

**Planning Committee (North)**  
**5 JUNE 2018**

Present: Councillors: John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Leonard Crosbie, Jonathan Dancer, Billy Greening, Tony Hogben, Liz Kitchen, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Godfrey Newman, Connor Relleen, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Claire Vickers and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Matthew French and Adrian Lee

Also Present: Councillor Kate Rowbottom

PCN/1 **ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN**

RESOLVED

That Councillor Karen Burgess be elected Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing Council year.

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

RESOLVED

That Councillor Liz Kitchen be appointed Vice-Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing Council year.

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

RESOLVED

That meetings of the Committee be held at 5.30pm for the ensuing Council year.

PCN/4 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1 May were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

There were no declarations of interest.

PCN/6 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/7 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/8 **DC/17/2216 - HAWTHORNS, BAR LANE, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the provision of four Gypsy and Traveller pitches, each with a utility building and parking space. The existing building would be used for storage by users of the site. Amenity areas and paddock area were included in the proposal. The proposal had originally been for six pitches and a retail unit and, in response to concerns, had been amended to four units.

Members were updated on a number of issues including:

- a correction to the final sentence of paragraph 6.19 of the Officers report which should have referred to 8 Bar Lane and Little Tuckmans;
- that five further letters/emails of objection had been received but that these had not raised any concerns that had not already been summarised in the report;
- that a further email had been received that afternoon which raised concerns with regard to the lack of information submitted in respect of ecology and the potential for determination of the application without due consideration of the impact of the proposal on ecology, and;
- that comments had been received from the Council's Conservation Officer who has agreed that the comments made in the report were an accurate summary of the discussion that has taken place.

The application site was located outside the built-up area boundary southeast of Southwater on the eastern side of Bar Lane and was agricultural land with two barns at the southwest corner. There were open fields to the north, east and south. The hamlet of Copsale was about 600 metres north. The nearest dwelling was about 86 metres to the southwest.

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.

Nuthurst Parish Council and Southwater Parish Council both objected to the application. There had been 86 objections to the original application and a further 33 objections to the amended scheme, making a total of 119 objections from 77 households. Since publication of the report a further six objections had been received including one commenting on the proposal's impact on ecology and the lack of an ecology plan, as outlined above.

Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. A representative of Nuthurst Parish 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 principle of development; its impact on the landscape character and appearance of the area; the privacy and amenity of neighbouring residents; and highways. It was noted that Condition 6 would address concerns regarding land contamination.

Members were advised that Condition 5 should be amended to require floor plans to be submitted in addition to full details of the proposed structures.

Members were also advised that in respect of ecology, this was addressed at paragraph 6.31 of the Officers report. Officers advised that the Council has a legal duty to consider the conservation of Biodiversity within the District and that there are a number of policies and legislation which enforce this including the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, NPPF and the Local Plan. Where a proposal was within or likely to affect a designated site or priority habitat or there is evidence or a reasonable likelihood of the presence of protected or priority species an initial survey would be required. Members were advised that in this instance given the limited part of the site which was proposed to be developed, its distance to any significant vegetation and the characteristics of the area of the site which is proposed to be developed, Officers did not consider that a survey was necessary. However as a precautionary measure and given that the majority of the site was rough grass and that there were ponds in the area, an additional condition was recommended requiring a method of ground clearance to be submitted to and agreed by the Council prior to the commencement of development.

Members considered whether the principle and scale of development would be appropriate in this rural location and after careful consideration concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2216 be granted subject to the conditions as reported, to include: an additional condition requiring the details of ground clearance methods to be submitted and agreed by the Local Planning Authority; and an amendment to Condition 5 to require details of proposed floor plans along with full details of the proposed structures to be submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority.

PCN/9 **DC/17/2636 - 20 ABBOTS LEIGH, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of an attached two storey 1-bedroom dwelling with its own curtilage. The proposal would include a pitched roof and tile hanging to match that of the existing building. Two car parking spaces would be available for each dwelling.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Southwater, east of Abbots Leigh and north of Turners Close. There was a mix of detached and semi-detached houses in the vicinity.

Details of relevant government and council policies, 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 also noted relevant planning history, in particular permission DC/15/1934 for a two-storey side extension.

Members were advised that Conditions 8, 9 and 10, as printed in the report referenced a now superseded plan. The correct reference was Revision E received on 20 April 2018.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been 111 objections from 44 households. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. The applicant and the applicant's agent both addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. A representative of the Parish 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 principle of development; design and appearance; impact on amenity of neighbouring properties; highways impacts; and landscaping, including the buffer area east of the site, and trees.

Members discussed the material differences between the approved side extension and the proposal for a new dwelling with its own curtilage and parking requirements, and concluded the proposal would lead to a cramped form of development. Concerns regarding encroachment into the landscape buffer were also discussed.

**RESOLVED**

That planning application DC/17/2636 be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of its nature, scale, and relationship with surrounding residential properties, would have a detrimental impact upon the character of the street scene, resulting

in encroachment of the landscape buffer, and loss of amenity to neighbouring properties.

The proposed development would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/10 **DC/18/0294 - 1A CLARENCE ROAD, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of a single storey storage building and the erection of a block of five flats, comprising three 2-bedroom and two 1-bedroom flats, with a maximum ridge height of 10 metres, and associated amenity space. There was no off-street parking provision proposed.

The application site was located close to the town centre of Horsham and was a commercial building that had been used for storage. The site was approximately 70 metres north east of the old Dairy Crest distribution centre, which was currently being developed under permission DC/15/1545. The immediate area was predominantly residential and 46 retirement flats were directly opposite on the other side of Clarence Road.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Relevant planning history, in particular DC/17/0765 for five flats which had been dismissed at appeal, was noted by the Committee.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

The Neighbourhood Council objected to the application. Five objections, including one from Horsham District Cycling Forum, had been received. The applicant's agent 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 and the recent appeal decision; the character and appearance of the street scene; the privacy and amenities of neighbouring residents; affordable housing; and highway safety and parking.

Members discussed concerns regarding the lack of parking provision and affordable housing contribution in the context of the DC/17/0765 appeal inspector's report and after careful consideration concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

**RESOLVED**

That planning application DC/18/0294 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

PCN/11 **DC/17/1195 - COOMBE COTTAGE, CHURCH ROAD, MANNINGS HEATH**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of a timber garage and shed and the erection of a two storey 3-bedroom dwelling, two single garages and a new access and driveway to be shared with Coombe Cottage, the donor dwelling. The existing vehicle access would be retained as a pedestrian access.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Mannings Heath and comprised part of the amenity space of the donor dwelling, which lay to the south. It was surrounded by residential properties and their gardens.

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

The Parish Council objected to the application. Eight objections had been received. Two members of the public spoke in objection to the application. Three members of the public, including the architect and the applicant, spoke in support of the proposal. A representative of the Parish Council addressed the Committee 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 development; character of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the street scene; the amenities of neighbouring residents; parking and traffic conditions; trees; and the quality of the residential environment for future occupiers.

Members discussed the scale and design of the proposal, including the windowless wall facing the adjacent property, and concluded that the resulting cramped form of development had not overcome the reasons for refusing application DC/17/0302.

**RESOLVED**

That planning application DC/17/1195 be refused for the following reasons:

The proposal, by reason of its scale, siting, design and relationship with surrounding development, would result in a cramped form of development which would appear an incongruous addition to the site and wider surroundings. The proposal would not relate sympathetically with the existing pattern of development, and would result in significant harm to the prevailing character and appearance of the area.

The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and policy 10 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan (2015).

PCN/12 **DC/18/0109 - STONEHOUSE FARM, HANDCROSS ROAD, PLUMMERS PLAIN**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought retrospective permission for the temporary change of use until 24 June 2019 of an area of hardstanding to allow it to be used for the storage of full and empty skips and for overnight parking of vehicles. The application was associated with temporary permission DC/16/0702 for an agricultural store until 24 June 2019.

The application site was located in the countryside between Hammerpond Road to the north and Handcross Road to the south, and was a hardstanding area adjacent to a dairy building and land used for grazing by the applicant. The wider area was characterised by open fields with mature tree boundaries. The land was within a Landscape Character 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. Eight objections had been received.

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; its impact on the character and appearance of the area; the amenities of nearby residents; and parking and traffic conditions.

Members noted that West Sussex County Council had confirmed the application site was being used for storage only.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/0109 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

PCN/13 **DC/17/2429 - 28 GREENWAY, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a two storey 3-bedroom dwelling in the side garden of 28 Greenway, forming an end of terrace property with a roof designed to match the existing dwelling. A new front access and driveway with off-street parking would serve both properties.

The application site was located within the built up area of Horsham on the north of Greenway and was a corner plot on the junction with Churchill Avenue and Spencers Road. Most of the nearby properties were semi-detached, with some detached and terraced properties.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The consultation responses from the Highway Authority and Southern Water, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Fifteen objections, from eleven households, and one representation of support had been received.

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 of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the street scene; the amenities of neighbouring occupiers; parking and traffic conditions; and the quality of the residential environment for future occupiers.

Members concluded that the proposal would be in keeping with the prevailing character of the street scene.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2429 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

PCN/14 **DC/18/0150 - FARNBRAKES, CHURCH STREET, RUDGWICK**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought retrospective permission for a variation of Condition 1 to permission DC/16/2668 for the demolition of a dwelling and erection of two 4-bedroom houses, garages and parking.

The semi-detached dwellings which had been approved under DC/16/2668 had already been constructed. The variation would allow for alterations to the approved floor and elevation plans, which had led to an increase the ridge height of approximately 0.4 metres when viewed from the access road to the south. Other alterations included minor amendments to the design of the properties, and fencing to the front and rear.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Rudgwick on the eastern side of Church Street and was part of a larger site which had been subdivided for development. There were a number of dwellings to the north, east and south of the site and five Grade II Listed Buildings on the western side of Church Street.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The



consultation response from the Highway Authority, as contained within the report, was considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Fifteen objections, from twelve households, had been received. Three members 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 character of the dwelling and the visual amenities of the street scene; the amenities of neighbouring occupiers; parking and traffic conditions; and the quality of the residential environment for future occupiers.

Members considered the height of the fence to be unacceptable and considered that it should be restored to the height agreed to in the original planning application.

With regards to concerns regarding the perceived height of the dwellings, it was agreed to refer the case to the Building Compliance Team to ensure that the height of the building as built is in accordance with the application plans.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/0150 be determined by the Head of Development with a view to approval, subject to further consideration of the height of the fencing, in consultation with the Local Members, and Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee.

*The meeting closed at 9.14 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm*

CHAIRMAN