

Planning Committee (South)
17 JANUARY 2017

Present: Councillors: Brian O'Connell (Chairman), Paul Clarke (Vice-Chairman), John Blackall, Philip Circus, David Coldwell, Ray Dawe, Brian Donnelly, David Jenkins, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Claire Vickers and Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: Jonathan Chowen, Roger Clarke and Ben Staines

PCS/84 **MINUTES**

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

PCS/85 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/14/2694 – Councillor Philip Circus declared a personal interest because he was a customer of the applicant's business.

DC/16/2279 – Councillor Tim Lloyd declared a personal interest because he knew one of the public speakers.

PCS/86 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCS/87 **APPEALS**

The list of appeals lodged, appeals in progress and appeal decisions, as circulated, was noted. The Development Manager confirmed that the dismissal of Appeal DC/14/0588, Sandgate Nursery, West End Lane, Henfield, indicated significant support for the policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework with regard to determining applications outside the BUAB (built-up area boundary).

PCS/88 **DC/16/2388 - PARSONS FIELD STABLES, PICKHURST LANE, PULBOROUGH (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT: MR JACK COLE**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought part retrospective temporary planning permission to change the use of land to a caravan site for up to three caravans for gypsy-traveller family occupation, together with a timber utility shed, utility trailer, septic tank, hard standing and landscaping.

The application also sought to extend the red edged application site, granted temporary permission until the end of 2019 under DC/09/2130, for the siting of two caravans for a single gypsy family with timber shed and hard standing.

The application site was in a rural location south of Pickhurst Lane. Leylandii trees had been planted along the northern boundary fence and hedgerow ran along the boundary to Pickhurst Lane. There were public footpaths close to the site, and the boundary of the South Downs National Park was some 175 metres to the west. Whitehall Cottage, a grade II listed building, was north-east of the site, on the opposite side of Pickhurst Lane. There was a static mobile home, outbuilding, utility trailer, barn and touring caravan on the site.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Members also considered details of the relevant planning history connected to the site.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee. Members were advised that the site had been formally put forward for consideration as an official Gypsy and Traveller site for inclusion in the Site Allocations DPD (Development Plan Document).

The Parish Council objected to the application. Fourteen letters of objection, including one from the Wiggonholt Association and one from the Pulborough Society, had been received. Three members of the public, and a representative of the Parish Council, spoke in objection to the application. 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; landscape character; sustainable development; its impact on neighbouring properties; and highways considerations.

Members discussed their concerns regarding the sustainability of the site and its impact on the character of the area and weighed these against the benefit of addressing the need for additional Gypsy and Traveller accommodation sites in the district. Members considered the application in the context of the Site Allocations DPD (Development Plan Document), which was being developed for implementation before the end of 2019, and concluded that a temporary permission until the end of 2019 would be acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2388 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

**PULBOROUGH (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT:
MR A STALLY**

The Development Manager reminded Members that this application (for the demolition of a shop, work shop and store and the erection of a building containing a retail shop, workshop and store, and three 1-bedroom flats within the second floor roof space) had been approved by the Committee in February 2016, subject to the removal of certain conditions and the completion of a legal agreement.

The proposal was to be reconsidered because the applicant had refused to agree the terms of the legal agreement, which sought to ensure the flats remained in the same ownership as the shop and workshop.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Pulborough on the southern side of London Road. 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.

Since publication of the report a petition signed by fourteen neighbouring residents objecting to the application had been received. The applicant and a representative of the Parish Council both addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered whether the additional condition to restrict hours of use of the commercial business would be required to protect the residential amenities of future and neighbouring occupiers, and whether such a condition would materially harm the operation of the business, due to the seasonal nature of its work. After careful consideration Members concluded that the restrictive nature of Condition 13 would harm the well-established business which had operated from the site for a number of years without having an adverse impact on the amenity of the area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/14/2694 be granted subject to conditions 1 to 12 as reported, and the removal of Condition 13 regarding hours of use.

PCS/90 **DC/16/1664 - CROSSWINDS, HAMPERS LANE, STORRINGTON (WARD:
CHANTRY) APPLICANT: MR MERRICK**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of a dwelling and construction of two detached 5-bedroom dwellings with garages. Whilst all matters were reserved for future approval, the applicant had indicated that the site would be divided into a northern and southern plot, with access from the north-east corner of the site onto Hampers Lane.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Storrington and Sullington in an area of low density housing set in spacious wooded plots. The site was set back a considerable distance from Hampers Lane, accessed via an unmade track. The existing chalet-bungalow was to the north of the site, the remainder being a garden largely enclosed by substantial vegetation.

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. Letters of objection from ten addresses had been received. Four members of the public spoke in objection to the application, and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection. The applicant and an advisor to the applicant both 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; character and appearance of the area; impact on neighbouring amenity; and highways.

Members discussed the special character of Heath Common and the restrictive nature of the local highway infrastructure and concluded that the replacement of one modest building with two 5-bedroom dwellings would have a harmful impact on the special character of the area and on the existing highway infrastructure.

It was suggested that the area could be designated as a Residential Area of Special Character (RASC) as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1664 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development would represent an overdevelopment of the site which would cause harm to the special character of this part of Hampers Lane, contrary to Policies 25, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.
- 02 The proposed development would increase the highways movements associated with the site, causing additional stress on local highway infrastructure, contrary to Policy 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

PCS/91 **DC/16/2279 - WEST WINDS, BRIGHTON ROAD, WOODMANCOTE (WARD: BRAMBER, UPPER BEEDING & WOODMANCOTE) APPLICANT: MR AND MRS ROSS AND SHARON DOUGLAS**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for a 5-bedroom two-storey dwelling. The proposed new building line was set forward from that of the current dwelling, a 4-bedroom Tudor-style building which would be demolished. The triple bay garage and two vehicular entrances to the site would be unaffected. An annexe to the east would be updated to reflect the contemporary design of the proposed new dwelling.

The application site was located outside the built-up area of Woodmancote on the south side of the A281, about two kilometres east of Henfield. There were clear views of the South Downs National Park to the south. Adjoining properties were predominately detached two-storey dwellings. A grade II listed building, Nutknowle Farm, was separated by two intervening dwellings. Properties to the north were well screened by vegetation.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Members noted the planning history of the site, in particular permission DC/16/0494 for a two storey rear and side extension to the existing building.

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. Sixteen letters of support, three from nearby properties, had been received. Both the applicants addressed the Committee in support of the proposal, and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in support of 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; its impact on visual amenity; impact on neighbours; the removal of the copper beech, which had an Emergency Tree Preservation Order placed on it in December 2016; and highways and parking. Members also considered the local support for the proposal.

Members considered the design and mass of the replacement dwelling and how it compared to the approved DC/16/0494 and concluded that, given the secluded nature and large scale of the site, the application was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2279 be determined by the Development Manager for the framing of conditions. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

PCS/92 **DC/16/2538 - THE PIGGERY, WEST END LANE, HENFIELD (WARD: HENFIELD) APPLICANT: MR AND MRS LEE MCCATTY**

The Development Manager reported that this application was a resubmission of application DC/16/1356, which had sought permission for the demolition of a dwelling and the erection of a 4-bedroom live/work dwelling with continued B1 light industrial use. The dwelling would be single storey with a pitched roof accommodating attic space, and would include two oak gable features. This had been refused by the Committee in September 2016 (Minute No. DMS/48 (20.09.16) refers).

The resubmitted scheme had not been amended, but additional information had been supplied by the applicant to show development on the site in 2003, and a Unilateral Undertaking tying the proposed dwelling to the commercial use of the site had been submitted.

The application site was located outside the built-up area of Henfield to the rear of a ribbon of residential development along West End Lane. The surrounding landscape included an orchard and a number of mature trees, with open countryside to the south. A local joinery business operated from the site, which comprised three workshops and two sheds used for storage.

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. Seventeen letters of support had been received. The applicant and the applicant's agent both 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 residential development outside the built-up area; the character of the site and its surroundings; amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and parking and traffic conditions.

Members considered whether the additional information supplied by the applicant overcame the reason for refusal of DC/16/1356, namely the construction of a residential property, which was not essential to its location, outside the built-up area boundary.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2538 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development is located in the countryside, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this proposed development would be contrary to

the overarching strategy and hierarchy 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, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

The meeting closed at 5.10 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm

CHAIRMAN