

Planning Committee (North)
4 DECEMBER 2018

Present: Councillors: Karen Burgess (Chairman), Liz Kitchen (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Christine Costin, Leonard Crosbie, Jonathan Dancer, Tony Hogben, Adrian Lee, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Brian O'Connell, Connor Relleen, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Claire Vickers and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Roy Cornell, Matthew French, Billy Greening and Godfrey Newman

PCN/59 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 November were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PCN/60 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/18/1746 – Councillor Christian Mitchell declared a personal and prejudicial interest. He withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the determination of this item.

DC/18/22121 – Councillor Stuart Ritchie declared a personal interest because he knew one of the members of the public speaking on this item.

DC/18/2212 – Councillor Claire Vickers declared a prejudicial interest because she was a member of Southwater Parish Council, which was the applicant. She withdrew from the meeting and took no part in the determination of this item.

PCN/61 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/62 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/63 **DC/18/1849 - LITTLE HOMEFIELD, BRIGHTON ROAD, MANNINGS HEATH**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of some outbuildings and the erection of six semi-detached 3-bedroom dwellings with associated parking and private amenity space. Access from Brighton Road would use a recently approved access connected with the development opposite the Dun Horse (DC/16/1753), and extend along the

western boundary of the site. Twelve parking spaces for the six dwellings were proposed.

The application site was located west of Brighton Road within the built-up area of Mannings Heath, west of the main settlement area in a semi-rural locality. It was adjacent to the strategically allocated site for eight dwellings opposite the Dun Horse. A public footpath ran along the western boundary.

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, with a further 69 objections received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application, and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection to it. The applicant 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; design and appearance; trees and landscaping; heritage impacts; the impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties; highways and parking; ecology; and affordable housing contribution.

Members expressed concerns that, whilst the site was within the Built-up area boundary, it was not allocated within the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan and the loss of amenity space through the development of this backland area would cause unacceptable harm to the amenity of residents fronting Brighton Road. Members also considered the development to be too urban in character for this semi-rural site and detrimental to the character of the area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/1849 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of this backland site, which would not respect or reflect the pattern of development in the vicinity, to the detriment of the character of the landscape and visual amenities of the site and wider area. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 10 of the Nuthurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan.
- 02 The proposed development, by reason of the siting and orientation of the proposed dwellings, would result in a harmful impact on the amenity of the occupiers of the properties fronting Brighton Road. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and Policy 10 of the Nuthurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan.

PCN/64 **DC/18/1599 - LAND WEST OF NORTHGATE, CHRISTS HOSPITAL**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of two detached 3-bedroom dwellings with private amenity space, access from King Edward Road and two parking spaces for each dwelling. The dwellings would be set back from Christs Hospital Road in a similar way to Northgate. A footpath serving both dwellings and the street was proposed.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Christs Hospital to the north of Christs Hospital Road, south-east of Station Road and east of King Edward Road. It was an open space of grassland with some trees in an area of linear residential development along the public highway.

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

The Parish Council raised no objection to the application. Seven objections from four households had been received. The Local Members had requested that the application be determined by the Committee. 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; design and appearance; landscaping and trees; heritage impacts; and highways and parking.

Members considered the scale, design, and appearance of the proposal and its impact on the character of the locality and the amenity of nearby residents. Members concluded that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site and have a detrimental impact on the streetscene and character of the area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/1599 be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development would result in the overdevelopment of the site, which would not respect or reflect the pattern of development in the vicinity, to the detriment of the character of the landscape and visual amenities of the site and wider streetscene. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/65 **DC/18/1746 - MELITA, 19 RICHMOND ROAD, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of an open front porch, single storey rear extension and loft conversion, with two dormer windows and a roof light on the south east side,

and one dormer window and roof light on northwest side. The side extension would measure 2.4 metres by 6.8 metres. A one metre wide covered balcony with set-back windows and doors to the rear was also proposed.

The application site was located within a conservation area in the built-up area of Horsham and comprised a two storey detached dwelling with integrated double garage that was built in the 1980s. The surrounding dwellings were predominantly Victorian and Edwardian.

The consultation response from the Council's Conservation Officer, as contained within the report, was considered by the Committee.

The Neighbourhood Council objected to the application. Twelve objections had been received, including an objection from the Wimblehurst Road Residents Association. One letter of support had also been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application, and one member of the public spoke in support of it. The applicant and the applicant's agent both 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; its impact on the character of the dwelling and visual amenities of the area; and the amenities of adjacent occupiers.

Members considered the design and scale in the context of the surrounding conservation area. Members concluded that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on neighbouring amenity or the overall character of the area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/1746 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/66 **DC/18/0794 - GLEN ARUN, 9 ATHELSTAN WAY, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for an extension to a care home. The demolition of a single storey extension to the south, and the erection of a single storey and first floor extension to the east and two storey extensions to the south and west of the building were proposed. The proposed extensions would accommodate an additional 20 bedrooms. The proposal had been amended to lessen the impact on the adjacent Grade II Listed Building to the east and to avoid overlooking. Off-street parking spaces would be increased from ten to 18 spaces.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Horsham on the southern edge of the town and was a 1960s brick building that had been extended in the 80s. It was accessed from Athelstan Way, which joined the A281 to the east. It was within a residential estate with open farm land to the south west.

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

The Neighbourhood Council raised no objection but raised a number of concerns as set out in the report. Twelve objections had been received, including one since publication of the report which raised no new concerns.

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 scale, design and appearance; impact on Half Timbers, the nearby Listed Building; neighbouring amenity; highways; impact on trees; and ecology.

Members concluded that the public benefits of expanding the facility outweighed their concerns regarding access and parking, and outweighed the limited impact on the Listed Building.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/0794 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/67 **DC/18/2212 - EASTEDS BARN, EASTEDS LANE, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of an entrance porch and the addition of a number of windows and changes to the existing ones. There would also be an internal reconfiguration to include the creation of a first floor.

The building was restricted to non-residential use under permission DC/11/2502 for a single storey extension. The proposal would enable the proposed change of use of the building to a children's nursery.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Southwater in a residential area with a playground and large open space south of the site. It was a single storey barn like structure. Vehicular access was from Easteds Lane to the west, there was pedestrian access from Nutham Lane to the east. There was a 22-space carpark next to the building.

An addendum to the report had been circulated to Members advising of the consultation response from the Highway Authority, which raised no objection and recommended a condition to secure a travel plan statement. An additional condition to secure a Travel Plan was therefore recommended. The addendum also advised of the Council's Environmental Health comments which included the recommendation that the applicant enter into a voluntary agreement with the local authority to provide the equivalent of a Noise Management Plan.

Southwater Parish Council was the applicant. Thirteen objections from 11 households had been received. Since publication of the report a further four objections had been received, details of which and the officer response were included in the addendum. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. A representative of the Parish Council, which was the applicant, 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 of the development and its impact on the visual amenities of the street scene; the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Members concluded that proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the building or the surrounding streetscene and the proposed change of use would not significantly change the building's impact on neighbouring amenity.

In the light of concerns raised regarding noise disturbance, as set out in the addendum, it was agreed that an Informative be sent to the applicant advising them to liaise with the Council's Environmental Health team to agree measures which would reduce the potential for any disturbance to adjoining residents.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/2212 be granted subject to the conditions as reported, with the following additional pre-occupation condition to secure an approved Travel Plan Statement:

The first floor of the building shall not be brought into use until such time as a Travel Plan Statement has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Travel Plan Statement shall be completed in accordance with the latest guidance and good practice documentation as published by the Department for Transport or as advised by the Highway Authority. The Travel Plan shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To encourage and promote sustainable transport in accordance with Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/68 **DC/18/1742 - 3 CHALICE WALK, HIGH STREET, RUSPER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a single storey side extension, which would replace a lean-to on the north side of the house. The proposal would be three metres wider than the current lean-to and be approximately 1.2 metres higher with a gable end rather than the current mono-pitch roof.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Rusper within a conservation area. It was south of St Mary Magdalene's Church, with the churchyard to the west. It was one of a semi-detached pair within a courtyard development of 3-bedroom dwellings. Access was from the High Street via an undercroft.

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 four objections from one household. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection to it.

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 impact of the proposal on visual amenities of the area; and the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

Members discussed the scale of the proposal and were concerned that it would have a detrimental impact on the neighbouring property through loss of light because of the height of the extension. The ridge height of the extension was also considered out of keeping with the existing development and likely to have a detrimental impact on the setting of the neighbouring Grade I Listed church.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/18/1742 be deferred to allow discussions with the Applicant in respect of a reduction in the height of the proposed extension, in consultation with the Chairman and the Vice-Chairman, who was also the Local Member.

PCN/69 **DC/17/2123 - EVOLUTION FITNESS, GLADSTONE ROAD, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the removal of Condition 6 to permission DC/07/0272 for the change of use from a retail warehouse to fitness centre. Condition 6 restricted the use of the 'back room' to a changing room and in connection with the instructions of weight-loss program only, along with a number of other operational restrictions on the building in the interests of the amenities of the locality. This back room no longer existed owing to the removal of an internal partition.

The application followed complaints that there had been a breach of planning consent. The removal of Condition 6 would regularise this breach.

The Committee had considered the removal of Condition 6 in January 2018 and resolved that its removal would be delegated to the Development Manager subject to a satisfactory Noise Management Plan (Minute No. PCN/79

(09.01.18) refers.) The Noise Management Plan had been completed and Members had requested that the proposal be determined by the Committee.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Horsham on the northern side of Gladstone Road, and was a small narrow building between residential properties.

Members were referred to the previous report which contained details of relevant policies, planning history, the outcome of consultations and a planning assessment of the proposal.

A public representation, on behalf of a number of neighbours, from an independent Acoustic Consultant had been received in October raising some concerns. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the case details and officer's conclusions and noted details of the Noise Management Plan and acoustic survey. Members noted neighbouring residents' continuing concerns regarding noise and vibration and concluded that a more robust Noise Management Plan should be secured.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/17/2123 be deferred, in consultation with the Chairman, Vice Chairman and Local Members, to allow a meeting between Officers, including Environmental Health Officers, and the Applicant in respect of the submitted Noise Management Plan and noise/vibration issues at the site, with a view to the submission of a more robust Noise Management Plan.

The meeting closed at 8.14 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN