

Development Management (North) Committee
6 SEPTEMBER 2016

Present: Councillors: Liz Kitchen (Chairman), John Bailey, Andrew Baldwin, Toni Bradnum, Alan Britten, John Chidlow, Christine Costin, Leonard Crosbie, Matthew French, Godfrey Newman, David Skipp, Simon Torn, Claire Vickers and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Karen Burgess, Peter Burgess, Roy Cornell, Jonathan Dancer, Tony Hogben, Adrian Lee, Christian Mitchell, Josh Murphy, Brian O'Connell, Connor Relleen and Stuart Ritchie

The Chairman of the Committee paid tribute to Councillor Ian Howard, who had passed away on 30th August. She spoke of his valued contribution, integrity and commitment, in particular with regard to planning matters, and what a pleasure it had been to work with him over the years.

DMN/35 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 2nd August were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DMN/36 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

DMN/37 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DMN/38 **APPEALS**

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

DMN/39 **DC/16/1263 - LAND SOUTH OF BROADBRIDGE HEATH LEISURE CENTRE, WICKHURST LANE, BROADBRIDGE HEATH (WARD: BROADBRIDGE HEATH) APPLICANT: HORSHAM DISTRICT COUNCIL**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for five all-weather MUGA (multi use games area) pitches, with associated floodlights, fencing and access footpath, on land to the south of the bowls club. The MUGA pitches would be next to each other towards the eastern boundary of the site. The rest of the open space would eventually include three sports pitches, spectator facilities and a skate park.

The wider site was being redeveloped for leisure and recreation purposes, and an application for a new leisure centre (DC/16/1844) on land to the north of the site had also been submitted.

There would be a series of floodlights around the perimeter of the MUGAs, and the precise details of this floodlight scheme would be dealt with by condition. A 4.5 metre high fence around the perimeter was proposed, in accordance with the standard recommended by the Football Association. A footpath would join the MUGAs to the land adjacent to the bowls club and tennis courts, and to the entrance to the proposed new leisure centre should that permission be granted.

The application site was located west of the A24 slip road and north-east of a wider sports area, with the Horsham District Indoor Bowls Club directly north of the site. Beyond the sports pitches to the west was a large housing development currently under construction. Broadbridge Heath Tesco lay beyond the bowls club to the north.

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. Members were advised that the Arboricultural Officer had raised no objection.

It was noted that any drainage issues relating to the surrounding area would be addressed through the planning application for the leisure centre and sports pitches.

The Parish Council raised no objection to the application. No further letters of representation had been received.

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 the adjacent highway; parking; and the impact on neighbouring amenity, in particular with regard to floodlights and noise.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1263 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMN/40 **DC/16/1320 - WINTERTON COURT, HORSHAM (WARD: HORSHAM PARK) APPLICANT: SAXON WEALD HOMES LTD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the demolition of buildings and the erection of 66 dwellings with parking and external works. The application followed the refusal of DC/15/0154 for 69 dwellings.

There would be 20 affordable rent units, comprising twelve 1-bedroom flats and eight 2-bedroom flats, and three affordable shared ownership 3-bedroom houses. The remaining 43 would be private market units, with an intention to rent rather than sell.

Five blocks of buildings with garden areas around a central public open space were proposed, with a vehicular access route running around the central square.

- Block A would be three-storey and include nine 2-bedroom flats and three 1-bedroom flats.
- Block B would be two-storey and comprise seven terraced 3-bedroom dwellings, including the three shared ownership units.
- Block C would be three-storey and include nine 2-bedroom flats and three 1-bedroom flats.
- Block D would be four storey and provide the 20 affordable rented units.
- Block E would be three storey and comprise nine 1-bedroom flats and six 2-bedroom flats.

There would be 68 un-allocated surface parking spaces distributed throughout the site.

The application site was located within the built-up area of Horsham and was currently occupied by sheltered housing accommodation comprising 27 dwellings. These had been vacated and the site was surrounded by hoarding. The site was bordered to the north by a public footpath, opposite which was a new development of two-storey dwellings and a block of flats at Standings Court. The rear gardens of dwellings fronting New Street were to the south east, the railway station

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 Neighbourhood Council had objected to the application. Forty-six letters of objection from 38 households had been received, including a letter from the Horsham Society. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant's architect addressed the Committee in support of the proposal.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment, and whether the reasons for refusal of the previous application for 69 dwellings had been overcome, in the light of the current policy context.

Members discussed aspects of the proposal, in particular: the impact of the proposal on the amenity of future and neighbouring occupiers; the design and appearance of the development, in particular with regard to its height; the provision of open space, including areas suitable for children to play; traffic

movements generated by the site and highway safety; and affordable housing provision in the light of current policy.

After careful consideration, Members concluded that the amendments that had been made to the previous planning application were not significant enough to overcome the first two reasons for refusal of that application. The proposal would still lead to overdevelopment of the site, which would lead to a poor level of amenity for future occupiers, and the height of buildings did not reflect that of the existing residential area. Furthermore, no Legal Agreement was in place to secure the proposed affordable housing.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1320 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development represents the overdevelopment of a confined site, leading to a poor level of amenity for future occupiers of the development due to a deficiency of private and communal outdoor space for safe outdoor play, for residents to sit out in reasonable privacy, for drying washing out of doors and other ancillary residential purposes. In addition, the proposed layout has resulted in internal conflicts between adjacent room types in separate flats and many bedrooms facing the adjacent car park and railway line, leading to potential noise disturbance and the need to provide mechanical ventilation to bedrooms, as opening windows would result in noise disturbance for future residents. This is not a sustainable approach to addressing the relationship of the site with the railway, and would not result in a good quality living environment for future occupiers. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 24, 32, 33 and 37 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015) as well as to the NPPF, in particular paragraph 17.
- 02 The height of proposed buildings does not respect or reflect the overall scale of buildings in this residential area and would result in an overly prominent appearance, forming a dominating backdrop to the smaller scale buildings on New Street and Standings Court. The proposal would therefore be harmful to the character and appearance of the locality and is contrary to Policies 1, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015) as well as to the NPPF, in particular section 7.
- 03 Policy C16 requires provision of at least 35% affordable units on developments of this scale. The provision of affordable housing must be secured by way of a Legal Agreement. No completed Agreement is in place by which to secure this Policy requirement. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy 16 of

the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015), to the Horsham District Local Development Framework Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document, and to the NPPF, in particular paragraph 50.

DMN/41 **DC/16/1490 - FAIRLEE COTTAGE, BUCKS GREEN, RUDGWICK (WARD: RUDGWICK) APPLICANT: GLADMAN DEVELOPMENTS LTD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought outline permission for up to 65 dwellings (including 35% affordable housing) with a new vehicular access off Guildford Road. The existing access at Fairlee Cottage would be retained as a pedestrian access. There would be planting and landscaping, public open space, and surface water flood mitigation and attenuation. 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 built-up area of Bucks Green, with a small proportion of it adjoining the built-up area boundary. It was opposite the junction of Church Street, fronting Guildford Road, and included an agricultural field and Fairlee Cottage with its annex and garden. A group of agricultural buildings lay to the south. The site sloped down to the south, towards the river Arun. There were a number of listed buildings close to the site, including Mill Hill House to the west, Green Lanes and Old Stores Place.

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 had objected to the application. Two hundred and forty-five letters of objection, from 206 households, had been received. These included three letters from the Rudgwick Preservation Society, one letter from the Haven Society, one letter from the CPRE and one letter from a Planning Consultant on behalf of an unspecified number of residents of Rudgwick. A Technical Note from a Transport Planning Consultant, commissioned by a local resident, had been included with one of the letters. One letter of support had been received. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application, including a representative of Rudgwick Preservation Society.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal included: the principle of development; its impact on the landscape, in particular with regard to the settlement boundaries of Bucks Green and Rudgwick and the gap between the two settlements; townscape character and density of the proposal; heritage assets; the amenity of existing and future occupiers; highways and parking; ecology; and affordable housing.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1490 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The application site is located outside of the built-up area boundary and is not allocated for residential development in a Local Plan or a Made Neighbourhood Plan. The development of the site is therefore contrary to the spatial strategy for growth in Horsham District and is contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 15 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).
- 02 The application is located outside of the existing settlement in a prominent position between the settlements of Rudgwick and Bucks Green, which provides a rural setting for these two settlements and contributes to the sense of place and separate identity of the settlements. The proposed development, by reason of its location and amount, would result in the urbanisation of the site and the significant reduction in the gap between these settlements, harming the open and rural landscape character of the site and locality and failing to protect conserve and enhance landscape character. In addition, the application is sited adjacent to the A281, which is a noise source due to the level of traffic. The submitted information is not sufficient to demonstrate that the amount of development proposed can be delivered without the need for mitigation which would exacerbate the landscape harm arising. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policies 2, 24, 25, 26 and 27 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).
- 03 The application site is located to the east of the settlement of Bucks Green, which is a linear development of mainly residential units set in relatively large plots. The proposed development would be significantly at odds with this general pattern of development, by reason of the development both at higher density than the adjacent settlement and projecting significantly further south than the existing residential plots within the settlement. The proposal therefore does not integrate well with, conserve, or enhance the existing townscape character and is contrary to Policies 2, 25 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).
- 04 There are a number of listed buildings in the vicinity of the site, including immediately adjacent to it. The rural character of the site forms part of the setting of these buildings, with the open and rural character of the site and dispersed form of development in the wider area contributing to the understanding of the heritage assets and their significance. The proposed

development of the site would result in harm to the setting of these heritage assets by reason of the loss of a gap between two nearby settlements, and the loss of transition from urban to rural character. The proposal therefore does not retain or improve the setting of heritage assets and is contrary to Policies 2, 33 and 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).

- 05 It has not been demonstrated that safe and suitable crossing facilities can be achieved from the site across the A281 Guildford Road and Church Street towards Rudgwick village. The formation and use of the crossing points as proposed would give rise to unsafe conditions for non-motorised road users. The development therefore conflicts with paragraph 32 of the NPPF and Policies 32, 33 and 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).
- 06 Policy 16 requires 35% affordable housing provision on developments of this size. Policy 39 requires new development to meet additional infrastructure requirements arising from the new development. Both the provision of affordable housing and contributions to infrastructure improvements/provision must be secured by way of a Legal Agreement. No completed Agreement is in place and therefore there is no means by which to secure these Policy requirements. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (Adopted November 2015).

DMN/42 **S106/16/0009 - LAND WEST OF WORTHING ROAD, SOUTHWATER
(WARD: SOUTHWATER) APPLICANT: MRS OLIVIA FORSYTH**

Item removed from the agenda.

The meeting closed at 7.44 pm having commenced at 6.00 pm

CHAIRMAN