MINUTES OF THE EXTRAORDINARY MEETING OF ASHURST PARISH COUNCIL, HELD AT ASHURST VILLAGE HALL ON THURSDAY 9th MARCH 2017 AT 7.00PM

ATTENDANCE: Cllr Hedley (Chairman), Cllrs Fischel, Nicholson, Jesse and Russell. In attendance the Clerk – Elizabeth Leggo

1. Apologies for Absence.

Apologies were received from Cllrs Hammond and Knight.

2. Declaration of Members Interest. Cllr Russell declared an interest regarding planning application DC/17/0261.

Cllr Russell left the meeting.

3. Planning matters

DC/17/0261 - Demolition of existing detached garage, proposed two storey side extension and internal alterations at Otters, Church Lane, Ashurst. Otters, Church Lane, Ashurst, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3AR.

Cllrs asked the Clerk to submit the following comments to Horsham District Council:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for - Design

- comment: Loss of General Amenity
 - Overdevelopment
 - Privacy Light and Noise
- **Comments:** Ashurst Parish Council believe this application to be overdevelopment for the size of site. The Council feels that the design of the extension, having a flat roof terrace with doors onto it, will impact on the privacy of the neighbours. They also view this as loss of general amenity having an overbearing impact on the neighbours with the proposed extension being very close to their boundary.

The Council would also like it noted that this would be a modern building in close proximity to a grade 1 listed building (St James Church), and grade 2 listed buildings - The Old House and Oakford.

Cllr Russell returned to the meeting.

4. Late planning applications

DC/17/0479

Demolition of existing single storey dwelling and erection of a replacement two storey dwelling. Cedar Cottage, Steyning Road, Ashurst, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3AN

Cllrs asked the Clerk to submit the following comments to Horsham District Council:

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Overdevelopment

Comments: Ashurst Parish Council do not believe that there is a significant change since application no DC/16/2551. Therefore the same comments apply as for this application - that the proposed plans represent overdevelopment and loss of a small dwelling in Ashurst.

5. Draft minerals plan

Cllr Russell made some amendments to the comments of Ashurst Parish Council to the West Sussex Draft Minerals Plan. See **appendix 1**. The Clerk was asked to submit these comments on behalf of the Council.

6. Grants

The Council reviewed the application by the Kent, Surrey and Sussex Air Ambulance for a grant from the Parish Council. It was RESOLVED that the Council would award a £100 grant to the charity because cllrs felt that this is a good cause and are aware that the air ambulance has been called to Ashurst on occasions in the past.

7. This item was taken in Closed Session as it concerned the Clerk's

salary. Those present other than Parish Councillors were asked to leave the meeting. It was RESOLVED by the Council to increase the Clerk's pay by 1% per year in line with NALC guidelines for annual pay increase.

The Chairman closed the meeting at 7.35pm

Signed Chairman

Dated

Appendix 1:

Response of Ashurst Parish Council to the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan.

It is our opinion that the Joint Minerals Local Plan is unsound in the respect of the inclusion of Ham farm site because it has failed to give due consideration to the following:

- Landscape and cumulative effect: Ham Farm lies adjacent to the SDNP and is highly visible from Chanctonbury Hill and the South Downs Way. There would be cumulative visual impact with Rock Common; this was considered as grounds for rejection of the proposed Buncton Manor Farm site. (Photographic evidence submitted by Steyning Parish Council)
- 2. Nature Conservation and biodiversity: the site is adjacent to Ancient Woodland which has been identified as potentially suffering moderate harm. There is also a risk to the Alderwood Pond site including migrating trout, Crested Newts and bats, all protected species.
- **3.** Historic Environment: there are several nearby Listed Buildings and it is a site of archaeological interest with Palaeolithic and Roman remains.
- **4.** Water Environment: 50% of the site has been identified as at high risk of flooding, yet no hydrology survey has been conducted. There is potential for significant impact on Alderwood Pond site and impact to the water table and surrounding agricultural land.
- **5.** Air Quality: it is likely that increased HGV traffic and dust generated from the site will have an adverse effect on air quality, impacting on the Nursery School at Chanctonfold and on the Steyning Grammar School playing fields, both in close proximity.
- **6.** Soil Quality: the site currently contains grade 2 and 3 soils, the best and most versatile agricultural land which will be permanently lost.
- **7.** Public rights of way: views from the existing public rights of way would be negatively impacted.
- 8. Transport and access: in our opinion the WSCC Transport Assessment does not give an accurate representation of the current high volume of daytime traffic using the A283 and the high number of accidents, with consequent road closures and diversions via single track roads through Ashurst. Additionally, the loss of maize production on the site would result in additional traffic needed to supply the anaerobic digester at Wappingthorn farm, access via the B2135 on a dangerous corner. This would have specific road safety impact on Ashurst and Steyning residents. The proposed site access on the A283 would greatly impact on road safety.
- 9. Amenity: WSCC has acknowledged that a number of residential properties are located in close proximity to the site and residents will be subject to high levels of harm. This was not however taken into consideration in the summary and outcome. There is no acknowledgement of the businesses that will also be impacted.
- 10 The Site area has been altered without RAG evaluation and without consulting Wiston parish

in to which it now extends.

Overall the WSCC RAG evaluation identifies a high number of Red and Amber concerns for which no mitigation is identified. We therefore believe that the conclusion drawn should be that the site is unacceptable, in line with other similar sites.