



ANNUAL PARISH MEETING AGENDA 29th April 2026 Kelsey Hall from 7.30pm

Attendees: Parish Councillors: Andrew Woolf (Acting Chair); Paul Jordan; Doug Brown; Sarah Denyer; Sophie Capsey; Rick Robinson; Nicholas Taylor; Jane Price. 18 members of the public Jane Bromley Parish Council Clerk.

1. **Minutes from the last Annual Parish Meeting.**

Resolved as approved the [Minutes of the 2025 Annual Assembly of the Parish Meeting](#) held on 8th May 2025.

2. [Parish Council Report- Councillor Andrew Woolf](#)

Questions put to the Parish Council:

Resident: Do you fund the Parish Village Halls?

PC: Yes, we are considering a grant application from Kelsey Hall currently and regularly help Winterton Hall with maintenance costs.

Resident: Do developers have permission to put the notices on the road signs directing to their sites?

PC: There is a requirement for Highways to authorise this but there is little enforcement from Highways where this does not occur.

Resident: A resident asked about the PC being able to respond to the emergencies of a cut off electricity or water supply.

PC: The PC has investigated installing generators at the halls which would be very expensive but not something that can be ruled out. A loss of water supply is reliant on the water authority supplying bottled water, this can be coordinated via the PC. The PC will require residents to volunteer in order to set up an emergency plan which requires feet on the ground in an emergency

3. **Planning matters-** Steve Tilbury from Steve Tilbury Consulting.

ST explained in his earlier career he had worked for Surrey and Hampshire Local Authorities but never in Sussex although recently had worked extensively in the county in his current consultant's role.

He felt although residents may not always get the result they would prefer it is always important to engage in the planning process.

The Planning system began with the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 with the ethos to achieve “the use of land in the best interests of the whole people”.

This ethos can still be seen in the CDC response to the Foxbridge Golf Club application recently allowed in that the district considered the economic benefits to outweigh local impact. In balance they felt the benefits were greater.

With National benefit, Central and Local Governments are often in conflict. The Localism Act 2011 was designed to shift power downward, towards local authorities and communities, particularly through neighbourhood planning, community rights, and greater local discretion in planning and housing.

However, by 2018, several national policy interventions began to recentralise planning powers. The most significant was the 2018 revision of the NPPF. The government is once again making big changes to the planning process and the Parish Council’s will have to adapt. The operation of district Planning Committees is changing, and more decisions are proposed to be made by Officers. If a Planning Committee is minded to refuse a major application, it is proposed that this be referred to central government before a decision can be made. The time frame for Local Plans is being shortened.

Local Government Reorganisation is partly about planning. It is easier to control planning in fewer authorities rather than the numerous district and boroughs that currently exist.

AI is also expected to feature in the Planning world with minor application all being dealt with at the AI level.

Planning is controlled by Planning Policies it is therefore important to engage in any process generating these policies from Neighbourhood Plans to Local Plans and beyond, they will all shape the development to come.

A brief word on the two major applications for this Parish.

Crouchlands: The opening statement at the appeal hearing betrayed the case as being very weak, but process still had to occur.

Foxbridge: Local engagement as with Crouchlands was very good and some very good representations were made. Conditions placed on the development partly evolved due to the comments made which tie up the development as best as Chichester could achieve.

4.

Questions from residents:

Resident 1: - Foxbridge- The resident had written to the CEO at CDC to ask under FOI for correspondence between CDC and WSCC Highways regarding this application. The resident asked why it was that the Committee did not seem to appreciate the local highways issues just because WSCC Highways had no objection.

ST explained WSCC Highways was the statutory authority in this regard, and it was their expert considerations that would be relied upon by any Inspector at Appeal and not the thoughts of a Planning Committee.

WSCC Highways will consider the site on several benchmarks:

- Is there safe and sufficient access
- Will the impact be “severe”

Severe whilst not defined is a high bar and does not mean local inconvenience. It is based on technical standards or junction capacity, percentage increase in traffic and history of accidents in the area.

Resident 2. Crouchlands: - If the Crouchlands application had come forward when major application refusal by a committee were referred to Central Government would it have been allowed.

ST advised he felt the application would still have been refused even at central Government level.

Resident 3. Foxbridge: - Foxbridge Lane is not constructed up to highways standards it is a surfaced farm track.

ST advised many rural roads were not up to standard but still function adequately this would not be a reason for refusal.

Resident 4. Foxbridge: - Will residents have a say when Reserved Matters are considered.

ST – Yes, they will be consulted upon it will be decided at Officer level.

The formal meeting closed at 8.50pm

DRAFT