



The countryside charity  
Sussex

**CPRE Sussex**  
Brownings Farm  
Blackboys  
East Sussex TN22 5HG  
Telephone 01825 890975  
info@cpresussex.org.uk  
www.cpresussex.org.uk

## **HORSHAM DISTRICT REPORT: APRIL 2022, by Dr Roger F Smith**

### **Contents:**

Horsham District's Minimum Annual Housing Need Target increased from 897 to 948 dwellings per year.

Standard Method formula takes no account of environmental consequences: it should be abandoned.

Water Neutrality: "*Insufficient certainty as to how water neutrality can be achieved*".

HDPF policies continue to hold weight in the deciding of planning applications despite the lack of a 5-year housing land supply.

**Appendix:** Transcript of Item 7 of the Planning Committee (North) meeting of Horsham District Council held on Tuesday 1 March 2022 at 5:30pm.

## **HORSHAM DISTRICT'S MINIMUM ANNUAL HOUSING NEED TARGET INCREASED FROM 897 TO 948 DWELLINGS PER YEAR**

Except where an alternative approach is warranted, councils are required to use the formula-based Standard Method to determine their 'minimum annual housing need figure', as required by the Government in their 'Guidance: Housing and Economic Needs Assessment, guides councils in how to assess their housing needs'.

The formula uses 2014-based National Household Growth Projections published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) to which is added an 'affordability' factor using median workplace-based affordability ratios.

Updated affordability ratios for each authority were published 23 March and in compliance with Government diktat councils have had to recalculate their minimum annual housing needs.

The resulting new numbers came in to play on 1 April when Horsham District's minimum annual housing need figure was increased from 897 to 948 dwellings per year.

Horsham District's currently stalled draft local plan must therefore be amended accordingly.

Of the 948 dwellings, 585 are to accommodate the average annual increase in the number of new households forecast for the District by the ONS for the period 2022/32. The additional 363 (34.64%) are in consequence of the 'affordability factor'.

To promote, enhance and protect a thriving countryside for everyone's benefit

President: Lord Egremont

Campaign to Protect Rural England Sussex Branch CIO | Registered charity number: 1156568

Facebook : [www.facebook.com/CPRESussex](http://www.facebook.com/CPRESussex) | Twitter : @cpresussex

Because of the pernicious 'Duty to Cooperate' Horsham District is required, together with Arun and Mid Sussex Districts, to accommodate dwellings deemed to be beyond the capacity of Adur, Brighton and Hove, Chichester, Crawley and Worthing to accommodate. Note that their targets have also been determined by means of the Standard Method formula.

Moreover, the Government's Guidance states that "*there will be circumstances where it is appropriate to consider whether actual housing need is higher than the standard method indicates*", a stipulation that developers will doubtless seek to exploit.

Horsham District's overall housebuilding target will therefore be considerably in excess of its new 'minimum annual housing need' allocation of 948 dwellings per year.

### **STANDARD METHOD FORMULA TAKES NO ACCOUNT OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES. IT SHOULD BE ABANDONED**

The Government's Standard Method formula for determining minimum annual local housing need takes no account of the resulting environmental consequences, including impact on the supply of potable water, increased outflows of raw and partially treated sewage into rivers and sea, and the loss of farmland needed for food production and carbon sequestration, and climate change.

The present reckless press-on regardless-never-mind-the-consequences approach to planning must stop. What is needed urgently now and for the future is planning that is empirical and pragmatic, and community led, and housing numbers that are truly sustainable.

When developers choose to build for whatever reason fewer houses than is required by unsustainable Standard Method targets, councils and communities have development imposed on them by developers at Appeal, as is happening now across Sussex.

'Affordability' in the context of the Standard Method is a misnomer because the application of the Method's affordability factor has not increased the delivery of truly affordable homes.

Meanwhile the Government's 'Guidance: Housing and Economic Needs Assessment' allows councils to determine their housing requirements, when warranted by exceptional circumstances without using the Standard Method formula.

Circumstances are now exceptional - the Standard Method and the hocus pocus formula should be abandoned.

### **WATER NEUTRALITY "*At present there is insufficient certainty as to how water neutrality can be achieved*"**

Horsham District is within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone in which potable water is sourced from abstraction sites in the Arun valley.

Natural England is concerned that the abstraction of water from the valley is harming protected sites, species and habitats of national and international importance.

Natural England therefore stipulates that new development within the zone must achieve water neutrality such that water use is equal to, or less than what it was before the development took place.

This requirement is detailed in 'Natural England's Position Statement for Applications within the Sussex North Water Supply Zone issued to HDC, September 2021 - Interim Approach' in consequence of which the process of making the new local plan and neighbourhood plans in the district is on hold.

In addition, HDPF Policy 31 Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity, paragraphs 4 a) and b), and 5, establishes that permission will be refused where development is anticipated to have an adverse impact on biodiversity sites such as SPAs and SACs, unless appropriate mitigation measures are provided.

The Planning Inspector who dismissed Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/21/3281657 Longlands, West Chiltington Road, Pulborough, RH20 2EE (Decision date: 18 March 2022), DC/20/2216 Construction of 4 dwellings with detached garages, creation of a new driveway and parking with landscaping and associated works, for which Water Neutrality is a significant issue, advised that

*“there is currently no general mitigation solution”* (Paragraph 18), and  
*“At present there is insufficient certainty as to how water neutrality can be achieved”* (Paragraph 19). And concluded that

*“Because the proposal would not achieve water neutrality it would adversely affect the integrity of the Arun Valley SPA/SAC. Because of the provisions of the Regulations and notwithstanding the housing land supply position and the contribution that four additional units would make, this is an overriding consideration. Furthermore, the proposed development would not be in a suitable location having regard to the spatial strategy for the district. Overall it would be contrary to the development plan and there are no other material considerations to outweigh that finding”* (paragraph 23).

**The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) commissioned by Horsham District Council, dated July 2021**, to assess the impact of at least 18,700 new residential dwellings and 111,700m<sup>2</sup> of employment space concluded that the 'best level of water neutrality' that could be achieved was 45%.

**Surprisingly, the number of new-builds for which total water neutrality could be achieved in the district has not been determined.** It should be determined and the overall housing target for the district reduced accordingly.

### **HDPF POLICIES CONTINUE TO HOLD WEIGHT IN THE DECIDING OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS DESPITE THE LACK OF A 5-YEAR LAND SUPPLY**

On 1 March, acting on the advice of officers Horsham District Council's (HDC) Planning Committee North changed its reasons for refusing application DC/20/2564, to build 73 dwellings on countryside at Woodfords, Southwater, which was and is the subject of an appeal.

**A full transcript of the committee's discussion of this application is included below as an Appendix to this newsletter at page 5.**

HDC had refused the proposed scheme because contrary to Strategic Policies 2, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF), the site was unallocated and not within a defined settlement boundary, and the proposed scheme was not essential to the site's countryside location.

Nevertheless, in their Planning Committee Report, Agenda Item 7, Officers advised the committee that because HDC did not now have a five-year housing land supply, Policies 2,4 and 26 carried no weight and a new reason was needed for refusal.

They recommended that the appeal should be defended instead on the absence of a water neutrality strategy for the scheme, and the need for 'tactile paving junction works on Worthing Road and Shipley Road' (for details see the transcript of the meeting below at Appendix).

Whilst the lack of a water neutrality strategy for the scheme is most certainly a valid reason for refusal, disregarding Policies 2,4 and 26 is not sensible.

With one exception, members of Planning Committee North were unaware of the pivotal Court of Appeal ruling (3 Feb 21) that even where development plan policies are rendered "out of date" by housing-land shortfalls, they remain "potentially relevant", and decision-makers are not legally bound to disregard policies of the development plan when applying the 'tilted balance' under NPPF paragraph 11d) ii (Neutral Citation Number: [2021] EWCA Civ 104. Case No: C1/2020/0542/QBACF).

None it seems were aware that notwithstanding the district's lack of a five-year supply two planning applications refused by the Council had been dismissed at appeal: APP/Z3825/W/21/3266503 Land South of Newhouse Farm, Horsham, 29 July 2021, and APP/Z3825/W/20/3261401 Land north of Sandy Lane, Henfield, West Sussex, 19 August 2021.

Applying the tilted balance, the Planning Inspectors gave some weight to relevant planning policies in the HDPF, including modest weight to Policies 2,4 and 26, concluding that the benefits of the proposed developments did not outweigh the conflict with the HDPF 'taken as a whole'. Note 'taken as a whole'.

All but three members of the committee voted in support of the officers' recommendations.

**That the council's understanding is mistaken is confirmed and reinforced by the dismissal by the Planning Inspectorate, 18 March 2022, of Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/21/3281657 Longlands, West Chiltington Road, Pulborough, RH20 2EE.** The application, DC/20/2216, proposed the creation of 4 dwellings with detached garages, new driveway, parking, landscaping and associated works.

**The Inspector in deciding the application considered that "*the broad strategic approach of the HDPF is not inconsistent with the Framework and the conflict with relevant policies is a matter that weighs significantly against the proposal. Indeed, the spatial strategy of the District would be undermined if it was allowed, bearing in mind that the planning system should be genuinely plan-led*" (paragraph 11).**

Dr Roger F Smith

Trustee CPRE Sussex

## APPENDIX

### Transcript of Item 7 of the Planning Committee (North) meeting of Horsham District Council held on Tuesday 1 March 2022 at 5:30pm.

[ITEM 7 BEGINS AT 34:18]

[34:18] Cllr Karen Burgess (Chairman): Moving on now to Agenda Item 7, DC/20/2564 Woodfords, Shipley Road, Southwater. Over to the officer. We haven't got a speaker for this, by the way.

[34:42] Officer 1: Good evening. This Item relates to an outline application currently at appeal for seventy-three homes on a site at the southern end of Southwater, within the Parish of Shipley. The site adjoins the built-up area boundary, as shown here. A number of protected trees extend along the northern boundary of the site. The site sits broadly opposite a site for one hundred homes that was granted on appeal last year, shown here highlighted red. The application was refused under delegated powers in April of last year for these two reasons: the first relates to the principle of development on the site; and the second relates to the absence of Section 106 agreement to secure the proposed affordable housing. This decision has been appealed and will be determined by way of written representations.

The reason we're bringing the scheme before you today is to seek your authorisation to amend the refusal reasons, as set out in the agenda report. The amendment will, in effect, permit the principle of housing on this site as a departure from the development plan, a matter that would ordinarily require committee consent under the council's constitution. To give you an overview of the appeal scheme, this is the site as existing looking across the northernmost of the two linked fields. And this is the site looking north from its southern end. This is the master plan for the development, showing seventy-three dwellings spread throughout the site and the single vehicle access point off the Shipley Road. A play area would sit between the tree belt in the middle of the site, and following amendments the proposals now include the retention of Woodfords, which is a dwelling that is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. This is the parameter plan, which shows the developable area in yellow.

As I explained earlier, the application was refused for two reasons, as shown again here. Since this decision was made there have been four material changes to the relevant planning considerations for this site. These are set out at Paragraph 6.1 of the main agenda report. Matter two relates to the weight to be attached to the Shipley Neighbourhood Plan, which was made in July last year. And matter three relates to the addition of four custom and self-built plots to the proposals.

Of critical importance are matters one and four, which relate to water neutrality and the council's housing land supply position, respectively. In respect of this fourth matter, it has been determined by the Planning Inspectorate that the council can no longer demonstrate a five year housing land supply, as now reflected in the council's latest authority monitoring report. This has a significant impact on how decisions must now be made, rendering Policy Four out-of-date, and triggering the presumption in favour of sustainable development within Paragraph 11d of the NPPF.

It is now, therefore, no longer possible to defend the appeal on the straight Policy Four basis that the site falls outside the defined built-up area boundary, and is not allocated for development on our development plan. The first reason for refusal must now fall away. In respect of the first matter, officers have not to date received a water neutrality strategy for this development. Therefore, an adverse effect on the Arun Valley Habitat Sites cannot be ruled out. This forms a new reason to refuse planning permission. The agenda report rebalances the benefits and harm of the appeal proposal in light of these material changes.

Officers recommend that instead of defending the appeal based on the principle of housing development in this location, the appeal should instead be defended on the absence of a water neutrality strategy, with the wording shown as Reason One here. This is in assumption that the necessary Section 106 agreement will be completed to overcome the second refusal reason. Members are advised that the wording of the second refusal reason has since been amended since the committee report was published. It now explicitly requires the delivery of the proposed series of tactile paving junction works on Worthing Road and Shipley Road, as proposed in the original submission. The amendments are shown here in red. On this basis, officers recommend the appeal be defended for these two reasons. Thank you.

[39:07] Cllr Karen Burgess: Thank you. As I said we don't have any speakers, so straight to the local members. Which one of you would like to go first, gentlemen? Councillor Lindsay.

[39:17] Cllr Gordon Lindsay (Southwater South and Shipley): Well, it's pretty obvious that we've got to accept this, because if we don't then we'll lose the appeal. So, let's accept it and get on with it.

[39:28] Cllr Karen Burgess: Concise. Councillor Stannard.

[39:31] Cllr Ian Stannard (Southwater South and Shipley): I agree. I mean, I think [laughter] we need to pass this quickly and get on with our day.

[39:41] Cllr Karen Burgess: Thank you very much. Councillor Claire Vickers.

[39:44] Cllr Claire Vickers (Southwater North): I totally agree, Chairman. I don't see how we can do anything else.

[39:50] Cllr Karen Burgess: Does anyone else wish to speak? Councillor Milne.

[39:54] Cllr John Milne (Roffey North): Thank you, Chairman. A couple of questions, really. Water neutrality's a ... the idea is we can defend it on that, on those grounds, not the original grounds. And then the five year land supply, which has been judged to be no longer adequate. However, a possible outcome of water neutrality, when it's finally settled, means, to me, could be a reduction in our targets, in our housing...house-building targets. Is it not possible that with that reduction we might, after all, be within our five year land supply, because it will change the targets and we might meet the new target? So, I'm not sure how it's possible for us just now, in advance of that, and so I'm suggesting that we should wait till we know the outcome of that before we change our right of appeal, or our grounds for appeal. And related to that, if we were to give up those grounds for appeal now, and that scenario would come as I suggested, could we reinstate it later? You know, if we give it up now, could we get it back again? So, those are the questions that I'd like some clarification on. It seems to me there are lots of complications around water neutrality and how that might play out. Thank you.

[41:22] Officer 1: Thank you. To answer your point about the housing targets, that is a future outcome that is not determined, or certain, by any strength of the imagination. At this stage we must be determining applications based on the development plan in front of us, as will the inspector for this appeal. The development plan at the moment asks for eight hundred homes a year, and we're now under the standard methodology which raises it to, I believe it's around nine hundred homes a year. So, we wouldn't be able to defend this appeal on the basis that in the future our housing number may be less than nine hundred homes a year; there's no certainty on that yet. It will be for the new development plan to work out what the trajectory for housing should be in the next plan period, taking into consideration water neutrality. So, I'm afraid we wouldn't be able to defend the appeal based on theoretical future scenarios. Thank you.

[42:11] Officer 2: Sorry. Just to add the second point is we can't delay this. This is a live appeal with the Inspectorate at the moment. It's based on their timeframes, not ours, and so, you know, the risk of not doing anything is that, you know, we won't be able to put forward the water neutrality reasons for refusal. We can't delay this, because the inspector will determine it in any event. Thank you.

[42:36] Cllr Karen Burgess: Councillor Vickers, do you have a point of order or something?

[42:38] Cllr Claire Vickers: Just a point of clarification. If the appeal goes ahead and we've used this water neutrality as a reason for refusal, if they come up with a strategy at the appeal, would that mean that the appeal would be allowed if they can overcome it at the appeal?

[42:59] Officer 1: In theory, but timeframes are tight. We're due to have our statement of case in at the end of this week, and then the applicant has only another ten days afterwards in which to submit their final statements.

[42:09] Cllr Claire Vickers: Thank you, thank you for clarifying that.

[43:11] Cllr Karen Burgess: Councillor Milne, does that answer your question, or did you want to come back on a point?

[43:17] Cllr John Milne: It still seems to me that it is...maybe this is what we have to do, but the scenario could arise is that we have to withdraw those grounds for defending the rejection now, yet they could become operative later in the event that our target does change. So, we'll give approval now which we won't be able to withdraw later, yet three months from now all that could change. It seems a bizarre scenario to be in, if you are telling me that is the situation.

[43:58] Officer 2: Given the timescales the inspector has to determine the appeal with, it's very unlikely that we will be in a position to have a new local plan with a new housing target before the inspectorate determines this appeal. In the very, very unlikely case that there's some form of delay with the inspectorate in determining this, and we happen to have a new local plan in place, then we would update the inspectorate for all of our appeals, because there will be a new material planning consideration that they would have to consider. But that is very, very unlikely given the timescales we're talking about here.

[44:31] Cllr Karen Burgess: Councillor Ruth Fletcher.

[44:34] Cllr Ruth Fletcher (Denne): Thank you very much. I obviously understand that because we don't have a five year land supply that this changes the basis on which the decision is being made, and as it says in Paragraph 6.19, and we're now looking at the NPPF Paragraph 11d Tilted Balance Situation. But, I am quite concerned about the way that Paragraph 6.19 is being worded and that we are taking that to mean that we have to entirely remove our first reason for refusal. It's clear from case law, I believe, that although our plan is now out-of-date it is still the primary document that needs to be considered. It's not wholesale of no use, not all policies are completely out-of-date, and everything has to be considered on a case-by-case basis as to whether a particular policy is out-of-date and whether it's so substantially out-of-date whether it should have a greater or lesser weight applied to it.

So, I don't see that we should be removing Paragraph 1 in its entirety if this whole approach seems to be a hostage to fortune to basically say we're throwing our existing local plan in the bin and not having any control over it. So, I would like to see us, if necessary, tweaking the wording of

Paragraph 1 and retaining two reasons, which I think helps cover Councillor Milne's concerns to some extent as well.

When we first looked at this we were assuming that because it was not in the local plan it could be successfully defended on one strong reason, which was that it wasn't an allocated site within the settlement boundary, and so on. Now the situation has changed, we should be looking more carefully at the balance of benefits and harms that accrue from this development taking place. So, for example, we're still required to have good design and sustainable development. This development, for example, is very badly connected to the rest of the village. There's no permeability through to the existing housing that adjoins it, and the road that serves it is not really suitable for people cycling and it's already admitted that it's got, even with improvements, is going to have substandard walking provision. So, I would like to see us adding into our conditions the factors that need to be taken into account now on that, rather than just removing that first condition. I have been proposing that we defer...that we should be thinking about deferring this in order to do this. The officer is obviously saying that time is extremely tight, so maybe a deferral is not appropriate, and I'd like to ask the officers to look at Condition One and either retain it in its entirety, so that we've...or refusal reason one, either retain it in its entirety or adjust it slightly to allow for the fact that there is a tilted balance now, but the local plan still applies and that the principle of sustainable development and good design still apply.

[48:36] Officer 1: Just to respond to that. As was set out in the report, refusal reason one on the existing, not the one you see in front of you, this one here, is a fairly blunt instrument. It is a very black-and-white reason to refuse planning permission on the basis that Policy Four is written in a very black-and-white manner: the site is not in our development plan for allocation and sits outside a built-up area boundary, it must be refused. That is what our development plan says. However, **absent of a five year housing land supply, that policy immediately becomes out-of-date and we must significantly reduce the level of weight to be attached to that policy.** I can't see how we can retain a refusal reason that says it's contrary to Policy Four, because it's, as I said, it's very black...either it is acceptable or it's not acceptable on the edge of the settlement. And our view is: absent of a five year supply we cannot possibly defend an appeal on the basic principle that, because it's outside a settlement boundary, it must be refused. We can refuse applications on other matters if we consider that placing them in a balance with the very significant benefits being applied to the housing development, that they outweigh that benefit; that's possible, but here, as the planning balance identifies, there are no other good reasons to refuse permission. All other aspects are considered to be policy compliant and acceptable. So, I'm afraid, unfortunately, I can't advise we can take your path forward on this one. Thank you.

[50:06] Cllr Karen Burgess: Right, I've got five more people wishing to speak, including the local member, and then I'm going to call it a day. So, the next person is Councillor Christian Mitchell.

[50:15] Cllr Christian Mitchell (Holbrook West): Chairman, it was ready to agree with the first speaker, Councillor Lindsay. I think we've had clean and unambiguous advice from our planning officers. Certainly when I advise, but in a very different area of law, I do put lots of appeal grounds in, but that's a very different area of law, because it might be one or two succeed when others don't. But, costs are very different in the area of law that I practice and we are being told that one of the grounds that we refused it on essentially has no merit. If it remains a live issue that we want to pursue, the respondents – or the appellants rather – have to respond to that and then costs become very much at large, and we have to act, as a public body, responsibly. So, we have been advised of where there is strength in terms of water neutrality, and that really is the long and the short of it. We don't have time. Those that are representing us have two or three days to prepare



our statement of case by the end of this week, and I'm quite sure that our legal advisers...our officers have taken and thought about this very carefully before this meeting, and they are giving us clear advice. And that really is the end of the matter, I think. Otherwise costs will be very much at large.

[51:34] Cllr Karen Burgess: Thank you. Councillor Colin Minto.

[51:37] Cllr Colin Minto (Forest): Thank you, Chair. The question was answered by the officers, thank you.

[51:43] Cllr Karen Burgess: Councillor Peter Burgess.

[51:45] Cllr Peter Burgess (Holbrook West): Thank you, ma'am. I'm sure you're pleased to say I agree with my Lib Dem colleagues. We're being very defeatist over this. If we rely solely on the only contention in appeal is water neutrality, there's absolutely no doubt that water neutrality will be solved and, in this case, the appeal will be allowed. I'm not arguing about it; that will happen. So, we're going to accept that we're building however many houses it was, seventy-three, in an area where we don't want them. I'm sure there is some scope that amending, as Councillor Ruth Fletcher says, the other reason to include it in as advice to the planning inspector, because if we just rely on water and that is solved, we'll lose this appeal and costs. So, I think we need to be a little bit more aggressive on this, despite the fact that we have a time limit. There is a way around this, I'm sure. Thank you.

[53:05] Officer 2: What might be useful, I just think, if you think of your original assessment: we've made our decision, it assessed the whole development in accordance with our current local plan, so it did consider all those points, Councillor Fletcher, in the original assessment. We refused it for a reason, now it's at appeal. Now you have to then consider are there any material changes which change that. And the material changes are we no longer have a five year housing land supply and we have a position statement from Natural England and applications need to demonstrate water neutrality. There are no other changes to material considerations that raise any significance to our arguments here, so we cannot raise new points that we didn't before unless there are new material considerations. So, therefore, we cannot defend the principle reason for development, because we don't have a five year housing land supply. However, the new material consideration of water neutrality now comes into play and that is why we are recommending changes. We cannot reasonably make different changes unless we can justify that in policy terms. And we cannot defend a reason for refusal on principle grounds when we do not have a five year housing land supply. My professional opinion is we would lose and we would have significant costs awarded against us. So, you can put a different position to the inspectorate if you can justify that by changes, material planning changes, which is what this report sets out. Thank you.

[54:41] Cllr Karen Burgess: Thank you. And the penultimate speaker is Councillor Tricia Youtan.

[54:46] Cllr Tricia Youtan (Itchingfield, Slinfold and Warnham): Sorry, I'm a bit confused. Who has a neighbourhood plan that will apply to this site?

[54:54] Unknown (off-mic): Shipley.

[54:54] Cllr Tricia Youtan: Shipley? And it wasn't in Shipley's neighbourhood plan?

[54:58] Unknown (off-mic): No, they haven't allocated any housing.

[55:00] Cllr Tricia Youtan: They allocated no housing at all?

[55:02] Officer 1: If they didn't allocate any housing in Shipley at all, the report talks at Paragraph 6.20 about the exemption, in the NPPF, of Paragraph 14 for recently made neighbourhood plans that provide allocated housing to meet their identified need. Shipley provides none of that. So, unfortunately it's not defensible under Paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

[55:28] Cllr Tricia Youtan: Can I just say that I do worry about the neighbourhood plans, having spent considerable amount of time and effort persuading my three parishes to adopt one, and the fact that they appear to be almost null and void when it suits both us and the developers I find quite concerning.

[55:50] Officer 1: I would respond to that, my understanding is that our neighbourhood planning officer did advise all the neighbourhood authorities, or neighbourhood plan areas, who were adopting their plans in the middle of last year about the provision of Paragraph 14 and the risks it provided to them. Some neighbourhood plans do provide for allocated housing sites to meet the identified need and, therefore, they'll be protected by Paragraph 14; others unfortunately won't, but they were advised of the situation. Thank you.

[56:19] Cllr Karen Burgess: And finally back to the local member, Councillor Ian Stannard.

[56:24] Cllr Ian Stannard: I am a teacher, not a planner. We employ professional people to advise us, and legal people to advise us, and it would be incredible to think that I knew more than they did. If they are comfortable, then so am I.

[56:41] Cllr Karen Burgess: Thank you very much, Councillor Stannard. Right, we're going to the vote now. The recommendation is to amend the reason for refusal being considered under the current appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. This would comprise withdrawal of the reason for refusal on the principle of development and introducing a reason for refusal on water neutrality. Again, like last time when you vote, can you keep your hands up, please? All those who are in favour of this recommendation to refuse, please raise your hand. [Pause 57:10 - 57:22] And those against? [Pause 57:24 - 57:31] And any abstentions? [Pause 57:32 - 57:36] Thank you very much.

[57:37] Unknown: So we had twenty-four for, three against and nobody abstained.

[57:42] Cllr Karen Burgess: Okay. The motion is carried. Thank you very much. That concludes tonight's business. Goodnight, everybody.

[MEETING ENDS 57:50]