

Development Management (South) Committee
18 OCTOBER 2016

Present: Councillors: Brian O'Connell (Chairman), Paul Clarke (Vice-Chairman), Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Roger Clarke, David Coldwell, Brian Donnelly, David Jenkins, Nigel Jupp, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Jim Sanson, Ben Staines, Claire Vickers and Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: John Blackall, Ray Dawe, Liz Kitchen, Gordon Lindsay and Kate Rowbottom

DMS/51 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20th September were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DMS/52 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

DMS/53 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DMS/54 **APPEALS**

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

DMS/55 **DC/16/0731 - LAND NORTH EAST OF GLEBELANDS, PULBOROUGH (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT: MR DAVID MORRIS**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the development of up to 100 dwellings, new internal access road (including the re-alignment of Drovers Lane) and associated infrastructure. Matters for consideration under this outline application were the principle of the development and access from Glebelands, with all other matters reserved for future determination. The scheme would make provision for policy compliant levels of affordable housing.

The applicant had indicated a number of housing parcels around the access roads interspersed with three landscaping belts to separate four different character areas. Existing planting to the east would be retained, there would be

a new hedgerow along the northern boundary, and a line of mature poplars within the site would be removed.

A majority of buildings would be two and a half storeys, with some two storey buildings near the southern boundary. Attenuation basins to the south providing green open space between the development and existing dwellings were proposed. There would be a pedestrian route along the southern boundary linking with the public footpath on the western side of the site, together with a children's play area close to the western boundary.

The application site was located outside the built-up area on the northern edge of Pulborough, north of Drovers Lane. Woodland and planting to the west screened a public right of way. New Place Nursery, adjacent to the eastern and northern boundaries, used the site for storing and growing plants. Pulborough railway station was approximately 1.9 kilometres to the south-west.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. There was no planning history relevant to the site.

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, but raised no objection to the principle of developing up to 50 dwellings on the site. Fifty-two letters of objection had been received. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant and the applicant's agent 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; impact on the landscape; noise; highways; drainage; infrastructure; neighbour amenities; ecology; and housing.

Members concluded that the proposal would lead to unsustainable development in the countryside, contrary to policies within the National Planning Policy Framework and the Horsham District Planning Framework.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/0731 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development is located in the countryside, outside the defined built-up area boundary of Pulborough on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. This scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the

main settlements. Furthermore the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. Consequently it represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraphs 7, 14, and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

- 02 The NPPF and Policy 16 require the provision of affordable housing on sites such as this, whilst Policy 39 requires new development to meet additional infrastructure requirements arising from the new development. Both the provision of affordable housing and contributions to infrastructure improvements/provision must be secured by way of a Legal Agreement. No completed Agreement is in place and therefore there is no means by which to secure these Policy requirements. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), paragraph 50 of the NPPF, and the Horsham District Local Development Framework Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document.

DMS/56 **DC/16/0543 - HOMELANDS NURSING HOME, HORSHAM ROAD, COWFOLD (WARD: COWFOLD, SHERMANBURY & WEST GRINSTEAD) APPLICANT: MEDICREST LIMITED**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the construction of a dementia care home for 32 residents within the grounds of Homelands Nursing Home. This would replace an annex used as a specialist dementia care unit for 15 residents that would be demolished. The two storey building would have 32 en-suite rooms and a number of communal facilities. There would be two conservatories, and large windows on all elevations. A new service road and parking was also proposed.

The application site was located outside the built-up area and comprised Homelands Nursing Home set in eleven acres of grounds. The home accommodated 35 residents plus the 15 residents in the annex. The site was about one kilometre north of Cowfold and was accessed from the A281 along a drive that was shared with five properties.

The boundaries to the north and east were well screened by trees and vegetation, with open fields and countryside beyond the site. The High Weald AONB was approximately one kilometre to the east.

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 raised no objection to the application. One letter 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 in this location; design; its impact on the character of the surrounding area and landscape; amenity of nearby residents; access and parking; and drainage.

Whilst Members considered that additional dementia care facilities would benefit the District, they were mindful that the applicant had not supplied any justification or proven need for additional residential care in this location. It was also considered that the external appearance of the proposal was not in keeping with its countryside setting.

Members concluded that the proposal should be deferred to give the applicant the opportunity to provide justification for the proposal, and to amend the appearance of the building.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/0543 be deferred to allow for additional information to be submitted to justify the need for the facility in this location, and to allow for improvements to the design of the proposed building.

DMS/57 DC/16/1252 - LITTLE THATCH, VERAS WALK, STORRINGTON (WARD: CHANTRY) APPLICANT: MR WATTS-WILLIAMS

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of one single storey 3-bedroom dwelling on land that comprised the garden of Little Thatch, with a new vehicular access from Veras Walk. The new access would be shared with the host property. The dwelling would be L-shaped with habitable openings facing south and east over its own garden area.

The host property's existing garage would be demolished to allow for the driveway to the new dwelling along the western boundary, and a replacement garage to the front of Little Thatch was proposed. The proposal had been amended to move the parking area back from the front of the new dwelling and to include a planting strip alongside the new driveway.

The application site was located to the east of Veras Walk (a dead-end lane off Sanctuary Lane) which was characterised by detached houses in irregular shaped plots. There was a variety of architectural styles and buildings including bungalows and two-storey houses in a range of sizes. The front boundaries in the vicinity ranged from dense boundary planting to open, unplanted and paved boundaries. Little Thatch was a post-war thatched bungalow in a garden of irregular shape. The site's current driveway was shared with the adjacent dwelling Pinehurst.

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.

Councillor Brian O'Connell advised the Committee that, whilst he lived on the same road as the applicant, he was not well acquainted with him and had no personal or prejudicial interest in the application.

It was confirmed at the meeting that Washington Parish Council (not Storrington Parish Council as printed in the report) objected to the application. Twenty-nine letters of objection (not 209 as printed in the report) had been received, and the Heath Common Residents Association had also objected to the scheme. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant 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; its impact on the setting of the area; neighbouring amenity; and highways considerations.

Members considered aspects of the proposal, including the unique character of the Heath Common area, design, the amenity of nearby residents; how the proposed plot related to the adjoining plots, and traffic.

After careful consideration Members concluded that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the character and setting of the area of Heath Common and was therefore unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1252 be determined by the Development Manager with a view to refusing permission, on the grounds that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the setting and character of the area.

DMS/58 **DC/16/1564 - LAND WEST OF NUTBOURNE LANE, NUTBOURNE LANE, NUTBOURNE (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT: MRS TICEHURST**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the creation of a new gated vehicular access, off Nutbourne Lane, to a vineyard located in the north-western corner of the site. The proposal would provide improved vehicular access to the site with enhanced visibility for vehicles. The development would require a small area of the raised bank bounding the field to be excavated. The existing gated access to the north-eastern corner of the site,

which formed part of a public right of way, would remain accessible to pedestrians only.

The application site was located outside the built-up area approximately one kilometre north of Nutbourne, surrounded by open countryside and a separate vineyard to the north. The site comprised a 1.2 acre vineyard in an eleven acre plot. There was thick foliage on the western boundary.

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 external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Five letters of objection had been received.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: its visual impact on the countryside; highway safety; and rural economic development.

Members considered the siting of the new access in the context of road safety and the rural setting and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1564 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMS/59 **DC/16/1147 - BANAVIE, LORDINGS LANE, WEST CHILTINGTON (WARD: CHANCTONBURY) APPLICANT: MR MICHAEL MASON**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for alterations and extensions to the roof of a bungalow to form a two-storey chalet bungalow with integral garage. The proposal would increase the ridge height by 1.3 metres, and the alterations included barn end and hipped extensions, dormer windows, and the installation of rooflights. A side conservatory would be removed.

The proposal included the demolition of a detached garage to the side of the property and its replacement with a side extension and canopy, creating a loggia. A pitched roof porch canopy over the existing main entrance was proposed. The application had been amended in response to officer concerns regarding the scale and bulk of the proposal and potential impact on neighbouring properties.

The application site was located in the built-up area of West Chiltington Common on the south-western side of Lordings Lane, which was a private road accessed from Haglands Lane to the north and Smock Alley to the south. The

surrounding area included detached bungalows and dwellings in a variety of styles and positions within their plots.

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

The Parish Council objected to the application. Objections had been received from ten separate households: nine letters had been received in response to the initial consultation, and a further seven letters had been received objecting to the amended plans. Two members of the public spoke in objection to the application and 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 character of the dwelling and its impact on the visual amenities of the area; and the amenities of the occupiers of adjacent properties. It was noted that concerns regarding the proximity of the garage doors to the neighbouring boundary would be addressed through Condition 4, which required hard and soft landscaping details to be approved prior to commencement of the development.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1147 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMS/60 **DC/16/1803 - SHAW COTTAGE, BLACKSTONE LANE, BLACKSTONE, HENFIELD (WARD: BRAMBER, UPPER BEEDING & WOODMANCOTE) APPLICANT: MR KEITH TOOGOOD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to a later barn edition, which would form a kitchen and living space with bedroom above. Internal alterations to alter the layout of a ground floor bedroom and provide a shower room on the first floor were also proposed. The extension would incorporate a two storey element to the east and flat roof addition to the south.

The extension would incorporate a full height glazed link to separate the main structure from the barn, and include a half-hipped roof extending to an overall height of 7.4 metres. A single storey flat roof addition, extending from the two storey extension, was also proposed.

The application site was located outside the built-up area to the east of Blackstone Lane and was a Grade II Listed Building with an attached Sussex barn which was re-located to the site from elsewhere in the District approximately 16 years ago.

The dwelling was in a relatively large site bound by mature hedging to the south and west, and post and rail fencing open to the surrounding countryside to the

north. The neighbouring properties to the south were approximately 30 metres away and were separated from the site with mature hedging.

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 Design and Conservation Officer, which referred to this application and Listed Building application DC/16/1804, as contained within the report, was considered by the Committee.

The Parish Council raised no objection to this application or Listed Building application DC/16/1804. Eight letters supporting both applications had been received. Both the applicant's agent and the architect spoke in support of the applications and the applicant also addressed the Committee in their support.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: its impact on the character, appearance and significance of the Listed Building; and the impact on the amenity of neighbouring occupants.

Members considered the scale and design of the proposal and noted that the site was hardly visible from the public highway. Members discussed the previous barn extension, that they considered to be a sympathetic addition to the original building, and concluded that the proposal, by way of its modern and glazed design, would not present a pastiche of the original design, but stand as a distinctive addition that would not have an overbearing or harmful impact upon the special character and distinctiveness of the listed building.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1803 be determined by the Development Manager to allow for the framing of conditions. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

DMS/61 **DC/16/1804 - SHAW COTTAGE, BLACKSTONE LANE, BLACKSTONE, HENFIELD (WARD: BRAMBER, UPPER BEEDING & WOODMANCOTE)**
APPLICANT: MR KEITH TOOGOOD

The Development Manager reported that this application sought Listed Building Consent for the erection of a two-storey rear extension to a later barn edition, which would form a kitchen and living space with bedroom above. Details of the proposal and its location were set out under Household Planning Application DC/16/1803, which was also considered by the Committee.

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 Design and Conservation Officer, which referred to this application and Householder application DC/16/1803, as

contained within the report, was considered by the Committee. One member of the public spoke in support of both applications and the applicant and the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in their support.

The Parish Council raised no objection to this application or Householder application DC/16/1803. Eight letters supporting both applications had been received. Both the applicant's agent and the architect spoke in support of the applications and the applicant also addressed the Committee in their support.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issue for consideration in determining the proposal was the impact of the proposal on the character, appearance and significance of the Listed Building.

Members considered the scale and design of the proposal and noted that the site was hardly visible from the public highway. Members discussed the previous barn extension, that they considered to be a sympathetic addition to the original building, and concluded that the proposal, by way of its modern and glazed design, would not present a pastiche of the original design, but stand as a distinctive addition that would not have an overbearing or harmful impact upon the special character and distinctiveness of the listed building.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1804 be determined by the Development Manager to allow for the framing of conditions. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

The meeting closed at 5.02 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm

CHAIRMAN