



Midhurst Town Council

A Meeting of the Planning and Infrastructure Committee took place on Monday 11th April 2022 at 7.00pm at The Old Library, Knockhundred Row, Midhurst.

MINUTES

Present: Cllr D. Coote, Cllr G. McAra, Cllr C. Lintott, Cllr G. Upjohn and Cllr D. Fraser

Officer: Julian Quail, Assistant Town Clerk

Also: Sharon Hurr, Clerk and RFO

P/069/22 - Apologies for Absence – Cllr J. Sutton and Cllr R. Watts.

P/070/22 - Declarations of Interest

None

P/071/22 - To approve Minutes of Meeting Held on 28th March 2022

These were agreed as a true record of the meeting held on 28th March 2022.

Proposed Cllr Lintott, seconded Cllr Fraser, all agreed.

P/072/22 - Matters Arising from the Minutes of the Meeting Held on 28th March 2022

None.

Meeting halted for Public Participation Session

P/073/22 - Public Participation Session

No members of the public were present.

Meeting reconvened.

P/074/22 - Planning Applications

74.1 SDNP/22/00392/HOUS

Increase size of existing dormer to the rear.

Farthings 26 Elmleigh Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9EZ

Decision: MTC has no objection to this application.

74.2 SDNP/22/01348/LIS

Replacement of 14 no. windows and window frames throughout building (resubmission of approved application SDNP/18/05801/LIS).

142 June Lane Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9EW

Decision: MTC has no objection to this application.

74.3 SDNP/22/00310/HOUS

Demolition of existing garage replaced with ancillary annexe and store.

Meadowleigh Carron Lane Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9LE

Decision: MTC rejects this application on the following grounds: (1) Loss of parking (2) The current design is overdeveloped as it looks more like a small house than an ancillary annexe (3) The design is incongruous with the existing structures.

74.4 SDNP/22/00981/HOUS

Single storey rear extension.

65 Petersfield Road Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9JH

Decision: MTC has no objection to this application.

74.5 SDNP/22/01484/HOUS

Replacement of 2. no windows on front elevation and 5 no. windows on rear elevations with double glazed white UPVC windows, and replacement of front entrance door with a composite door.

2 Railway Terrace Bepton Road Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9QY

Decision: MTC has no objection to this application.

P/075/22 – Tree Applications

75.1 SDNP/22/01274/TPO

Crown reduce by 3m (height and widths) on 1 no. Sweet Chestnut tree (quoted as O6) within Area, A1 subject to MI/64/00669/TPO.

Brook House 6 Gaillard's Oak Midhurst West Sussex GU29 9JZ

Decision: MTC has no objection to this application.

P/076/22 – Glover Report

There was considerable concern at last week's meeting about the Government's response to Julian Glover's report. Cllr Coote, Cllr McAra and Cllr Watts reviewed the response from the Government and drafted a reply which is at **Annex A**. The committee supports this response.

Action: Assistant Clerk to confirm if Cllr Watts has sent a copy of MTC's response to Trevor Beatty at SDNPA.

P/077/22 – Decisions

None.

P/078/22 – Actions

The actions were provided to the committee before the meeting. There is one outstanding action relating to polluting the River Rother. The Assistant Town Clerk has asked Southern Water to arrange a visit to the closest up stream site but has yet to receive a response.

P/069/22- Matters of Report

Cllr McAra noted that both the red Volvo and blue Peugeot have been moved from Petersfield Road. Cllr McAra also mentioned the importance of the SDNPA Design Guide, which will be discussed at the next Planning meeting. It is important to establish whether this aligns with the work conducted by the Midhurst Vision.

The Town Clerk informed the committee that the South Downs National Park Authority has received the Easebourne Parish Design Statement (EPDS) from Easebourne Parish Council. The consultation will run from **Tuesday 5 April to Tuesday 17 May 2022** and will be discussed at the next Planning meeting. To view a copy of the document please see the following link:

<https://www.southdowns.gov.uk/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/village-design-statements/>

There being no further business the Chairman closed the meeting at 7.25pm.

Signed: Date:.....

Chairman

MTC's Reply to the Government's Response to the Glover Report



MTC Response to
Government's Resp

Monday, 28th March 2022 @ 14:30

Meeting with Vicky McKay, Divisional Manager, Property & Growth. Chichester District Council
With Cllrs Lintott, Coote and Fraser and Sharon Hurr, Clerk to Midhurst Town Council

MTC asked four questions about the disposal of the Grange Development site:

- 1. Does the contract have a final reversion date when CDC can abort the contractual arrangements?** There are various dates within the contract, but Vicky is unable to share the detail of these with MTC. She added that the process had been slowed by Covid but that Montpelier are still working within the timescales of the contract.
- 2. The developer has twice aborted having a planning application determined. Can they continue to do this and does CDC have any remedies to address this scenario?** Montpelier have a contract subject to planning, how they go about obtaining that planning permission is up to them. If they achieve planning within the timescales of the contract they will be able to satisfactorily complete the contract. Vicky said she has asked Montpelier to contact MTC to communicate their plans, we told her that we had contacted them and they had already been to a planning meeting but that we still weren't impressed with their plans.
- 3. Would CDC cancel the contract and then contest any subsequent court case for damages given the time that has passed and the developers unwillingness to design appropriate plans for a prominent building in a conservation area in a national park?** The site remains under contract and at this point Vicky couldn't give any assurances as to what may happen going forward, she said she would keep us informed and will contact us towards the end of April with an update.
- 4. Has CDC had any other approaches/declarations of interest for the site since the contract was awarded/tender accepted and has CDC pursued/open discussion with them?** Vicky said that CDC have received approaches from other interested parties but that they had not pursued discussions because they are in contract with Montpelier.

Additional points discussed:

We talked in general about other developments that might be more acceptable to the town and impressed upon Vicky that the majority of residents do not want to see a care home at this location.

We urged Vicky and her team to stick to the dates within the contract and to not give Montpelier any extensions.

We asked that if the contract with Montpelier is broken we would like to meet with the Cabinet Members responsible for the disposal with a view to marketing the site towards something the town wants/needs.

We discussed the general state of the site and Vicky said she would ask the estates team to visit with a view to tidying up the hoardings.