

**Planning Committee (North)**  
**2 FEBRUARY 2021**

Present: Councillors: Liz Kitchen (Chairman), Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), Matthew Allen, Tony Bevis, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Peter Burgess, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Brian Donnelly, Ruth Fletcher, Billy Greening, Frances Haigh, Tony Hogben, Richard Landeryou, Gordon Lindsay, John Milne, Colin Minto, Christian Mitchell, Louise Potter, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Ian Stannard, Claire Vickers, Belinda Walters and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Andrew Baldwin and Godfrey Newman

PCN/64 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 1 December 2020 were approved as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman.

PCN/65 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/20/0321 and DC/20/0322: Councillor Claire Vickers advised that she had been a trustee of the mill from 1991 to 2003, but had no current personal or prejudicial interest in the applications.

DC/20/0321 and DC/20/0322: Councillor Gordon Lindsay stated that he had also been a trustee a number of years ago and had no current personal or prejudicial interest in the applications.

PCN/66 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/67 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/68 **DC/20/0321 - KING'S MILL, SCHOOL LANE, SHIPLEY**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the conversion of an engine house to form a 2-bedroom home. There would be a number of internal alterations of the engine house to facilitate the change. The proposal was intended to finance ongoing repair and maintenance works to the attached windmill, a Grade II\* Listed Building.

The application, and listed building application DC/20/0322, had been deferred by this Committee in December so that further financial information could be

sought to demonstrate the proposal could secure the long-term repair and maintenance of the Grade II\* Listed windmill (Minute No. PCN/59 and PCN/60 refer).

This application and application DC/20/0322 were considered by the Committee together because they refer to the same proposed development. After discussion they were voted on as two separate items.

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

Members noted that since the previous meeting, the applicants had agreed to open the windmill tower to the public on 'Heritage Open Days', and further information regarding the financial viability of the proposal had been supplied. Additional information included mortgage illustrations and other funding options available to the applicant.

Since the previous Committee report, three representations objecting to the proposal had been received as outlined in the current report. Further objections had been received that included comments on the following: lack of public access to financial information; questioning the viability of the scheme; a failure to seek an alternative solution for the long-term future of the mill through engaging with previous trustees; the financial benefits of running the mill as a private charity rather than privately; that the heritage access scheme would only guarantee one open day a year; the loss of the engine house would lead to a loss of understanding of the history of the mill and prevent it operating on wind-free days; that the legal agreement lacks details; potential loss of a potentially working Sussex smock mill; and interference with the adjacent public right of way.

Three members of the public and a representative of the Parish Council all spoke in objection to both applications. The applicant's architect spoke in support of them.

Members considered the proposal in the light of the additional information, and whether the heritage benefits of the scheme outweighed any harm. It was noted that the legal agreement could stipulate a number of open days, and that the Conservation Officer had advised there would be ways of enabling the mill to operate on windless days without harming the building.

Members discussed the importance of demonstrating that the proposed enabling development was a financially viable solution that would secure the ongoing maintenance, repair and conservation programme for the windmill. In order to consider the financial information supplied to support the proposal, the Committee

RESOLVED

That, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting on the grounds that the discussion involved the likely disclosure of exempt information, as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, by virtue of paragraph 3 regarding information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person, including the authority holding that information, and in all the circumstances of the case the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Members concluded that the proposal did not guarantee the future of the mill and that other options had not been sufficiently explored. It was therefore proposed and seconded that the application be refused. The motion was carried.

RESOLVED

That Planning Application DC/20/0321 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the development will enable a financially viable solution to secure the future conservation of the heritage asset, and therefore the proposal cannot demonstrate that it will provide sufficient public benefit that will outweigh the identified harm to this important designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 02 It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that all other options have been fully explored for funding. In the absence of such, the proposal is not considered to justify the partial conversion of this building which would create identified harm to the designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/69 **DC/20/0322 - KING'S MILL, SCHOOL LANE, SHIPLEY**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought listed building consent for the conversion of an engine house to form a 2-bedroom home. There would be a number of internal alterations of the engine house to facilitate the change. The proposal was intended to finance ongoing repair and maintenance works to the attached windmill, a Grade II\* Listed Building.

The application, and application DC/20/0321, had been deferred by this Committee in December so that further financial information could be sought to

demonstrate the proposal could secure the long-term repair and maintenance of the Grade II\* Listed windmill (Minute No. PCN/59 and PCN/60 refer).

This application and application DC/20/0321 were considered by the Committee together because they refer to the same proposed development. After discussion they were voted on as two separate items.

Members: noted the additional information supplied by the applicant; noted further updates and advice from officers; heard the statements from the public speakers; and considered the proposal in open and exempt session, as detailed in Minute No. PCN/68 above.

Members concluded that the proposal did not guarantee the future of the mill and that other options had not been sufficiently explored. It was therefore proposed and seconded that the application be refused. The motion was carried.

#### RESOLVED

That Planning Application DC/20/0322 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that the development will enable a financially viable solution to secure the future conservation of the heritage asset, and therefore the proposal cannot demonstrate that it will provide sufficient public benefit that will outweigh the identified harm to this important designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 02 It has not been demonstrated, to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, that all other options have been fully explored for funding. In the absence of such, the proposal is not considered to justify the partial conversion of this building which would create identified harm to the designated heritage asset. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

*The meeting closed at 7.00 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm*

CHAIRMAN