

Planning Committee (North)
7 SEPTEMBER 2021

Present: Councillors: Karen Burgess (Chairman), Liz Kitchen (Vice-Chairman), Matthew Allen, Andrew Baldwin, Tony Bevis, Martin Boffey, Roy Cornell, Christine Costin, Brian Donnelly, Ruth Fletcher, Billy Greening, Frances Haigh, Tony Hogben, Lynn Lambert, Gordon Lindsay, Christian Mitchell, Louise Potter, Stuart Ritchie, David Skipp, Claire Vickers and Belinda Walters

Apologies: Councillors: Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, Peter Burgess, Richard Landeryou, John Milne, Colin Minto, Ian Stannard and Tricia Youtan

PCN/29 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 July were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

PCN/30 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/21/1524 – Councillor Claire Vickers declared a personal interest in this item because of the proximity of the site to her home.

DC/21/1524 – Councillor Billy Greening declared a personal interest in this item because he was a member of the Bluecoat's Gym.

DC/21/0625 – Councillor Claire Vickers declared a personal interest in this item because she knew one of the objectors.

PCN/31 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

PCN/32 **APPEALS**

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

PCN/33 **DC/21/1524 - CHRIST'S HOSPITAL SCHOOL, THE AVENUE, CHRIST'S HOSPITAL**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for various additional sports and recreation facilities, as detailed in the report, additional car parking and landscaping.

Members were advised of two corrections to the report: the time period sought for the commencement of the development set out in Condition 2 was to be five

years, not three; and, at paragraph 1.18, the net increase of eight metres in hedgerows was between the initial proposal in 2018 and the current scheme. The actual increase in hedgerow length would be some 553 metres.

The application was a re-submission of application DC/19/1149, which had been refused on landscape grounds by the Committee in September 2019 (Minute No PCN/34 (03.09.19) refers.). The applicant had sought to address the reason for refusal by submitting a further Landscape and Visual Appraisal. The re-submitted scheme was very similar to the refused one, with additional tree planting, as recommended in the LVA, and 47 electric vehicle charging points.

The applicants had also lodged an appeal. This had been delayed until November and the current application sought a quicker less costly route to obtaining permission.

The application site was located outside and adjacent to the built-up area boundary of Christ's Hospital. It was grassland used for sports pitches in the summer months in the northern part of the school campus. The sports centre was used by the school and members of the public. Properties in Barnes Wallis Avenue and Bluecoat Ponds were close to the northwest boundary.

The Parish Council objected to the application. There had been 26 representations objecting to the application, one neutral, and two in support. Two of the objections had been received since publication of the report; these related to issues addressed in the report. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. The applicant, applicant's agent and the applicant's Transport Consultant all addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members noted the planning history of the site and considered the consultation responses and the officer's planning assessment. Key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the principle of development and assessment of the benefits; landscape impacts and trees; design, layout and specification of the proposed facilities; heritage; highways considerations; amenity impact including noise and lighting; drainage; and ecology.

Members assessed the benefits of the scheme to both the school and wider community and weighed these against a number of concerns raised by Councillors and members of the public.

Whilst it was acknowledged that the Highways Authority had not objected, Members were concerned at the impact of traffic generated by the scheme, including the impact of construction traffic and of large occasional events that may be arranged by the school. The need to address drainage concerns was also discussed.

A number of amendments to the conditions attached to the report were proposed to address these concerns. The proposal was seconded. Members concluded that with these amended and additional conditions the proposal was acceptable.

It was also agreed that an **Informative** would be added to the decision notice requesting that the applicant work positively with the Highways Authority and Horsham District Council to investigate cycle and pedestrian safety improvement solutions should evidence demonstrate that the development was impacting on users of the nearby roads.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/21/1524 be granted subject to the following amendments and additions to the conditions as set out in the report:

- i) Condition 2 to be amended to a 5-year commencement.
- ii) The details pursuant to Conditions 4 (Construction Environment Management Plan) and 13 (Event Management Plan) to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Local Members
- iii) The addition of a surface water drainage condition, with the details to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Local Members.
- iv) The addition of a condition to prevent the importation of spoil (soil and other fill materials) onto the site.
- v) The details pursuant to Condition 18 (cycle parking) to be agreed in consultation with the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and Local Members.

PCN/34 **DC/21/0625 - PHASE 4, UNIT 22 - 29 OAKHURST BUSINESS PARK,
WILBERFORCE WAY, SOUTHWATER**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for a variation of Condition 15 of permission DC/19/1738, which related to permission DC/17/1023 for eight business units.

Condition 15 related to the hours of operation permitted on the site. The variation would extend hours of operation until 9.00pm Mondays to Friday (instead of 6.00pm) and to 6.00pm on weekends and public holidays (instead of 1.00pm).

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.

There had been three public consultations: the first based on the initial proposal for 24 hour operation; the second two on the reduced hours currently proposed (the third clarified the unit numbers). The Parish Council objected to the first

and second consultation. There had been nine representations objecting to the first consultation; seven objections to the second; and three objections to the third. One letter of support had been received. Since publication of the report, a further objection had been received relating to potential noise disturbance.

Two members 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; the need for the variation in hours of operation; and amenity impacts and the revised Noise Assessment.

Members discussed their concerns regarding the amenity impacts of the proposal on neighbouring residents, and weighed these against the potential benefits to the local economy.

Members considered that, with further marketing, the units could be let with the current hours of operation and by extending the hours a precedent could be set for other units within the business park. There was also concern that it would not be possible to control the type of noise that future occupiers of the units might generate.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/21/0625 be refused for the following reason:

The proposed alteration to the hours of operation condition would result in significant harm to the amenities of neighbouring occupiers by way of noise and disturbance that would not outweigh the benefits, contrary to policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

PCN/35 **DC/21/1274 - THE OWL BARN, THE MOUNT, IFIELD**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of an agricultural barn and the erection of a single storey barn-style 2-bedroom dwelling. The barn to be demolished was subject to prior approval for conversion to a residential dwelling.

The application site was located outside the built-up area boundary between Rusper and Crawley. The new dwelling would be slightly to the south-east of the barn, with amenity space to the south.

The Parish Council had not commented on the application. There had been three public representations supporting the proposal.

Members noted the consultation responses set out in the report and 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; highways impacts; and ecology.

Members considered the proposal in the context of the extant prior approval permission under DC/20/2452 and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/21/1274 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

PCN/36 **DC/21/0761 - BIRCHENBRIDGE HOUSE, BRIGHTON ROAD, MANNINGS HEATH**

The Head of Development & Building Control reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of a pool house and storage building and the erection of a single dwelling and detached garage. The proposal included a new independent access and garage for Birchenbridge House. The conversion of the outbuildings to a dwelling had been approved at appeal under DC/19/0455.

The application site was located outside the built-up area boundary on the A281 between Horsham and Mannings Heath. The garden to the west and north, where the proposed dwelling would be sited, was relatively secluded.

The Parish Council objected to the application. No further representations to the public consultation had been received.

Members noted the consultation responses set out in the report and 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 design and its impact on heritage; amenity impacts; accessibility and highways; and ecology considerations.

Members considered the proposal in the context of the extant permission DC/19/0455 and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/21/0761 be granted subject to the conditions as reported.

The meeting closed at 6.56 pm having commenced at 5.30 pm

CHAIRMAN