerns over the land between his house address that under the current situation would not be developed, although it backs onto where possible development is proposed. His view was the area in general already had more development than was fair, required infrastructure was lacking and further development was not required.

Peter Young of Aviary Way spoke regarding his concerns over more development stating that it was not justified and would also adversely affect Aviary Way

David Streeter of Aviary Way stated the village should not be exposed to further housing development, and if it was the term 'village' would be a wrong description for Crawley Down. The proposal was contrary to the Vision of the Neighbourhood Plan

The remaining members of the public did not speak.

Meeting formally opened at 19:35

Apologies:

Cllr. Scott
Cllr. Lord

Declarations of Disclosable Pecuniary and Other Interests:

None

To discuss opportunities for developing the land in accordance with the Objectives and Policies of the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan.

Chairman's Introduction.

The Chairman initially thanked Mrs Fiona Hayes-Vincent for attending the meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Committee, giving a detailed description of the position with regards to the development of land to the East of the Martins and at HopHurst Hill, about 3.3 Hectares in all.

The Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan notes that there should be no more than 30 units in any one development at a density not exceeding 25 dpHa.

The land parcel to be discussed had not been offered during the formal call for sites and only consisted of the southern half of the entire site listed in the SHLAA as available for development (April 2016). The site bordered Ancient Woodland and was adjacent to the pond – an SSCI.

The Chairman gave an explanation of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, a study to inform future planning policy development. It helps to monitor land availability and provides the evidence base to support the delivery of sufficient land for housing development. The SHLAA also informs planning decisions regarding the suitability of the land for any application.

Noting that this was a very early conversation and the first of a kind, the Chairman then invited Mrs Fiona Hayes-Vincent to speak.

Mrs Fiona Hayes - Vincent's reason for requesting this meeting.

Mrs Fiona Hayes-Vincent thanked the committee members for letting her speak and explained there had been considerable interest in recent years by developers in acquiring her land for housing development.. Over the past two years 8 developers had expressed an interest in

developing. Most had promised an appeal if permission were to be refused initially. A smaller developer had very recently suggested a sustainable proposal.

She thanked the committee for the explanation regarding SHLAA and stated that the site had been put forward by a developer, not by her.

Mrs Hayes - Vincent stated that she had concerns over the likely effects of development, and although she could see the financial benefit for herself did not wish this to be to the detriment of those already living at Crawley Down. Her object of this meeting was to establish the following:

- 1) What would be acceptable to the local community, and
- 2) What is needed by the local community, particularly with regard to?
 - i) infrastructure,
 - ii) Environment, and
 - iii) Ecology.

What is acceptable housing development in relation to local housing needs?

Mrs Fiona Hayes-Vincent was thanked for attending the meeting, and complimented for taking the trouble to investigate the position with regard to the effects of land development on the local community at Crawley Down.

Reference was initially made to the Crawley down Neighbourhood Plan 2014. The results of the housing survey that had formed part of the plan highlighted a number of points:

- a) That existing older residents wished to downsize but also wished to remain in the village
- b) The requirement for starter homes - the survey revealed a need for houses by the young.
- c) Social housing is well provided for in Crawley Down. We do not understand the logic of relocating people to social housing in a village where there are few opportunities for employment.

What is needed by the local community with regard to infrastructure, environment and ecology?

a) There are serious concerns as to the ability of local services to cope with existing demand for sewerage disposal, electricity and water supply, let alone from further housing development. The demand on local schools and GP surgeries to meet current requirements is such that pressure on education and health resources is unsustainable without increased funding, for example GP surgeries are now closing their lists to new patients and WSCC Infrastructure have identified a major shortfall in school places for the entire East Grinstead area inside the next two years. These are unresolved issues which need to be addressed.

b) Section 106 contributions/ Community Infrastructure Levy known as CIL – money is provided by developers as a contribution towards infrastructure improvements. These do not address the existing underlying problems associated with expanding communities.

c) The Woodland Trust and Natural England recommend there should be buffer zones around Ancient Woodland of a minimum of 15 metres with variations upwards on 15 metres depending on the individual woodland circumstances. MSDC are applying a blanket 15 metres which can potentially cause damage to these woodlands, an irreplaceable resource

d) Concern over the Planning Process. It has been increasingly evident that developers submit an Outline Planning Proposal, which is approved with conditions on which WPC are not consulted. The conditions are then met by the developer by submitting information to allow a condition to be removed by MSDC. WPC have no say in whether this information meets the NP requirements. Planning decisions regarding made NP's rest entirely with the local planning authority. WPC has no say and no right of appeal. Grampian conditions are often used to circumvent the practical consideration of inadequate infrastructure.

Chairman's summary

a) Applications need to take into account the requirements of those who wish to down size and remain residents.

- b) Applications need to take into account those young single and family members of the community who wish to remain in the community and own or share own property.
- c) Infrastructure must be properly addressed at the application stage.
- d) Full Planning Applications are the only type of application that can allow WPC to measure the compliance of an application against the NP and comment accordingly.

The Chairman thanked all for attending.

Meeting closed at 8.42pm.