

HASSOCKS PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Monday 12 February 2018 at 7.30pm in the Parish Centre, Adastra Park, Hassocks

Attendees: Parish Councillors: Nick Owens, Jane Baker, Leslie Campbell, Bill Hatton and Victoria Standfast

Clerk: Ian Cumberworth
1 member of the Public.

P17/139 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE. Apologies for absence were received from Cllrs Judith Foot.

P17/140 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.
Cllr Nick Owens declared a pecuniary interest in application **DM/18/0010** Land at Grid Reference 529886 115629 Hurst Road, Hassocks. Cllr Owens confirmed that when this item was to be considered he would withdraw from the meeting.

P17/141 MINUTES.

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting held on 22 January 2018 as confirmed, be signed by the Chair as a true and accurate record of the meeting.

P17/142 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.

In light of the member of public wishing to speak on the item relating to Hurst Road, Cllr Owens suggested that the order of the agenda be moved to allow item DM/18/0010 be considered first. On this basis he would withdraw from the meeting whilst Members considered the public contribution on this development, and to allow Members to consider the application itself. Members agreed. Cllr Owens left the meeting at 7.42 and Cllr Standfast as Vice Chair of the Committee assumed the role as Chair.

P17/143 Mrs Owens indicated that she was representing a number of neighbours in Hurst Road including Mr Brian Corr who had submitted a detailed representation to the Clerk in relation to the proposed development. This was confirmed by the Clerk. In summary the basis of the objection covered 7 key areas.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. Land Ownership | – failed to notify landowners as required |
| 2. Community Engagement | – misleading statements |
| 3. Access | – failure to accurately reflect the risks |
| 4. Air Quality order | – lack of consideration of impact on AQMA |
| 5. Housing Need | - failure to demonstrate need |
| 6. Hassocks services | – lack of consideration of strain of services |
| 7. Archaeological interests of the site. | – failure to fully explore the archaeological |

Further detail was provided on each area and Members were requested to consider these when considering the application. The detailed objection is produced as Appendix A.

P17/144 APPLICATIONS

DM/18/0010 Land At Grid Reference 529886 115629, Hurst Road, Hassocks Outline planning permission for residential development (25 houses) with details regarding access submitted and all other matters reserved. The Clerk confirmed a detailed objection had been received from Mr. Brian Corr which was included in the planning papers for Members consideration which had been the basis of the member of public's concerns in the public participation section of this meeting. Response: RECOMMENDED REFUSAL for the following reasons: The proposed access is a key issue and will cause a dangerous traffic hazard, the proposed development site is not in the Neighbourhood Plan and will not contribute to the 5 year land supply being sought by the District plan. There is not a Housing need, as this site is not included in the Hassocks Neighbourhood Plan, which already provides for local need and because we understand MSDC have achieved a five year housing land supply. Therefore there is no presumption in favour of development and the application has to be considered on its merits and de-merits. A development of this scale would have an adverse impact on the AQMA pollution levels at Stonepound crossroads.

Members also raised concerns with regard to whether the correct certificates had been obtained regarding land ownership and in particular to the site referred to as site 1c in the Neighbourhood Plan, which forms around one quarter of the site proposed for development in this application. HPC therefore requests MSDC to ensure that all appropriate certificates are in place for the application to be valid – which at present it appears not to be.

Cllr Owens returned to the meeting at 7.55 to resume the role as Chair

DM/18/0173 4 Bromley Close, Hassocks, BN6 8DQ. Proposed single storey side extension to replace conservatory, roof conversion to provide bedroom and en-suite with dormer to the rear and Velux window. 3 Velux windows to the front elevation. Proposed alterations to the side porch to include new pitch roof over. (Lawful Development Certificate) Response: NOTED

DM/18/0248 13 Ann Close, Hassocks, BN6 8NB Proposed single storey pitched roof rear extension with new chimney to south/east elevation. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0360 17 Adastra Avenue Hassocks West Sussex BN6 8DP Conversion of garage into hobbies room/workshop. Removal of existing flat roof and replace with new pitched roof on garage. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0336 2 Parklands Road, Hassocks, BN6 8JZ Rear extension at first floor level. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0371 42 Dale Avenue, Hassocks, BN6 8LS Loft conversion including new gable end to side, pitched roof dormers to front and rear, demolition of existing garage, and erection of new single storey rear extension. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0237 Waverley, Parklands Road, Hassocks, BN6 8JZ Hip to gable loft conversion to create two additional bedrooms with flat roof dormer to side providing second bathroom plus wrap-around conservatory to rear. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0446 Griffiths Smith Solicitors, 32 - 34 Keymer Road, Hassocks BN6 8AL Aluminium powder coated fascia signs with 1 internally LED illuminated push through acrylic letters. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

DM/18/0442 6 Bankside, Hassocks, BN6 8EL Conversion of existing garage to study and additional first floor accommodation above the garage. Removal of existing cladding to front elevation and replacement with Marley Cedral cladding, colour C10 Blue Grey. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

SDNP/17/06489/FUL Oldland Barn, Oldlands Lane, Hassocks, BN6 8ND Single storey extension to the rear. Response: RECOMMEND APPROVAL

P17/145 APPEAL NOTIFICATION. AP/18/0002 South Bank Lodge Brighton Road Hassocks West Sussex NOTED.

P17/146 DECISION NOTICES

The following APPROVALS were noted:

DM/17/4505	56 Church Mead, Hassocks, BN6 8BW
DM/17/3412	27 Hurst Road, Hassocks, BN6 9NL
DM/17/4847	7 Abbots Close, Hassocks, BN6 8PH
DM/17/4864	28 Friars Oak Road, Hassocks, BN6 8PX
DM/17/5038	8 The Close, Hassocks, BN6 8DW
DM/17/4950	8 The Willows, Hassocks, BN6 8NP
DM/17/4940	30 Clayton Avenue, Hassocks, BN6 8HD
DM/17/4939	6 Bankside, Hassocks, BN6 8EL
SDNP/17/06091/HOUS	Clayton Castle, Underhill Lane, Clayton, Hassocks, BN6 9PJ
SDNP/17/05782/FUL	Reservoir North of Whitelands, Underhill Lane, Clayton, West Sussex.

The following decision was received and noted:

SDNP/18/00280/APNB Foxhole Farm, Spring Lane, Clayton, Hassocks BN6 9PN. Proposed Grain Store. Application not required.

The following Application Withdrawal was noted:

DM/17/4823	57 The Quadrant, Hassocks BN6 8BS
------------	-----------------------------------

P17/147 URGENT MATTERS at the discretion of the Chairman for noting and/or inclusion on a future agenda. There were no urgent matters.

P17/148 **RESOLVED** that the observations on the planning issues as agreed above be submitted to the relevant Planning Authority for consideration.

P17/149 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING:** Monday 5 March 2018 at 7.30 pm

There being no other business the Chairman closed the meeting at 8.40 pm

Chairman..... Date.....

Parish Council consideration on the 15th February - Brian Corr

Objection to Outline planning permission DM/18/0010

I object on 7 grounds:

1. Land ownership - failure to notify landowners as required

The Hassocks neighbourhood plan clearly sets out areas 1b and 1c on the proposed plot for development. With 1c being identified separately as it is not owned by the person making the outline planning application. It is clear that the applicant has failed to notify all landowners as you will note from the objection on the MSDC website by Janet Sharman (Hon Secretary to the Parochial Church). I understand failure to notify all landowners makes the application invalid and it should be withdrawn.

2. Community Engagement - false and misleading statements

The statements in the community engagement document are false.

2.2. states that the only immediately affected neighbours are those to the south of the site at the top of the hill.

3.1. During December of 2017 the site owner alerted immediate neighbours to the existence of the application and that this would be lodged with the LPA in advance of the Christmas break.

4.1comments received from informally from the immediate neighbours are already addressed.

The two houses to the south of the site are numbers 4 and 6 Hurst Road. The gardens of both houses back onto the proposed development site. I live in number 6, the applicant did not make any contact. I understand from talking to neighbours at number 4, that the clarity suggested in the document of an informal but clear conversation on the plan to build 24 homes and discussion of concerns did not take place. The provision of false and/or misleading statements in an application are serious, and in my opinion, should lead to a withdrawal of the application.

The two points above point to an applicant that was hoping that the outline application would pass under the radar, whilst heads were turned towards the SaveHassocks500 campaign. This gives the impression of an applicant that is showing no regard for the impact on local residents or their concerns.

3. Access - failure to accurately reflect the risks

This is a serious concern as the outline plan proposes the introduction of an entry/exit on the brow of a hill close to a very congestion junction on an A273. I have enclosed a number of pictures of traffic on a typical day at rush hour. The reports provided focus on the level of increased traffic and past accident statistics, and some suggested improvements to make the access safe for site residents and the high volume of traffic that passes the proposed entrance everyday. I have included some pictures below to give you a clear sense of the dangers that come with the proposed access to the site.

Cars travelling northbound (from the lights down the hill) - (see 1st, 2nd photo) will potentially have cars:

- a) turning into the site - either coming southbound and turning right across their lane into the site or if heading northbound in front of them slowing down and turning left into the site.
- b) coming out of the site - either turning right into stationary traffic, (see 3rd photo) to head southbound or pulling out and turning left to head northbound, slowing traffic.

It should be noted that those leaving the site and turning right will have to navigate 2 lanes of traffic as there is a filter lane as seen in the 4th photo. The combination of increased traffic, another entry/exit point around 50 metres further down, and lack of visibility significantly increases the risk of accidents, in the most congested cross roads in the area.

The proximity of the traffic lights to the access point, makes this access point less visible to cars that pass and difficult for those leaving the site.

It is also not clear that the estimated increases in volume of traffic include:

- allowances for the increased volumes of traffic that will arise for the potential circa 30 % increase in population of Hassocks should approved (and planned) additional houses build go through.
- reliable estimates to take account of the fact that we all now receive many more deliveries (e.g. food deliveries, takeaways, internet deliveries) that we did several years ago increasing traffic.
- sufficient weight to increased number of HGV's during the period of any build, including the neighbouring Barratt's build.

Also the proposal to move the bus stop, has not been explained clearly, so the impact on local residents that use that stop cannot be assessed. Indeed the MSDC site includes objections from local residents.

It is not clear where a future bus stop could safely be put on the route, give the current one has a lay-by, as illustrated by the 2nd picture above. The planning application attempts to point to the state of disrepair of the bus stop as a reason to move it, with little consideration for current users (further objections from concerns residents on the MSDC website). To have a fully functioning bus stop all you need is a sign, and in addition this stop has an additional hut to shelter passengers from the rain or wind.

4. Air quality order - lack of consideration of impact on AQMA

The general thrust of the applicants argument for this not to pose concern, is that if the Barratt's application does not make a difference so an extra 25 will not either.

There is useful context in the 2017 MSDC Air Quality Annual Status Report (June 2017), which is relevant here:

- AQMA - an area encompassing 3 residential properties approaching stone pound cross roads. In a 5 year period, from 2012 the level has moved from 47 to 43.2 (p.g. 3) so continue to exceed the AQO. The numbers reported in the application are lower, as they are taken from the bus stop and have seen a fall from 41.9 to 36. It is notable, the other reading shared is for Hurst Pier point at 25.7. So the bus stop is far in excess of this and close to the AQO of 40.
- A number of measures have been put in place (p.g 4,5), but some have been slower to have an impact, with MSDC anticipating further additional measures not yet prescribed, will be required, in subsequent years to achieve compliance and enable the revocation of the Stonepound cross roads AQMA.
- Principal challenges include (p.g. 5) a lack of demonstrable supply of housing (see points below on failure of MSDC to feedback on the Neighbourhood plan) mean that developers rather than residents and the local authority may identify sites for new housing.

It appears that the levels currently are lower than the 40 AQO at the bus stop, albeit the AQMA still exceeds 40 after 5 years, any development that is close will have an impact on the AQMA. There are serious concerns that arise from the conclusion that there is no impact on the AQMA.

- given the cause is emission from cars, additional cars will increase the number of cars and congestion at the cross roads contributing to NO levels in the AQMA.
- declines in concentrations that are modelled in future years are optimistic, as there are known examples of vehicle engine emissions having been falsified.
- the existing range of interventions have had little impact (heavily reliant on behavioural nudges that are notoriously difficult to embed) and MSDC recognise more needs to be done, but do not appear to have any more ideas.
- we need to be careful that 40 does not become a target we are safe to aim for, the impact on health is what is important and the impact on someone with asthma or lung challenges could be material even at a lower level. At best this is a likely safe level and the Hamfields case provided evidence of the impact on health of residents that the Parish Council should consider.
- the cumulative impact of developments in Hassocks (500 Save Hassocks site + Friars Oak + the Golf course + Barratts) and significant development in the Burgess Hill Northern Arc will increase pressure on Stonepund cross roads. It will be irresponsible to consider individual developments in isolation (death by a thousand cuts), even if only known approved sites were factored in, there will be an bigger impact than modelled.

Importantly, given the above and the key challenge recognised by MSDC of developers choosing sites close to the AQMA, it would be irresponsible for MSDC to:

- a) approve a site within metres of the AQMA;
- b) support the logic if we approved Barratts we should approve this; and
- c) approve a site so close when there is no credible plan for meeting the AQMA.

5. Housing need - failure to demonstrate need

As the Parish council is all too aware the Local Neighbourhood Plan (LNP) has been sat on by MSDC for a period of 18 months or so, when they have, I understand a statutory timeframe to respond to either approve or provide feedback.

Despite this being raised by the Parish Council and Councillors there appears to have been no progress, which is a disgrace, makes a mockery of local planning and points to not responding so that they can meet wider housing targets by building in Hassocks. At the save Hassocks 500 parish public meeting I understand there was a call to progress a vote of no confidence in MSDC. Something needs to change, otherwise underhand tactics will continue like trying to sneak in the 500 homes.

The LNP, delivered a plan for circa 300 homes following a consultation with over 1,000 residents on 15 sites. This site came 12th and was not considered suitable for development. The voice of the residents has been ignored to date, whilst the LNP holds little weight until made, the voice of over 1,000 resident should count for something.

If current approved/proposed housing goes through then, the number of houses far exceeds the proposed need as assessed in the neighbourhood plan. Therefore there is no demonstrable need for this site to be developed.

A key consideration for buying a home, is school places, the family homes being proposed are unlikely to be filled with families when the situation regarding local schools is clear.

6. Hassock services - lacks consideration of strain on services

You will be well aware of the strain on existing services, I note a few here:

- School places - 2 years ago 16 families were unable to place their children in the local school. My daughter did not get place in her local school. The extensive plans for further development have not been accompanied by a credible, signed off commitment to increase school places. More children will not be able to go to their local school, this may lead to empty family houses as a key priority among families moving is school places. This could lead to further traffic congestion as children are taken to neighbouring villages.
- Doctor services - I understand the heath centre is under strain even before we have the significant approved increases.
- Sewage services - objectors on the MSDC website are highlighting existing problems with sewage overflow that will only be exacerbated by further builds.
- Train services - existing overcrowding will only increase making Hassocks a less attractive commuter town.

7. Archeological - failure to fully explore the archaeological interests of the site

The Surrey County Council Archeology response to the application concluded

- Appraisal of this proposal using the West Sussex Historic Environment Record and information provided with the application indicates a need for further information to reach an informed judgment of the impact the planning application can be anticipated to have on heritage assets of archaeological interest.