

**Planning Committee (South)**  
**27 APRIL 2021**

Present: Councillors: Brian Donnelly (Chairman), Tim Lloyd (Vice-Chairman), John Blackall, Chris Brown, Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Paul Clarke, Michael Croker, Ray Dawe, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Lynn Lambert, Mike Morgan, Roger Noel, Bob Platt, Josh Potts, Kate Rowbottom, Jack Saheid, Jim Sanson, Diana van der Klugt, Claire Vickers and James Wright

PCS/83 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 9 March and 16 March were approved as correct records and would be signed by the Chairman.

PCS/84 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/20/2497 – Councillor Nigel Jupp advised that he had been contacted by a number of local residents, some of whom were known to him.

DC/20/2497 – Cllr Roger Noel advised that he had been contacted by a neighbouring resident in relation to the application.

DC/20/2497 – Cllr Paul Clarke advised that he had been contacted by a number of residents in relation to the application.

DC/20/2543 – Councillor James Wright declared that he was a frequent customer of the applicant, but this would not affect his judgment in determining the item.

DC/20/2494 – Councillor Nigel Jupp declared a personal interest because he is acquainted with the wife of one of the public speakers.

PCS/85 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCS/86 **APPEALS**

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

PCS/87 **DC/20/2497 - LANE TOP, NUTBOURNE ROAD, PULBOROUGH**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for the construction of two additional settled Gypsy accommodation site pitches. The proposal included the demolition of a stable building and the change of use of the land to allow for the additional pitches, including two parking spaces and a bin store. Access would be via the existing drive, with additional hardstanding to accommodate access and parking for the additional pitches.

Since publication of the report, Southern Water had confirmed that their concerns had been addressed and the amended block plan, showing areas of easement to the water supply main and to the sewer, was acceptable.

The application site was located outside the built-up area to the south of Nutbourne Road. It was historically used as an agricultural paddock, and more recently for two Gypsy pitches and one unrestricted dwelling. There were also a number of outbuildings along the boundary. The proposed two pitches would be located in the northern undeveloped part of the site. There was a cluster of residential dwellings nearby with open countryside beyond.

The Parish Council objected to the initial consultation in January and submitted two further consultation responses objecting to the proposal, following the applicant's submission of an amended plan. There had been 59 representations, from 33 households, objecting to the application. An objection from Codmore Against Rural Decline had also been received.

A highway safety report commissioned by Nutbourne residents, which rebutted the recommendations of the Highways Authority, had also been received.

An addendum to the report advised of a letter that Richard Buxton Solicitors had submitted, since publication of the report, objecting to the Highways Impacts section of the report and the weight officers have given to the Local Highways Authority consultation response. The addendum set out the officer's response.

Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. A representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection.

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; amenity impacts; and highways impacts. Members noted the planning history of the site.

Members raised a number of concerns about the proposal, including the raised topography of the site and how it related to nearby dwellings, and that the location was unsustainable in terms of access to amenities. In particular, Members discussed the length of the visibility splay to the west and were

concerned it was insufficient to allow for safe egress from the site. After careful consideration, the Committee concluded that the intensification of traffic movements caused by the proposal would have a detrimental impact on highway safety.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20/2497 be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development would result in an intensification of vehicles movements utilising the access, which due to the limited attainable visibility splay to the west would result in an unacceptable impact on highways safety. The proposed development would therefore be contrary to policies 40 and 23 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

PCS/88 **DC/20/2355 - WHITEOAKS, SHOREHAM ROAD, SMALL DOLE, HENFIELD**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for the change of use of land to residential curtilage and the retention of a detached garage that had been constructed to the north of the host dwelling. The extended curtilage was between a paddock and a number of rural buildings. The detached garage had a ridge height of over six metres and two roof dormer windows.

The application site was located north of the build-up area of Small Dole, within a ribbon development along the west side Shoreham Road, with open countryside beyond. There were a number of barns to the northwest of the site owned by the applicant, beyond which were two Gypsy pitches subject of Enforcement Notice reference EN/18/0080.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been ten representations from eight households 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 appearance; impact on amenity; and highways impacts. Members also noted the planning history of the site.

Members considered the garage's location within the wider site, its design and large scale and concluded that its relationship to the main dwelling and wider countryside was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20 2355 be refused for the following reasons:

The development, by reason of its size, scale and distance from the host dwelling relates unsympathetically to the subject dwelling and results in unacceptable impact on the surrounding area, contrary to Policies 26 and 28 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCS/89 **DC/20/2543 - PETROL FILLING STATION, LONDON ROAD, ASHINGTON**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for the removal of Condition 21a of previously approved application DC/14/1420. That permission was for a new service area (operating between the hours of 6am to 10pm) comprising a petrol filling station and ancillary shop, forecourt canopy, five pump islands, automatic car wash and associated service facilities.

Condition 21a related to operational hours and delivery times. The application sought to remove part (a), which restricted opening hours of the filling station retail unit and restaurant to 6.00am – 10.00pm so that there would be a 24 hour service.

The application site was located immediately north of the built-up area of Ashington between London Road and the A24 and comprised a triangular piece of land. In addition to the petrol station and shop, there was a car sales showroom and workshop (subject of planning approval DC/16/0643). There was hedging and trees along the boundaries and the nearest dwelling was approximately 80 metres to the west.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been 18 representations from 12 households objecting to the application and one in support. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant's agent 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; impacts on amenity; and highways considerations. It was confirmed that the officer's report took into account all dwellings in the area, including those recently built to the northwest.

Members considered the impact of the proposal on the amenity of neighbouring dwellings. They were concerned that the Environmental Noise Assessment submitted by the applicant was limited to the noise generated on-site only and did not include additional traffic movements. Concern was also raised regarding the impact of all-night lighting on neighbouring amenity and also its potential impact on the SDNP, which had Dark Sky Reserve status.

Members were also concerned that the proposal would lead to an increase in overnight lorry parking along the London Road.

Members weighed these concerns against the social and economic benefits to road users and nearby residents and after careful consideration concluded that the proposal was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20/2543 be refused for the following reasons:

The proposal, which would allow 24-hour operation of the Petrol Filling Station and ancillary shop, would result in unacceptable impact to the neighbouring properties through noise and light pollution, contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCS/90 **DC/20/2494 - LAND ADJOINING FIRTOPS, GROVE LANE, WEST CHILTINGTON**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought a minor material amendment to an existing planning permission for the erection of a two storey four bedroom dwelling with detached garage, through a variation of the approved plans. The proposed variation of Condition 1 related to the design, height and massing of the garage by replacing the pitched roof with a half hip barn style roof with the inclusion of two rear rooflights on its southwest elevation.

Members were advised that at paragraph 6.6 of the report, the increase in height of the garage roof was incorrectly put at 0.6 metres, and should read 0.3 metres.

The application site was located in the built-up area of West Chiltington Common, on the southern side of Grove Lane and east of Roundabout Lane in an area of residential properties in medium to large plots. The original garden of Firtops had been divided in two to accommodate the dwelling granted under DC/17/1499.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been 15 representations from 12 households objecting to the application. Two members of the public 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; character and appearance; and its impact on neighbouring amenity.

Members noted that the planning history of the site and concerns regarding possible future applications were not relevant to the determining of this particular application. They considered the extent of the impact of the revised garage on visual and neighbouring amenity and concluded that the modest change in height and design was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/20/2494 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

*The meeting closed at 5.20 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm*

CHAIRMAN