

Planning Committee (North)
5 NOVEMBER 2019

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

Apologies: Councillors: Andrew Baldwin, Alan Britten, Leonard Crosbie, Colin Minto and Belinda Walters

PCN/43 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1 October were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PCN/44 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

PCN/45 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/46 **APPEALS**

The list of appeals lodged and appeal decisions, as circulated, was noted. There were no appeals in progress during this period.

PCN/47 **DC/19/1205 - KINGFISHER FARM, WEST CHILTINGTON LANE, BILLINGSHURST**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for a change of use of land for the stationing of 11 pitches for residential purposes to contain 11 static caravans, 11 touring caravans, 11 dayrooms, parking for associated vehicles, hard standing and associated infrastructure.

The application site lay in open countryside, it formed the eastern part of the field, and was linked to West Chiltington Lane to the west by a hard surfaced track along the northern field boundary. The eastern part of the Kingfisher Farm field, which was the part of the field subject to this application, had been developed as a caravan site for use by the gypsy and traveller community.

Since publication of the report Itchingfield Parish Council had submitted a formal objection stating that it considered the District Council should decline to determine this application under Section 70 (c) Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and if the Council were minded to determine it, invited the District Council to refuse permission on the basis that: it is outside the built-up area boundary and it had not been demonstrated that it was essential to its countryside location; the development would have an unacceptable impact on the landscape character of the surrounding area; and the application was not supported by adequate evidence to conclude the development preserved the qualities of the listed Pear Tree Farmhouse.

Members were also advised that the Council's Environmental Health and Compliance officer had visited the site that day and confirmed that seven of the 11 units were provided with the correct specification for drainage.

The applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the application. A representative of the Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

Members considered the officer's recommendation to determine the planning application under Section 70 (c) and then the officer's recommendation on the planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were:

- The principle of development
- Effect on the character and appearance of the surrounding area
- Whether the proposal, in combination with other pitches, would dominate the nearest settled community and was reasonably located for schools, shops and other local services and community facilities
- Whether a need for site provision existed locally
- If harm arose, whether it was outweighed by other material considerations including the general need for and provision of sites, the availability of alternatives, and any personal circumstances.

Members also gave consideration to the enforcement and planning history of the site. Members gave consideration that, until a new Gypsy and Traveller policy was adopted by the Council, the Council was unable to demonstrate a five-year land supply of deliverable Gypsy and Traveller pitches.

A Local Member raised concerns regarding the history of the site and considered the proposal to be harmful to the landscape character. It was proposed and seconded that the application be refused. The motion was lost.

It was proposed and seconded that the proposal be subject to a temporary consent for two years. The motion was lost.

A Local Member proposed an amendment to regulatory conditions 2, 3 and 4 to reduce the required timescale for these conditions to 4 months instead of 6 months. The motion was carried.

RESOLVED

That Planning Application DC/19/1205 be granted subject to the amendment to the conditions 2, 3 and 4 to require details / works to be submitted / implemented and completed within 4 months.

PCN/48 **DC/19/1229 - BOREHAM HOUSE, CHURCH STREET, RUDGWICK**

The Head of Development reported that this development sought permission for the erection of two 2-storey detached dwellings with associated parking and garage, landscaping and creation of hard standing. The original application had been amended from three dwellings to two in order to address concerns regarding overdevelopment.

The application site comprised a large detached dwelling known as Boreham House that was located within the built-up area boundary of Rudgwick. The site was adjacent to the Rudgwick Conservation Area.

Rudgwick Parish Council objected to the application on the grounds that the footprint of the dwellings was too large and the resulting overdevelopment was not in keeping with the area.

A total of 47 letters of objection were received from 26 separate households. 38 of these were received prior to the amended plans being submitted, with an additional seven letters received as part of the re-consultation process.

One member of the public spoke in objection to the application 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.

Matters for consideration under this application were:

- Principle of development
- Design and Appearance
- Heritage impact
- Existing trees
- Amenity impacts
- Highways impact
- Ecology

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1229 be approved subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/49 **DC/19/1345 - GLOBAL HOUSE, MARKET SQUARE, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought planning permission for the demolition of the remains of an ancillary outbuilding and the erection of a new single storey ancillary outbuilding to the rear of the main property.

The application related to a Grade II listed building on the eastern side of Market Square in Horsham.

Denne neighbourhood Council objected to the application. A total of 19 letters of objection had been received.

Two members of the public spoke in objection to the application, and to listed building consent application DC/19/1537 which was also being determined by the Committee. A representative of Denne Neighbourhood Council spoke in objection to both applications.

Matters for consideration under this application were the use of the proposed outbuilding structure, the design, appearance and impact on listed buildings and conservation area, the impact on neighbouring amenity, highways and parking considerations and impact on trees.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1345 be refused for the following reason:

That the proposal was an inappropriate and cramped form of development resulting in overdevelopment of the site which was harmful to the character and historic setting of Horsham Conservation Area. The proposal was therefore contrary to Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/50 **DC/19/1537 - 13 GLOBAL HOUSE, MARKET SQUARE, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought listed building consent for the demolition of the remains of an ancillary outbuilding and the erection of a new single storey ancillary outbuilding to the rear of the main property.

The application site was a Grade II listed building on the eastern side of Market Square in Horsham.

Denne Neighbourhood Council objected to the application. A total of four letters of objection had been received.

Two members of the public spoke in objection to the application, and to application DC/19/1345 which was also being determined by the Committee. A representative of Denne Neighbourhood Council spoke in objection to both applications.

Matters for consideration under this outline application were the design, appearance and impact on the listed building.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1537 be refused for the following reason:

Insufficient evidence had been submitted to demonstrate that the proposal would not detrimentally damage the historic wall. The proposal was therefore considered to have a harmful impact on the listed property and was contrary to Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/51 **DC/19/0860 - THE ROYAL OAK, FRIDAY STREET, RUSPER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of a disused public house and erection of two semi-detached two storey dwellings with garages. The dwellings would be parallel to Friday Street, set back approximately four metres from the road.

The application site was positioned to the south of Friday Street, outside of any defined built-up area boundary and therefore within the countryside in policy terms.

Rusper Parish Council supported the application but asked for the highest standard of energy efficiency to be required. There had been no other representations in response to the public consultation.

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; heritage impacts; amenity impacts; and highways.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/0860 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/52 **DC/19/1738 - PHASE 4, OAKHURST BUSINESS PARK, WILBERFORCE WAY, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for a variation of Condition 1 to previously approved DC/17/1023 for the erection of eight business units arranged in two groups. The amendment sought to increase the ground floor area and add mezzanine floors to four of the units, and extend the mezzanine floor on the other four units. The variation also proposed a reconfiguration of parking to accommodate all spaces within the site service yard.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Southwater within the established business park, which was a Key Employment Area. The site

and its immediate neighbours were owned by the Council. A bund with dense vegetation surrounded the southwest and northwest boundaries and screened the site from the Worthing Road and nearby properties.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been two representations objecting 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 and highways impacts.

Members considered the impact of the increased floor space and were advised that the parking provision would be adequate and any increase in traffic movements would not be significant.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1738 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/53 **DC/19/1801 - 10 BEAVER CLOSE, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the removal of a conservatory and the erection of a single storey side extension with a pitched roof, to provide for two additional bedrooms.

The application site was located at the west end of Beaver Close, a cul-de-sac of two storey dwellings in North Horsham.

The Parish Council raised no objection to the application. There had been one representation from the adjacent property 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: design and appearance; impact on amenity; and parking.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1801 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN