

Planning Committee (North)
9 APRIL 2024

Present: Councillors: Tony Bevis (Vice-Chairman), James Brookes, Len Ellis-Brown, Nigel Emery, Chris Franke, Anthony Frankland, Warwick Hellowell, Alex Jeffery, Liz Kitchen, Richard Landeryou, Dennis Livingstone, Jay Mercer, John Milne, Colin Minto, David Skipp, Clive Trott, Tricia Youtan and Claire Vickers

Apologies: Councillors: Peter van der Borgh, Colette Blackburn, Martin Boffey, Ruth Fletcher, Nick Grant, Kasia Greenwood, Jon Olson, Sam Raby and Jonathan Taylor

PCN/66 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6th February 2024 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PCN/67 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/23/2074 Councillor James Brookes declared an interest in the item as he knew the applicant and the agent. He spoke as a member of the public and then left the room and did not participate in the debate or the vote.

DC/23/2142 Councillor Richard Landeryou declared an interest in the item as he is a member of Rudgwick Preservation Society who intended to lodge an objection to the application. He did not sit on the committee lodging the objection so contributed to the debate and took part in the vote.

PCN/68 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/69 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/70 **DC/23/2278 FORMER ARUN FEEDMILLS, SINCOX LANE, SHIPLEY**

The Head of Development and Building Control reported that this application sought planning consent for the erection of eight dwellings, with associated parking, drainage, and hard and soft landscaping.

The application site is positioned to the south-east of Sincox Lane, outside of any defined built-up area boundary. The site comprised a former commercial site, with the area currently unused and comprising hardstanding. The site is located approximately 4.5km north-east of West Chilton and approximately 5.8km north-west of Ashington. The wider area primarily consists of open countryside with a scattering of farm enterprises and sporadic residential development within the wider locality.

Seven letters of objection were received, 6 letters supported the proposal and Shipley Parish Council objected to the application.

The agent for the application spoke in support.

Members had concerns regarding the impact of the proposed development on the landscape and they felt that the applicant had not successfully demonstrated water neutrality.

It was proposed and seconded to vote on a motion to refuse the application on the grounds of impact to the landscape and lack of demonstrated water neutrality. This motion was lost.

Members then voted to approve the application as recommended in the report.

RESOLVED

That DC/23/2278 be delegated approval to the Head of Development in accordance with the officers amended recommendation to finalise conditions, given discussion is taking place regarding drainage.

PCN/71 **DC/23/2142 BOREHAM HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, RUDGWICK**

The Head of Development and Building Control reported that this application sought variation of conditions 1, 8, 9, 10 and 13 of the previously approved application DC/22/2048. The conditions related to plans, details of the air source heat pump, foul/surface water drainage, finished floor levels and arboriculture details. The nature of the variations sought were detailed in Section 6.

The application site comprises a large, detached dwelling known as Boreham House that is located within the built-up area boundary of Rudgwick. The site is located adjacent to the Rudgwick Conservation Area and lies close to a new residential/commercial development site at Windacres. There are several Grade II Listed Buildings close to the site.

Twenty-two letters of representation were received objecting to the proposal following the publication of the committee report a further letter of objection has also been received. Rudgwick Parish Council objected to the application.

Rudgwick Parish Council spoke in objection to the application as well as two members of the public. One speaker also spoke in objection, on behalf of Rudgwick Preservation Society. The agent spoke in support of the proposal.

Members discussed the detrimental impact of the development on the neighbouring trees due to the proximity, potential loss and site being within the root protection area. The proposal was also contrary to section 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy 33 of the Horsham District Council Planning Framework.

RESOLVED

That DC/23/2142 be refused in contrary to the officer recommendation for the following reason:

The proposed amendment, by virtue of its proximity to nearby trees would result in harm to the health and potential loss of the tree/s. The development is within the root protection area of a retained tree where development is undesirable, and in this case avoidable. This is contrary to Policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework and Paragraph 136 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).

PCN/72 **DC/22/2045 HOLME FARM ORCHARD, WINTERPIT LANE, MANNINGS HEATH, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development and Building Control reported that this application sought consent for the demolition of existing amenity building, removal of two yurts and associated infrastructure. Change of use of land to residential and erection of one single storey dwellinghouse incorporated into the landscape.

Holme Farm Orchard lies within a rural area on the southern side of Winterpit Lane, approximately 500m southeast of the built-up area boundary of Mannings Heath. The land to the north of Winterpit Lane lies within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Thirty-two letters of representation were received objecting to the proposal, including two from outside of the district. Thirteen letters of representation were received in support of the application, including one from outside the district.

Following the publication of the committee report Nuthurst Parish Council objected to the application and details were published in an addendum.

One member of the public spoke in objection to the application. The applicant and one member of the public spoke in support.

Members discussed the objections to the application noted in the report and raised concerns regarding the conversion of the yurts to a residential dwelling in the future. Additionally, some Members felt that they were not best placed to

make judgement on whether the application merited approval on the basis that the design was of exceptional quality as per Paragraph 48 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

RESOLVED

That DC/22/2045 be refused in line with officers' recommendation.

PCN/73 **DC/23/2074 HIGH WOOD HILLS SPORTS GROUND, WICKHURST LANE, BROADBRIDGE HEATH**

The Head of Development and Building Control reported that this application sought consent for stadium upgrades including additional capacity for 50 seated spectators, 50 standing spectators and spectator toilets. Construction of additional changing room. Installation of perimeter pitch fencing and alterations to existing stadium perimeter fencing. Additional turnstile adjacent to the existing one.

High Wood Hill Sports Ground is situated to the south of the Bridge Heath Leisure Centre and Indoor Bowls Club, within the Built-up Area boundary of Broadbridge Heath. It is bounded to the east by the slip road from the A24, to the south by the A281 link road, and to the west by residential development. There is a line of trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order along the northern site boundary. Beyond the leisure centre and bowls club to the north lies the Broadbridge Heath Tesco and car park.

Two neighbour letters of objection were received. Broadbridge Heath Parish Council raised no objection to the application.

Councillor James Brookes spoke as a member of the public on this item, then left the room for the duration of the discussion and did not vote.

Members discussed the positives of the infrastructure detailed in the application on the football club and were supportive of the recommendation.

RESOLVED

That DC/23/2074 be approved in accordance with officer recommendation.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN