

# RUSPER PARISH COUNCIL

---

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held in the Village Hall on Tuesday 30<sup>th</sup> August 2016 at 8.00pm

**Present:** Cllrs. G. Hill (Chairman), G. Sallows (vice Chair), R. Allen, G. Hussey, R. Gatt, V. Bender, C. Forrest, and A. Sheridan  
L. Bannister (Clerk)  
WSCC & HDC Cllr. L. Kitchen

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Cllrs. Lawton and Saunders.

## **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr. Bender declared an interest in planning application DC/16/1533 as this is in very close proximity to where she lives. Cllr. Gatt declared an interest in planning application DC/16/1677 for the same reason.

## **3 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

These were agreed and duly signed by Cllr. Hill.

*Cllr. Forrest arrived*

## **4 OPEN FORUM**

No members of public present.

*Cllr. Kitchen arrived*

## **5 REPORTS FROM OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Cllr. Kitchen made the point that she has been accused along with another person (some years ago) that she would support a planning application on the recreation ground for housing once the lease has expired. Cllr. Kitchen stated that this is untrue.

There will be a change of electoral boundaries. This will put Rusper with Colgate and North Roffey.

Cllr. Kitchen is involved with the North Horsham application at a County level on the infrastructure side of things.

The Gatwick Noise Management Board meeting is coming up in early September. If Members have any issues that they would like Cllr. Kitchen to raise, please let her know. Members reported that many aircraft have been taking off before 6am.

## **6 PLANNING**

There was a Planning Committee meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> August. The draft Minutes of this meeting are attached below.

DC/16/1533 Rusper Road, Ifield

It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:

‘Rusper Parish Council objects to this application for the following reasons:

1. The boundaries between the development and the existing houses are not clearly defined. It is unclear whether or not the existing hedgerow is accepted as the boundary. This must

- be clarified as there is some overlap with existing properties.
2. Although access to the site has already been agreed, Rusper PC do not accept that this is in the safest location. This access will also be used by pedestrians and bicycles. It sits between two bends in the road and there is much foliage restricting views. We would ask that the access is moved onto the North West corner (next to Emmanuel Cottage) so that vehicles can better be seen from both ways.
  3. The drainage pond that was previously shown to be on the south west corner of the development has been moved to a different location. Water will not drain into this as it is on higher ground. The area around this development regularly floods, and the drainage is a big concern. Water from residents' property currently runs off into the fields. What are the plans to deal with this water? The porous surface planned does not appear to be satisfactory taking into account the level of surface water in the area.
  4. Where will your own sewerage go? This needs to be pumped away, and not added to the current system as this is already at capacity. We suggest that Southern Water are asked to provide a drainage report for the area to highlight the current state of the drainage infrastructure.
  5. There are concerns about what route the site traffic will take. The pavements surrounding the development are busy with children going to/from school. Please clarify this.
  6. The plans appear to make little provision for parking. It is essential that all dwellings have enough parking facilities within the site. Rusper Road is not suitable for on road parking.
  7. The width of the roads and lack of pavements would make it difficult for refuse trucks or emergency vehicles to navigate the development.

Further to this, we would make the following requests:

1. Can a footpath be established along the boundary to join the two paths shown on the plan? This would act as a buffer between the development and the existing houses.
2. This part of Rusper is an area of dark skies. Therefore, we would ask that no streetlights are added within or surrounding the development to maintain the rural character of the area.
3. Residents have trees on the edges of their boundaries and their roots extend into the site. These will need to be considered and not damaged in the construction process.
4. The extra traffic caused by this development will add to the already over burdened infrastructure. We ask that the 30mph zone is extended from Ifield up to and beyond the site access, and that traffic calming measures are introduced along Rusper Road.
5. The positioning of the proposed flats will mean that existing properties will be overlooked. Could these please be moved to a different location within the site?
6. Can priority for affordable housing be given to people that already reside in Rusper?'

Cllr. Bender reported that a letter has been sent to HDC today from Ifield Conservation, who have also asked Crawley Borough Council to object to this application.

#### DC/16/1677 Land at North Horsham

It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:

'Rusper Parish Council objects to this application because of the impact the development will have to the Parish, in particular the extra traffic burden that will be placed on Rusper. Also, the scale of the development will undoubtedly change the rural character of the area.

Traffic is already a major issue in the Parish and this should not be added to by this development. We suggest that the planned Rusper Road roundabout is changed to a crossroads and traffic lights are added which do not allow turns to the country roads in the north (so that all outgoing traffic has to go via the A264). Despite this, there will still be additional traffic in the Parish. Rusper is a predominantly rural Parish and the access to the development would be via country lanes. These would be unsafe if subjected to increased traffic. We ask for traffic

calming measures to be extended into Rusper.

Although traffic calming measures have been added within the site, there isn't enough detail to decide whether or not this will be sufficient. We would ask that the entire development be a 20mph zone. This approach has been successfully taken in many areas of Brighton.

It would not be acceptable for any construction vehicles to drive through the Parish. Please ensure this is adhered to.

We are keen that the development is integrated with Rusper. Could Rusper residents have access to sports facilities? We would also ask that the bus route includes a loop of Rusper and Faygate. Also, can priority for affordable housing be given to people that already reside in Rusper?

It is shown on the plans that the footpath (which passes Moathouse Farm and Old Holbrook) will be upgraded to a cycle path. As this is a rural area, could this be upgraded to a bridleway?

A meeting with Liberty is being held with some Members on 1<sup>st</sup> September. If there are any amendments to the comment suggested following that meeting, they will be sent to HDC.

#### DC/16/1715 Prestwood Paddock, Prestwood Lane

It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:

‘Rusper Parish Council objects to this application. This building had permission as a haybarn, and a change of use application has never been approved. This means that the property is unsuitable for habitation (from a planning perspective). The presumption was that the haybarn was being used as a haybarn as it cannot be viewed from the road, so there is no evidence that this was inhabited. Also, this is within the noise contours of Gatwick, and in a greenfield location and therefore unsuitable for habitation.’

This will be circulated to all Members to check before it is submitted.

This application appeared to only prove 6 years habitation. It was understood that this was 10 years, and so the Clerk will check this.

#### DC/16/1809 West Laing, Horsham Road

It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:

‘Rusper Parish Council does not object to this application.’

This was after much discussion and it should be noted that the vote was not unanimous.

#### DC/16/1843 Rusper Garage, High Street

It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:

‘Rusper Parish Council has no objections to this application, but please note the following.

The existing trees and hedgerow form part of the conservation area. Therefore it should be noted that all existing trees will have TPOs on them. If the tree next to the current building is going to be removed, please state this. It is important that the hedgerow is preserved as this not only forms part of the conservation area, but acts as a buffer for the playground.

Please ensure that the street lighting is in conformance with the local area. This is an area of dark skies so please do not add street lights either within the development or along the access road.

We would ask that no parking is allowed on the right of way to the site.

Although it states in the application that no bats have been observed in the area, this is not accurate.'

#### DC/16/1614 The Old Stables, Bonwycks Place

No paper details were available for this application, and the details were not available online. So, an extension will be requested.

### **7 PLANNING UPDATES**

A new planning application has been received for New Barn Farmhouse application DC/16/1696. This will be discussed at the next meeting. Cllr. Kitchen mentioned that Planning Enforcement is involved with this site.

An appeal has been lodged following the stop notice at Ifield Court Hotel. Rusper PC will be given a chance to comment on this.

No response has been received from the Case Officer of Midwinter Farm. Cllr. Kitchen suggested writing to Aidan Thatcher.

### **8 SPEED LIMITS IN RUSPER VILLAGE**

The application for the speed limits in the village has been considered by WSCC. They have said that to be considered the average speed of traffic in the village needs to be below 24 mph to be suitable for a TRO. Otherwise, traffic calming measures need to be put in place and this gets very costly. This is based on a survey that was done when the original application was made.

They have suggested that new speed data is collected, and this is to be funded by the PC. The Clerk will get quotes for this.

If the TRO is rejected, this will be entered into the Integrated Works Program.

### **9 DAMAGE TO CAR PARK**

A construction vehicle went into the car park and damaged the entry chain and pole. This has been fixed and an invoice for approx. £150 is expected. The Clerk has been in touch with the company that caused the damage, and they have admitted they caused the damage.

Cllr. Forrest reported that he has had no luck talking to the manager at The Plough. It was agreed that the Clerk will send a formal letter to the owner of the lease to request a meeting.

### **10 SUPERFAST BROADBAND**

Cllr. Allen reported that as a result of submitting a Community Fibre Partnership Application he has had a conversation with BT Openreach about extending superfast broadband to premises within the Parish which are currently not served. BT have some funding available to do this but it would uneconomical for them to roll this out for the entire Parish. The green distribution cabinets, when enabled, are able to provide superfast broadband to properties up to 1km away but they cost between £25,000 and £50,000 each to install. The choice of location for additional cabinets is therefore critical in terms of being able to serve the maximum amount of premises and consequently the collection of data showing the location of those wishing to have superfast broadband is vital. At the present time only one of the three existing distribution cabinets is definitely known to be enabled for superfast broadband so the upgrading of the other two will also be up for discussion with BT Openreach.

Parishioners should be encouraged to register their interest by email to [sfbb@rusper-pc.org.uk](mailto:sfbb@rusper-pc.org.uk) and a flyer is being produced to deliver to properties in unserved areas.

Where it proves impractical or uneconomic for BT to provide superfast broadband then a third

phase of provision involving more localised solutions will need to be considered.

Cllr. Sheridan offered to rally support in Lambs Green. Cllr. Bender pointed out that her area may be suitable for a box as it has very slow connection speeds.

*Cllr. Kitchen left the meeting*

#### **11 WINTER MANAGEMENT PLAN**

This has been updated by Cllr. Allen. This plan was adopted by Rusper PC.

#### **12 STREETLIGHTS - MAINTENANCE**

Most of the maintenance work has now been completed. The following issues have been reported by the maintenance company.

One of the lanterns in Cooks Meadow has been hit by a branch and the hood and photocell are damaged. It is beyond economic repair. The lantern is unidentifiable, so no parts can be purchased. The only way forward is to replace the lantern. This will cost between £525 and £655 plus VAT. Cllrs. Sallows and Hill will take a look at this to decide if it is worth replacing.

The ant powder has been put into the column and there have been no further problems. However, the original ants nest caused problems within the secondary isolation and the unit will now have to be replaced. This will cost £65 plus VAT. It was agreed to go ahead with this.

The lanterns on two other street lights are unidentifiable, so it was advised that we may wish to replace them as they can no longer be repaired.

#### **13 NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

No meeting was held in August due to the Planning meeting. The next meeting will be in September.

Cllr. Sallows has been working on the terms of reference for Members to sign at the next meeting.

#### **14 REPORTS FROM REPRESENTATIVES**

Cllr. Hussey looked at the playground today. He is not recommending any work this year and would like to carry the budget over to next year. This was agreed.

There is still work to complete on the finger posts.

Cllr. Sallows reported that there was a fun day held at the recreation ground. He was unsure how this went.

#### **15 PARISH MAGAZINE**

It was agreed to put in an update about superfast broadband, and the new 'subscribe to updates' section on the website. Cllr. Sallows will put together an update for the Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **16 CLERK'S REPORT**

The Tesco funding is now open again, with a reduced grant of between £1,000 and £5,000. The Clerk will look into the terms of this.

The Operation Watershed team has now produced the technical scopes for the applications. The only one they have suggested not pursuing for now is the section on Rusper Road from Ifield Golf Club to Hyde Drive. As this is a major network, WSCC will undertake investigation survey and jetting of the highway drainage in this area. If any defects or issues are identified we can then discuss a further application to Operation Watershed. The next step is to get some quotes. The scopes will be sent to those Members local to the proposed works to check for

suitability. Two local firms were recommended – I Bell & Son and Steve Callis.

The Clerk and Cllr. Hussey will now start contacting companies to ask them to quote for grass cutting for 2017.

The Sussex Border Path has been temporarily closed for 6 months due to a landslip from New Barn Farm. There is also an issue with the footpath being eroded due to potential seepage from the reservoir. Our ranger is in touch with Planning Enforcement about this to see if anything can be done.

A request has been received for funding for West Sussex Mediation Service. This was not agreed.

The Clerk will take annual leave from 24<sup>th</sup> to 28<sup>th</sup> October, excluding the date of the meeting – Tuesday 25<sup>th</sup> October.

#### **17 CODE OF CONDUCT & PROCEDURES**

Cllr. Sheridan suggested that everyone signs this to agree to the contents. This was agreed and all Members and the Clerk duly signed.

#### **18 FINANCES**

##### Reconciled accounts & bank statements

These were agreed and duly signed by Cllr. Sheridan.

##### Invoices to pay

It was agreed to pay the following:

Salary for Clerk (April) – £469.30

Litter Warden salary & expenses – £103 & £11.74

Expenses for Clerk - £127.79, £56.12 of this was to pay the BT broadband invoice

HMRC – Litter warden's tax for the month is £15.80

Cheques were written for all of these payments and duly signed.

#### **19 OTHER BUSINESS**

Cllr. Forrest reported that rubbish is still being left to the north of Northside Farm. He will send a picture of this to the Clerk, who will report it.

#### **20 DATE OF NEXT MEETING:**

The next Council meeting will be held on 27<sup>th</sup> September 2016. There will be a Neighbourhood Plan meeting on Tuesday 20<sup>th</sup> September 2016.

The meeting closed at 10.10 pm

LEANNE BANNISTER  
CLERK

# RUSPER PARISH COUNCIL

---

Minutes of the Planning Sub Committee Meeting held in the Village Hall on Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> August 2016 at 9.00pm

**Present:** G. Hill (Chairman), Cllrs. G. Sallows (Vice Chair), R. Allen, C. Forrest, G. Hussey, R. Gatt, V. Saunders and V. Bender  
L. Bannister (Clerk)  
11 members of the public

The plans were available between 8pm and 9pm for members of the public to view. This was attended by Members of Colgate Parish Council and approximately 15 members of the public. A sheet was available for the public to write their comments on. The issues/suggestions raised were as follows:-

## North Horsham development

- A park and ride bus service was suggested from the new train station to Gatwick Airport to reduce the number of vehicles at peak hours, but it would mean extra traffic off peak.
- Also suggested was a tunnel under Rusper village – although it was noted that this would be very expensive.
- The road layout should be reconsidered to reduce the access to the Horsham/Rusper Road, and to force access to the A264 via the other two roundabouts. Explore an access road directly on to the A24.

## Rusper Road development

- How is the boundary between the houses and Rusper Road and the development going to be established?
- Is the existing hedgerow at the rear of the current houses (Greenacre, Meadowlands, Trouville, Pinewood, Hammersfield, Ruspers, Capella) accepted as the boundary?
- According to the plans the gardens of the development back onto hedges.
- Can a footpath be established along the boundary (to join the two paths on the plan)?
- What has happened to the two ponds which assisted drainage in the area?
- Where will the site traffic go? Towards Ifield or Rusper? There are lots of children walking to school in this area.

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

None were received.

## **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Cllr. Saunders noted that his property is on the boundary of the North Horsham development, and would be enclosed by this. Cllr. Gatt noted that his property would be consumed by the North Horsham development. Cllr. Bender noted that her property backs onto the Rusper Road development.

## **3 OPEN FORUM**

The following issues were raised:-

Rusper Road development	There is already an application on the other side of the road to this, and there are issues with WSCC regarding parking. This is proposed to be in lockup garages and there appears to be no room for pavements. Where will the cars park?  Will streetlights be required?
-------------------------	---

	<p>Residents are concerned that their own land will be developed as the plans do not clearly show the boundaries.</p> <p>This will change the nature of the area. The road will change into a highway with highway standard lighting. This will add to light pollution.</p> <p>Footpaths have been proposed on other people's land.</p> <p>Cllr. Saunders noted that there doesn't appear to be space within the development for refuse trucks.</p> <p>The plans are unclear about the boundaries, it needs to be understood whether or not these are inclusive of hedges.</p> <p>Cllr. Saunders said that there should be a buffer between the hedges and the development.</p> <p>Residents have trees that back on to the development, and are concerned that these roots will be damaged. Residents were advised to have these trees surveyed to see if they need Tree Protection Orders.</p> <p>In the previous scheme there was a sustainable drainage pond in the south west corner of the site. This has now gone, but this area is always under water in wet weather. The pond has been moved to higher ground, which water won't run into.</p> <p>Water from residents' property runs off into the fields. Will these now be blocked off? The sewerage drains are already at capacity, so what system are they going to use? Ideally they will pump the water away and not add to the current system.</p> <p>Cllr. Saunders suggested that a study is undertaken by Southern Water to find out the current drainage state of the area.</p>
North Horsham development	There were big concerns raised about the traffic that will be caused by this development. It is believed that traffic will come through the village instead of going to the A264. The traffic in the village is already bad.
Rusper Road development	There is also a traffic concern with this application.

Cllr. Hill said that although Rusper PC will put most of these issues to HDC, he encouraged members of the public to send their own objections individually.

#### 4 PLANNING

##### DC/16/1533 Land East of Rusper Road

The following issues/suggestions were raised by Members:-

- Cllr. Bender is concerned about the access road as it sits between a 90 degree and 45 degree bend. The visibility will be poor and trees will have to be removed. Cllr. Benders suggested that access is moved to the corner of the 90 degree bend, despite the access already being agreed. There will be residents trying to access on foot and cycle,



and the access appears too dangerous for this.

- Cllr. Sallows suggested extending the 30mph zone to include the access.
- Cllr. Hill voiced concerns about the dustcarts and access for emergency vehicles as the roads do not seem to be adequate for these.
- Perhaps some traffic calming measures on Rusper Road could be added.
- It was agreed to ask for no streetlights as these will add to light pollution in an area of dark skies.
- Cllr. Bender is concerned about the positioning of the flats in the development. The existing houses will be overlooked by these. It was agreed to ask that these are moved to a different location so that they don't intrude on existing residents.

An extension to the comments deadline will be requested for this application so that a comment can be formulated, and a meeting with the developer can be arranged to discuss these issues.

#### DC/16/1677 Land North of Horsham

The following issues/suggestions were raised by Members:-

- It was agreed to ask that the roundabout is replaced with crossroads and traffic lights that do not allow left turns.
- There isn't enough detail about the traffic solutions to see what they are proposing, so it isn't clear that this will be sufficient.
- The development should try to be integrated with Rusper village. So, it was agreed to ask for access to sports facilities, and suggest that the bus route includes a loop of Rusper and Faygate so that the areas are not isolated from each other.
- What provision will WSCC make for traffic calming?
- Could the entire development be a 20mph zone? This has been seen in Brighton.
- The footpath access has been shown that it will be upgraded to a cycle path, but could this be a bridleway as this is still a rural area?
- The percentage of affordable housing is 30% at the moment.

An extension to the comments deadline will be requested for this application so that a comment can be formulated, and a meeting with the developer can be arranged to discuss these issues.

#### DC/16/1688 Carylls Farm, Faygate Lane

No comment needs to be submitted on this application as it is utility work.

#### DC/16/1739 1 Cooks Mead, Rusper

The applicant was in attendance at the meeting and clarified that the building will be dug down and set back slightly from the boundary. It was agreed to comment on this application as follows:-

'Rusper Parish Council does not object to this application, but ask that space of a metre is maintained between the building and the boundary.'

LEANNE BANNISTER  
CLERK

*The meeting closed at 9.50 pm*