

Planning Committee (South)
20 JUNE 2017

Present: Councillors: John Blackall, Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, Roger Clarke, Ray Dawe, Brian Donnelly, David Jenkins, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Brian O'Connell, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Claire Vickers and Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: Jonathan Chowen, David Coldwell, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd and Ben Staines

PCS/1 **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED

That Councillor Brian O'Connell be elected Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing Council year.

PCS/2 **APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED

That Councillor Paul Clarke be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing Council year.

PCS/3 **TO APPROVE THE TIME OF MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE FOR THE ENSUING YEAR**

RESOLVED

That meetings of the Committee be held at 2.30pm for the ensuing Council year.

PCS/4 **TO APPROVE AS CORRECT THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16TH MAY 2017**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16th May 2017 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

It was noted that the resolution, as printed in Minute No. PCS/107 of the meeting held on 21st March 2017 regarding Planning Application DC/16/2108 (Monastery Lane, Storrington), should be amended to show the correct planning application number DC/16/2108.

PCS/5 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/17/0665 – Councillor Mike Morgan declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item because he lived opposite the application site. He withdrew from the meeting during determination of the application.

PCS/6 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCS/7 **APPEALS**

The list of appeals lodged, appeals in progress and appeal decisions, as circulated, was noted.

The Director of Planning, Economic Development & Property advised that the Council's decision not to pursue an appeal of the Inspector's decision to allow DC/15/0193 (Threals Lane, West Chiltington) was taken on Counsel advice and would not set a precedent, particularly given the number of appeal decisions which had supported Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) policies. The Parish Council was being advised of details of this decision.

Members were advised that the Head of Development was carrying out a review of appeal cases over the last year.

PCS/8 **DC/17/0347 - 46 LONDON ROAD, PULBOROUGH (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT: MR S O'CARROLL**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the construction of a detached two storey building of traditional appearance comprising two 2-bedroom maisonettes, each with its own access. The closest corner of the building would be approximately two metres from the boundary, and five metres from the corner of 46 London Road. Overlooking windows would be obscure glazed. The highest part of the roof would be approximately 8.2 metres. A total of three parking spaces were proposed.

The application site was within the built-up area of Pulborough. It was a roughly triangular area located between a terrace of three dwellings, the railway line and London Road. A large supermarket and petrol filling station were within 360 metres of the site, and Pulborough railway station and village facilities were a little over one kilometre away.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Relevant planning history, in particular outline permission DC/14/2284, was also noted by the Committee.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee. The Parish Council objected to the application. Twelve letters of objection had been received. The

applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal, and a representative of the Parish Council spoke in objection.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development; character and appearance; residential amenity; the communal amenity space; and highways and parking.

There was concern over land ownership issues within the site, where it was noted that the Parish Council's initiative for a footbridge over the railway line could be compromised should the development be allowed.

Members discussed aspects of the proposal, in particular its impact on parking and the highway safety, including access onto the London Road. Whilst the Highway Authority had raised no objection, Members considered that a more comprehensive analysis was required before the application could be determined.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/0347 be deferred to allow for further clarification in the assessment of the highways impact of the proposal, to include an onsite meeting with West Sussex County Council Highway Authority and Local Members.

PCS/9 **DC/17/0665 - 8 CHESTNUT WAY, HENFIELD (WARD: HENFIELD)**
APPLICANT: MR ALAN MURPHY

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for a single storey side extension to an existing bungalow, which would project 7.35 metres from the dwelling, with a ridge height of 4.6 metres. A replacement detached single garage with a pitched roof was also proposed.

The application site was located in the built-up area of Henfield on the eastern side of Chestnut Way, behind the main high street. Chestnut Way was largely made up of detached bungalows of a similar character and description, and was within the Henfield Conservation Area.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Fourteen letters objecting to the proposal and subsequent revisions had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application. A representative of the applicant addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant and on behalf of the applicant's agent in support of the proposal. Councillor Mike Morgan, who had declared a personal and prejudicial interest, addressed the committee in

objection to the application. He then withdrew from the meeting and took no part in its determination.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the design and appearance of the proposal; its impact on the conservation area; neighbouring amenity; highways; and impact on trees.

Members considered the size of the proposal in relation to the existing building and how it would relate to the plot, which was prominently located near the entrance to Chestnut Way, and its impact on the character of the locality, including the Grade II Listed Building in Church Street. Concerns regarding the proximity of the replacement garage to the public highway and its impact on access safety were also discussed.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/0665 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The size, scale and massing of the development would lead to overdevelopment on the site.
- 02 The proposal is out of character with the streetscene and therefore contrary to Policy 33 of the HDPF.
- 03 The impact on road safety of the proximity of the garage to the public highway.
- 04 Subject to agreement with the Heritage Officer, the detrimental impact of the proposal on the Grade II Listed Building, Martyn Lodge, contrary to Policy 34 of the HDPF.

The meeting closed at 3.22 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm

CHAIRMAN