

Planning Committee (North)
6 MARCH 2018

Present: Councillors: Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Roy Cornell, Leonard Crosbie, Matthew French, Billy Greening, Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman, Brian O'Connell, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Simon Torn and Claire Vickers

Apologies: Councillors: Liz Kitchen, Christine Costin, Tony Hogben, Adrian Lee and Tricia Youtan

Absent: Councillors: Jonathan Dancer, Josh Murphy and Connor Relleen

PCN/94 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 February were approved as a correct record, subject to the addition of the following sentence to the final paragraph before the resolution of Item PCN/90 (41Pondtail Rd – DC/17/1704):

“The Chairman confirmed that, in the event of non-agreement during determination in consultation with the relevant Members, the application would return to Committee for further consideration”.

The amended draft minutes were signed as a correct record by the Vice-Chairman.

PCN/95 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/17/2316 – Councillor Stuart Ritchie declared a personal interest in this item because he knows the person who he believes to own the land.

PCN/96 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/97 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/98 **DC/17/2481 - LAND TO THE WEST OF PHASE 1, KILNWOOD VALE,
CRAWLEY RD, FAYGATE**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the development of between 204 and 250 dwellings, with 40% affordable housing, a pumping station and amenity space. Matters for consideration under this outline application were the principle of the development and a new access from Calvert Link, with all other matters reserved for future determination.

The application site was located north of the A264 adjacent to Phase 1 of the Kilnwood Vale development. It was currently grass pasture surrounded by hedges with fields to the west, and woodland to the north. The site formed part of the West of Bewbush strategic development site and had been reserved to accommodate a western relief road if required; the period of safeguarding the land for a relief road had expired in May 2014.

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.

In response to Wealden District Council's objection on the grounds of the potential impact on the Ashdown Forest Special Area of Conservation, it was reported at the meeting that to limit the impact of the proposal on adjacent Special Areas of Conservation, the applicants had proposed to enter into a legal agreement to cap the number of dwellings across the whole of the Kilnwood Vale development to 2,650. This cap would be lifted if and when the Council is satisfied that the additional units would not result in significant likely impacts on the Ashdown Forest SAC. As such the planning permission for up to 250 dwellings on the Reserve Land would simply enable residential development across the full extent of the established site area for Kilnwood Vale for up to 2,650 dwellings, which had been fully assessed under the EIA and Transport Assessment for the outline permission. On this basis, the proposed development on the Reserve Land would result in no additional AADT (annual average daily traffic) to the committed Kilnwood Vale development which had already been assessed through the outline approval.

Colgate Parish Council had commented on the application. Wealden District Council and Crawley Borough Council both objected to the proposal. A total of 57 letters of objection had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development in the context of the Kilnwood Vale development; impact on the character and visual amenity of the landscape and locality; the amenity of

neighbouring occupiers; access, highway and pedestrian safety; and its impact on nature conservation, flooding, land contamination and archaeology.

Members were concerned that West Sussex County Council's current strategy was not to build a western relief road, although it was noted that development of the site would not preclude the possibility of such a road being built in the future. The Head of Development agreed to write to the County Council requesting that they review their policy and explore alternative solutions for a potential future relief road.

It was also confirmed that discussions with the CCG regarding securing appropriate medical facilities in the locality were progressing.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement be entered into to secure: 40% affordable housing; contributions towards open space provision, education, libraries, fire and rescue services, health improvements, community and sports facilities; and a cap the number of dwellings within the whole of the Kilnwood Vale site to 2,650 units. The legal agreement is to be agreed in consultation with the Local Member, who was also the Chairman of the Committee, and the Vice Chairman.
- (ii) In the event that the legal agreement is not completed within three months of the decision of this committee, the Director of Planning, Economic Development and Property be authorised to refuse permission on the grounds of failure to secure the Obligations necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.
- (iii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/17/2481 be determined by the Head of Development with a view to approval.

PCN/99 **DC/17/2316 - NORTH EASTERN PARCEL OF SOLOMON'S SEAL, OLD GUILDFORD RD, BROADBRIDGE HEATH**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of 28 dwellings with garaging, parking, hardstanding and landscaping. The application site was part of a wider development for 165 residential units. A reserved matters approval for 15 bungalows on this parcel of land had been granted as part of permission DC/16/1073.

The application site was located on the northern side of Old Guildford Rd, outside the built-up area of Broadbridge Heath. The wider development site comprised two fields, which shared a common border with the built-up area boundary.

The application site had mostly dense hedging on its north, east and west boundaries. A care home was being constructed to the south. A public footpath ran through the wider development site, dividing this parcel of land and the care home from the rest of the site to the west.

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. The Local Member also objected to the proposal. Three letters of objection had been received. The applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development; layout, scale and appearance; landscaping; housing mix; affordable housing; impact on neighbouring amenity; and highway safety.

Members discussed the proposal in the context of the previously approved proposal for 15 bungalows, and concluded that the proposed housing mix would lead to over intensification of the site.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2316 be refused for the following reason:

The proposed development would result in over intensification of development on the site that would lead to a detrimental impact on the character of the area, contrary to policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

PCN/100 **DC/17/2524 - MICKLEPAGE, NUTHURST STREET, NUTHURST**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for a variation of Condition 1 to permission DC/15/2493 for the erection of three two storey houses. The variation would allow amendments to the approved plans to reflect the development as built. The amendments increased the roof height and enlarged the footprint of the approved dwellings with some internal alterations. The extent of the alterations had altered the appearance and scale of the approved houses, and increased roof space to allow for an additional bedroom.

The Head of Development reported that that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government were considering a request to call in the application for determination by the Secretary of State. Therefore the recommendation was amended to read 'To grant planning permission subject to the application not being called in by the Secretary of State'.

The application site was located in the countryside and had been a paddock to the east of Nuthurst Street. A private access to adjoining development lay north of the site. There was linear residential development along Nuthurst Street in a rural setting.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning and enforcement history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The consultation responses from HDC Building Control and the Highway Authority, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council objected to the application. A total of 190 letters of objection from 46 households had been received. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection to the application. The applicant, applicant's agent and applicant's architect all spoke in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development; the character and appearance of the dwellings; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers and occupiers of the land; and traffic and parking.

Members noted the strong local opposition to the application and were particularly concerned that the development as built was considered contrary to policies within the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan.

Members concluded that, whilst the principle of development had been established, the extent and nature of the departure from the approved plans had changed the character of the development and were significant enough to have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2524 be refused for the following reasons:

The layout and increased form and massing of the amendments, creating four bedroom houses, represents an overdevelopment of the site that is harmful to the character of the area and fails to meet its housing needs, contrary to policies 7 and 10 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan and policies 16, 33 and 42 of the HDPF.

PCN/101 **DC/17/1579 - THE ROYAL OAK, FRIDAY STREET, RUSPER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the conversion of a public house into a 4-bedroom dwelling with external alterations, including a single storey side and rear infill extension with roof lights and the demolition of toilet facilities on the east elevation. The proposal had

been amended during the application process to reduce the rear extension from two-storey to single storey.

The application site was located outside the built-up area over two miles from Rusper on a rural lane east of the A24. It comprised the pub The Royal Oak, a small detached building of traditional design, which was currently closed and vacant. There was a car parking area for approximately 15 cars associated with the pub, part of which would be used for private parking.

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. There had been 19 objections from 18 households received relating to the revised scheme. There had also been seven objections from six households to the original scheme. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of the change of use to a dwelling; impact on character and appearance of the area including heritage assets; neighbouring amenity; and highway issues.

In response to concerns regarding the impact on Howells Cottage, the neighbouring property, with regards to drainage, it was agreed that the existing drainage ditch along the south east of the site should be protected through an additional condition to secure drainage details.

Members noted concerns regarding overlooking and loss of amenity for Howells Cottage and it was agreed that an Informative would be included advising the applicant that the boundary treatment required under Condition 5 should include a solid fence of sufficient height to protect neighbouring amenity.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/1579 be granted subject to the conditions as reported, with an additional condition to secure details of drainage to protect the drainage ditch along the south east boundary adjacent Howells Cottage.

PCN/102 **DC/17/2048 - BECKLEY STUD, REEDS LANE, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the change of use of equestrian facilities to combined equestrian and charitable use by the HOPE Charity Project, which supported children with emotional and mental health difficulties. The application included the retention of a mobile home and the re-siting of a timber clad container. The proposed uses of the land included: the charity project; keeping donkeys, sheep and alpacas in

association with the charity; and the keeping, breeding and rearing of pedigree horses.

The application site was located in a countryside location and comprised a field used for grazing livestock and horses with mature trees along its boundaries. Colstable Lane lay to the north and west of the site. The site was accessed from Reeds Lane which ran alongside the eastern boundary. There were two listed buildings some distance from the site. Four stable blocks, an area of hard standing, a mobile home and the timber clad container were close to the eastern boundary of the site.

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. Members were advised of additional conditions that were recommended which would: restrict the number of horses stabled to 10; prevent external lighting without prior consent; restrict the playing of amplified music; and secure details of toilet facilities and animal waste management.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Eight letters of objection and 16 letters of support had been received. The applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development; the scale of the development and its impact on the character and visual amenities of the area, including the nearby listed building; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and parking and highway safety.

Members were supportive of the charity's objectives and concluded that the proposal was appropriate to its countryside location. Members welcomed the additional conditions which would further protect neighbouring amenity.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2048 be granted subject to the conditions as reported, with additional conditions to:

- restrict the number of horses stabled at the site to 10;
- prevent any external lighting being installed without prior consent;
- restrict the playing of amplified music;
- secure details of toilet facilities; and
- secure details of how animal waste is to be managed.

PCN/103 **DC/17/2675 - MELBURY, 34 RICHMOND RD, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a single storey flat-roof rear extension, and a loft conversion featuring three dormer windows, a skylight and the removal of a chimney stack.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Horsham and was a semi-detached building on the south-eastern side of Richmond Road. The surrounding houses were predominantly post-Edwardian and the site was within the Horsham (Richmond Road) Conservation Area.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The consultation response from the Heritage Consultant, who raised no objection, was noted by the Committee.

The Neighbourhood Council objected to the application. Twenty-one letters of objection, from ten households, had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. A representative of Denne Neighbourhood Council spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the policy background; character and appearance; and its impact on neighbouring amenity.

Members considered the scale and design of the proposal in the context of the building's Edwardian design and the character of Richmond Rd and were concerned that the scale and extent of the changes, particularly with regard to the side dormer window, would have a detrimental impact on the character of the Conservation Area. Members concluded that the proposal should be deferred to allow for further discussion and reconsideration of details of the design.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2675 be deferred to allow for further discussion with the applicant to secure amendments to the design of the proposal, in consultation with the Local Members, the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee.

The meeting closed at 8.20 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN