

Planning Committee (North)
7 JULY 2020

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

Apologies: Councillors: Leonard Crosbie

Also Present: Councillor Brian Donnelly

PCN/13 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2 June were approved as a correct record and would be signed by the Chairman at a later date.

PCN/14 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/20/0169: Whilst there were no declarations of interest for this item, the Chairman stated that all Committee members had been lobbied by parties both in support of and in objection to the application.

TPO/1528: Councillor Billy Greening declared a personal interest because he sometimes plays cricket at the Roffey Cricket Club.

PCN/15 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/16 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/17 **DC/19/1723 - LAND AT LYONS FARM, LYONS ROAD, SLINFOLD**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought outline permission for the erection of a continuing care retirement community with new means of site access onto A264 Five Oaks Road. Indicative proposals included: 17 extra care bungalows; 82 extra care cottages; 88 extra care apartments (not 108 as incorrectly stated in the printed report); and a 60-bedroom care home. Matters for consideration under this outline application

were the principle of the development and access, with all other matters reserved for future determination.

The application site was located outside the Broadbridge Heath built-up area boundary on the north side of Lyons Road and west of the A264. It comprised flat arable fields, with the River Adur running past the site to the west.

Members were advised of updated draft Head of Terms from the applicant, as set out in the addendum to the report. These included confirmation of C2 Use Class Restriction and the affordable housing offer.

Slinfold Parish Council and Broadbridge Heath Parish Council both strongly objected to the application. The report set out the following public consultation responses: five letters of support had been received from NHS practitioners; there had been 39 representations objecting to the application; and a petition signed by 34 individuals objection to the proposal.

The addendum to the report updated the number of representations received. Since publication of the report an additional 85 letters/emails of support had been received, only one of which was from within the District, and 14 additional objections. An additional representation had also been received from Slinfold Parish Council.

Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. Two members of the public and a representative of the applicant's agent addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. Representatives of Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath Parish Councils both 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 in relation to the need for housing and extra care provision; use class and affordable housing; character and appearance of the surrounding area; accessibility and highway safety; and flood risk and drainage.

Members discussed whether the location would be appropriate for such a development and weighed the benefits of the scheme against the harm, including concerns regarding coalescence between Slinfold and Broadbridge Heath and the resulting impact on the landscape. After careful consideration, Members concluded that the adverse impact of the proposal would significantly outweigh the benefits.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/19/1723 be refused for the reasons as set out in the report.

PCN/18 **DC/20/0687 - 15 EYLES CLOSE, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the conversion of a communal area into one specialised care flat and the conversion of the first floor 4-bedroom caretaker's flat into two 1-bedroom flats. The integrated garage would become part of the ground floor conversion.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Horsham and was a detached property in a large plot within the close, which had a mix of terraced and semi-detached dwellings under Saxon Weald ownership.

The Parish Council had not commented on the application. There had been eleven representations objecting 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; design and appearance; amenity impacts; and highways considerations.

Members noted that the proposed replacement community facility was further from Eyles Close and Albery Close than the application site and Members considered it important for Saxon Weald to do what they can to ensure less mobile residents would be able to visit the new community facility.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20/0687 be determined by the Head of Development, with a view to approval, subject to the completion of a legal agreement to secure affordable housing units.

PCN/19 **DC/20/0761 - THE STABLES, BROADWATER LANE, COPSALE**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of an office building, which has been vacant since 2017, and erection of an L shaped single storey dwelling

The application site was located outside the built-up area boundary east of Broadwater Lane. The surrounding area was characterised by sporadic residential dwellings in open countryside.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been no further public consultation responses received. 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 and the permitted Prior Notification for conversion of the existing

building; design and appearance; amenity impacts; highways impacts; and climate change.

Members considered the proposal in the context of current planning policy and the extant permission for conversion from office space to a dwelling. They were concerned that the impact of the proposal on the character of the area would be significantly greater than that of the extant permission, given the scale of the proposal when compared to the existing structure.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20/0761 refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development, by reason of its scale, doubling the size of the existing structure, represents an overdevelopment of the site harmful to the character of the area contrary to policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 26 and 32 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015)

PCN/20 **TPO/1528 - ROFFEY CRICKET CLUB, CRAWLEY ROAD, HORSHAM**

The Head of Development reported that this application sought to confirm Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 1528. A provisional TPO was served on 30 January 2020 to give immediate protection to seven oak trees at Roffey Cricket Club.

The trees were along the eastern and northern boundaries of the cricket field, north of Crawley Road. Some of the trees were in the vicinity of residential dwellings.

There was one consultation response in support of the TRO if it improved their level of maintenance. One consultation response objected to the protection of five of the trees because of the lateral overhang across the boundary of their property. One member of the public spoke in objection to the proposed TPO.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which included the condition and location of the trees. It was noted that the TRO would not prevent any person applying for consent to trim the trees in a manner that would not imbalance or cause harm to the trees' value. Officers confirmed that the Council's Arboricultural Officer was engaging with the Cricket Club regarding the management of the trees.

RESOLVED

That TPO 1528 on seven oak trees be confirmed, for the reasons as reported.

The meeting closed at 7.48 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN