

Minutes of a Planning Meeting of Colgate Parish Council held on 27th July 2022 6pm Colgate village Hall.

Present

Councillors: S. Marley, C. Crosdil, R Faith, N Staff, V. Finnegan, B. Humphreys, R. Faith and S. Garley,
Apologies were accepted: S Davies and R Calvert

1. Minutes of the last meeting.

None.

2. Declaration of Interests

Cllr Finnegan- Holmbush application-DC/22/0995

3. Members of the public-

One members of the public attended.

4. **Applications.**

DC/21/0738-

Erection of a single storey dwelling with associated parking.

1 Brockwell Cottages Faygate Lane Faygate Horsham

Colgate PC have no further comments on this application.

DC/22/0958 –

Erection of building in paddock for storage, maintenance and processing of agriculture and storage of equipment associated with paddock activities.

4 The Courtyard Forest Grange Horsham West Sussex

Colgate Parish Council objects to this application, due to the size of the building, its location within the curtilage of a Grade 2 listed building and we would question why double glazed doors and windows are required for a storage shed.

If HDC is mindful to grant planning permission, Colgate Parish Council requests that a planning condition should be that this shed is not to be used as, or in conjunction with, any holiday let or Airbnb activity. We would also request that the shed will be removed from the site and the area returned to a natural condition, when it is no longer required for activities associated with bee keeping.

DC/22/0995

Change of use of section of agricultural field for use for 'glamping' purposes, incorporating erection of an off-grid zero carbon cabin on stilts, with solar panels and composting toilet.

Holmbush Farm Crawley Road Faygate West Sussex

Colgate Parish Council objects to this planning application and has the following comments:

The eco cabin has been constructed without planning permission and the current application is not clear in its intentions as there is conflicting information in the planning statement:

The applicant states in the planning statement that if the application is successful, the site will be expanded with further units, in order to cover the loss of farm subsidies. The amount of further units required would be considerable in order to replace the amount of subsidy that a farm of this size may lose. This would be overdevelopment in the AONB. A glamping site is not in keeping with the local area.

From the planning statement it is unclear if this eco house will be a holiday let, a show home or a trial on low-cost housing for the estate?

With all these additional uses and not just a holiday let, a traffic survey should be provided to assess the impact of the construction.

Any assessment on traffic use should be calculated on a basis of 6 people staying in the eco house and the fact that these people might not all be from the same family or arrive in the same car.

The calculations on water usage is questionable in its accuracy and the assumptions and should be reviewed. If the eco house is given planning permission then surely the intention would be to have it let out for as many days throughout the year as possible? Therefore, the calculations on water consumption would be incorrect.

The whole of the 4 hectare field is part of the change of use application, this will take agricultural land out of use at a time when home food production is essential. The area for the change of use needs clarification.

If the whole field is given change of use then this will give rise to an overdevelopment of a holiday let enterprise, resulting in more traffic, increased water usage.

- Response to Gatwick airport consultations:
- In our view the consultation is based principally around discussions GAL has held with the Highways Agency rather than Horsham DC ,local Parish councils and Crawley BC and thus the proposals from GAL do not assess nor resolve integration into the local road networks. The net effect is more traffic on the roads, and precisely the opposite of the transport response required to tackle the climate emergency and other environmental targets (including through a modal shift to walking and cycling, buses and trains). New transport modelling will be needed to reflect the highways revisions. This must also include analysis of the impact of changes in mode share estimates, transport derived noise pollution and air quality. We are concerned that these proposals have been put out for consultation whilst the

modelling is still ongoing and not shared. Therefore this consultation is too early – future consultation is still required.

- Highway modelling using the appropriate models meeting Government Transport Analysis Guidance should be presented which demonstrates the effects of these scenarios, and the full cost or benefit to local communities presented, including the indirect impact of social and environmental externalities including air pollution, noise and loss of amenity. In addition, this consultation coincides with Surrey County Council approving its new Local Transport Plan 4, which sets out a new hierarchy for road transport of avoid; shift; improve – prioritising removal of the need to transport, walking and cycling, and public transport ahead of the car. This is a significant policy change for the Highways Authority for Surrey. This consultation’s proposals to expand the main transport network is completely at odds with this new strategy.
- The consultation fails to consider the impact of the increased traffic on the main road network on surrounding local roads. The additional main highway network capacity proposed will tend to remove the natural deterrent that makes public transport more attractive, so will suck in more local traffic and increase traffic on the wider network. Instead of increasing traffic on surrounding roads Gatwick should invest to ensure that road traffic to the airport uses the strategic highway network, and introduce measures that reduce traffic on local roads including in Horley and Crawley as well as villages in the surrounding areas. The proposed transport measures are too narrowly focused on the airport for public transport as well as for changes and impacts to the highway network. The extent of public transport improvements required must include the catchment area that the airport has for both passengers, and staff. This should include significant investment in E-W links such as bus and train routes between East Grinstead and Horsham and train routes from Kent and Surrey (e.g. Maidstone-Gatwick and Reading-Gatwick). To ensure that no-one is left behind this should ensure disabled/step free access from across the network.
-
-
- Gatwick’s assertion that aviation emissions reduction is somehow assured is therefore incorrect and misleading. It follows that the airport’s proposal that it should forecast conformity with the Government’s ‘High Ambition’ aviation emissions reduction scenario as the most likely outcome for aviation emissions at the airport is irrational and unacceptable. Whilst the High Ambition scenario might be one outcome that could be illustrated as a sensitivity, the DCO assessment must also set out other, probably more likely, scenarios in which aviation emissions reductions are much lower.
- Gatwick is continuing to attempt to mislead the public on the economic costs of its proposals. The airport is well aware that the carbon values upon which its initial consultation was based were materially incorrect at the time that consultation was published. It is also well aware that its initial consultation failed to quantify both the non-CO2 effects of air travel and the climate impacts of arriving flights and that Government guidance requires all these costs to be monetized in project appraisals. It is likely that Gatwick and its economic consultants were

aware of these deficiencies when the consultation was published, and knew that correcting them would have a very material impact on the project's economic appraisal. The airport nonetheless decided to proceed to publish a consultation that was materially misleading in crucial respects. It has failed to correct these errors and continues to seek to hide the fact that the economic analysis in its consultation was misleading. Gatwick says it will correct the economic analysis in its DCO submission next year. It should of course do so. But that is not sufficient. It is now clear that the climate costs set out in the airport's consultation were underestimated by many billions of pound and that the consultation therefore gave a false impression of the project's climate impacts and economics. The scale of these errors and omissions is such that responses to the consultation cannot be relied upon. Gatwick should carry out a further full public consultation using correct carbon values and taking into account all climate costs. If it does not voluntarily do so the Planning Inspectorate should reject the DCO application on the grounds of inadequate consultation.

-
- In addition GAL's response time of just over 6 weeks is too little for a consultation of this complexity and that the physical locations and briefings are far too limited. Colgate PC would like to see the consultation extended which will also allow Gatwick airport to put right any incorrect information they are using in the consultation information provided.
-
-
- **Noise envelope comments**
- Gatwick's engagement on its noise envelope proposals has so far been of little value. The engagement arrangements the airport has put in place are wholly unsuitable given that the noise envelope is by far most important noise management development at Gatwick for many years and is likely to determine the noise environment around the airport and under flight paths for decades to come. In addition they are incompatible with good practice at other airports and do not comply with the CAA's advice on noise envelope development. In particular:
 - 1 The airport has imposed terms of reference for the process that are one-sided. In particular Gatwick proposes that the starting point for the exercise should be its own noise envelope proposals. In our view those proposals do not comply with government policy and CAA guidance to such an extent that using them as the basis for engagement is not credible. The process should instead examine all noise envelope options, metrics and limits from a first principles basis. The fact that Gatwick's noise envelope proposals were only supported by 9% of respondees to its DCO consultation further supports the need for a first principles approach.
 - 2 The process Gatwick has set up lacks any independence. The Noise Envelope Group is chaired by an airport employee and advised by subject matter experts whose role is to promote the outcomes Gatwick is seeking to secure. Luton and Heathrow, the only other

airports to have done work on noise envelopes, set up independently chaired and advised, well-resourced, multi-stakeholder groups. The CAA recognises the potential need for independent third parties to assist stakeholders to reach agreement, but no such involvement is proposed at Gatwick.

- 3 Gatwick has imposed a wholly unrealistic timetable. It requires the process to have been completed by 9 September 2022, allowing only three months, over the summer holiday period. It is proposing that the Noise Envelope Group should only meet three times in that period. Luton's noise envelope development work took over 18 months and the group it set up met 15 times in that period. We do not believe there is any prospect of completing the work required in the period Gatwick has allowed. The airport is withholding, or refusing to generate, information and analysis which only it is able to provide and which is an essential input to effective noise envelope engagement. Without this information and analysis it will not be possible to formulate, let alone agree, noise envelope proposals in the way the Airports National Policy Statement and the CAA's guidance require.
- Each of these facts suggests that the exercise is intended to serve a presentational purpose for the airport but is not a serious attempt to achieve the agreement between all stakeholders that the CAA says is essential.
- Finally, the airport is proposing nothing to alleviate the continued and now increased road noise impacts on residents, including the increased use of local roads connected to the strategic road network around Gatwick, including traffic passing through Horley, Crawley and Charlwood.

5. Decisions

DC/22/0943

Site: Colgate Farm Blackhouse Road Colgate West Sussex RH13 6HS

Description: Prior notification for the erection of a steel portal frame agricultural building.

Decision: Prior Approval Required and PERMITTED

Date of Decision: 11/07/2022

DC/21/2759

Site: 3 Holmbush End Faygate Horsham West Sussex RH12 0AL

Description: Erection of a single storey rear extension.

Decision: Application Permitted

Date of Decision: 20/07/2022

Signed Date.....

Closed meeting 18:31pm