



Shingley Parish Council

Chair: Cllr Matthew Payne, Purveyors Farmhouse, Coolham Road, Coolham, West Sussex, RH13 8GP
Email: cllr.payne@shingleyparishcouncil.org.uk

Clerk: Mr Paul Richards, Dawtreys, Bracken Lane, Storrington, West Sussex, RH20 3HR
Tel: 07824 312070 **Email:** shingleyparishclerk@gmail.com
Website: www.shingleyparishcouncil.org.uk

The Minutes of the Planning Sub-Committee Meeting of Shingley Parish Council held on Wednesday 3rd January 2024 commencing 7.30pm. The meeting was held at the Andrew Hall, Shingley.

1. Attendance and Apologies for Absence.

Those Present: Cllr Payne (Chair), Cllr Larcombe (Vice-Chair), Cllr de Zoete, Cllr Huggett, Cllr Nunn and Cllr Wright.

Also Present: P. Richards (Clerk) - No members of the public were present.

Apologies: Apologies were accepted from Cllr Emrich, Cllr Roggendorff, Cllr Smale, Cllr Tuck and Cllr Woodage.

2. To receive any declarations of interests from members in respect to Items on the agenda – none.

3. Public Session – None

4. Planning Applications.

- **DC/23/2102 - Nightingale House, Coolham Road, Coolham** - Installation of a small scale 12 panel above ground solar PV array;

Members voted to SUPPORT, unanimously, the application.

- **DC/23/2278 - Former Arun Feedmills, Sincox Lane, Shingley** - Erection of 8no. dwellings, with associated parking, drainage, and hard and soft landscaping.

Members voted to OBJECT to the application. The proposed application conflicts with the made Shingley NHP and HDC Local Plan. It is a small-scale development, overtly domestic in nature and, as such, breaches many of the NHP policies. It conflicts specifically with 4 of the 5 Shingley NHP criteria (1) not infill or on previously developed land, (2) is an outward extension of the village outside Coolham the settlement boundary (3) doesn't deliver affordable housing and (4) contravenes the Shingley Parish Design Statement.

- Policy Ship HD1: New housing development - the development cannot be considered to meet any of the specified criteria, namely:
 1. The proposed development is for an infill gap, or on previously developed land, within the continuity of existing buildings – this criterion is not met by the application.
 2. The proposed development will not result in the outward extension of the villages or hamlets onto greenfield land – the application could create 'ribbon development' opportunities and is not in accordance with the Policy.
 3. The proposed development delivers new affordable housing – the application is aimed at the high-end, executive market and would not provide affordable housing.
 4. The proposed development reflects the scale and density of existing development in the village or hamlet where it is located - this criterion is not met by the application.
 5. The proposed development responds positively to Shingley Parish Design Guidance in Appendix 2 of the Neighbourhood Plan – the Architect has 'cherry-picked' certain elements of the Design

Statement, but the use of metal railing and excessive use of white render are among many examples of where the design conflicts with the Policy.

- Policy Ship HD2: Housing mix - the proposed development does not contribute to the rebalancing of the housing stock, with an emphasis on affordable homes, catering for families and smaller households.
- Conflict with the HDC Local Plan - The application site lies in the countryside outside of the identified built-up area of any settlement. Given this location, the application appears to be in breach of paragraph 80 of the NPPF and policies 3, 4, 25, 26, 32 & 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).
- Water Neutrality – The site is currently a derelict former feed farm, with no buildings, and no water supply, water has not been used on site for a generation or about 30 years. The applicants water neutrality statement appears to rely on the supposed future water usage of future staff that could work in commercial buildings consented under an planning application long since expired if they were ever built and those people employed, (SP/48/98) which of course is not a legitimate offsetting arrangement. For the site to be water neutral the applicant would need to provide a demonstrable offsetting arrangement against a current proven water usage of another property(s) and their proposed realistic and again demonstrable water saving measures equal or greater to than the proposed water usage of the new planned housing.
- **DC/23/2299 - Fairways, Emms Lane, Brooks Green** - Erection of a single storey side and rear extension with internal alterations.

Members voted to SUPPORT, unanimously, the application.

5. **Planning Matters** – none.
6. **Dates of next meetings** – to be advised.

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 20:05.

Signed **Chair**

Date.....