

Development Management (South) Committee
20 SEPTEMBER 2016

Present: Councillors: Brian O'Connell (Chairman), Paul Clarke (Vice-Chairman), John Blackall, Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, David Coldwell, Ray Dawe, Brian Donnelly, David Jenkins, Nigel Jupp, Liz Kitchen, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Ben Staines and Claire Vickers

Apologies: Councillors: Roger Clarke, Gordon Lindsay and Michael Willett

DMS/37 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16th August were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DMS/38 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

Councillor Mike Morgan declared a personal interest in item DC/16/1356 because he knew two residents who objected to the application.

DMS/39 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DMS/40 **APPEALS**

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

DMS/41 **DC/16/1489 - LAND AT STORRINGTON ROAD, STORRINGTON ROAD, THAKEHAM (WARD: CHANCTONBURY)**
APPLICANT: GLADMAN DEVELOPMENTS

The Development Manager reported that this application sought outline permission for up to 60 dwellings (including up to 35% affordable housing), with vehicular access from Storrington Road. Matters for consideration under this outline application were the principle of the development and the main access, with other matters including public open spaces, children's play area, surface water attenuation and landscaping for future determination.

The proposal was a resubmission of outline application DC/15/2374 for up to 107 dwellings, which had been refused in January 2016 (Minute No. DCS/90 (19.01.16) refers).

The indicative layout included detached two storey dwellings with parking spaces and garages. Three residential areas were proposed. Two of these were north and west of Snapes Cottage, set back from the boundaries of the site by open green areas. The third area was adjacent to Storrington Road. The new access road would link the three residential parcels. Most of the trees around the borders of the site would be retained.

The application site was located north of the built-up area of Storrington, to the west of Storrington Road. It comprised four fields, the smallest of which was adjacent to the road and surrounded by trees and hedgerow. This field was directly north of a dwelling known as Venters, and south of a paddock. This paddock separated the majority of the site from Storrington Road. The other fields within the site were also surrounded by trees and hedgerow.

The site was separated from the built-up area of Storrington by an area of land adjacent to Rother Close and Jubilee Way which had been granted planning permission at appeal for 75 dwellings. Development had commenced on this site. There were detached buildings to the south, and Snapes Cottage, a Grade II listed building, to the south-east.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. Since publication of the report the South Downs National Park Authority had advised that they did not consider the application would have a detrimental impact on the setting of the SDNP given the existing development and the distance of the site from the park boundary.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee.

Thakeham Parish Council and Storrington & Sullington Parish Council had both objected to the application. Objections had been received from the Campaign to Protect Rural England, Sussex and Thakeham Village Action. Seventy-seven letters of objection had also been 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; its impact on the grade II listed Snapes Cottage; landscape character and the visual amenity of the locality; the amenity of existing and future occupiers; highways, access and parking; trees, nature conservation and ecology; and air quality.

Members discussed the impact that the proposal would have on the surrounding area, in particular the rural gap between Storrington and Thakeham and concluded that the adverse impacts of granting permission would be significant and the proposal was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1489 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development is located in the open countryside, outside of any defined Built Up Area Boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location and consequently represents an inappropriate, unsustainable and unacceptable form of development that is contrary to the aims and objectives of the NPPF and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 15, 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 02 The provision of housing in this location, at the scale proposed, would diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the character of the local countryside. The development is, therefore, contrary to the NPPF and Policies 25 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 03 The open, green fieldscape of the application site provides the rural landscape in which the historic Grade II Listed Building at Snapes Cottage can be read and interpreted. The provision of up to 60 no. dwellings, within the landscape setting of the Listed Building, would result in less than substantial harm to the setting of the listed building. This would affect the significance of the heritage asset and the appreciation of its sense of rural isolation as a countryside residence. The development is therefore contrary to S66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and Policy 34 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 04 The proposed development makes no provision for securing affordable housing units, or for contributions towards improvements to education provision; transport infrastructure; libraries; fire and rescue services; sport facilities; community facilities; and is, therefore, contrary to Policies 16 and 39 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), as it has not been demonstrated how the infrastructure needs of the development would be met.

APPLICANT: OAKFORD HOMES LTD

The Development Manager reported that this application sought a variation of Condition 1 to permission DC/15/2547, which had allowed minor material amendments to DC/10/1314 for the redevelopment of the Abingworth Nursery site for 146 dwellings, including 20 key worker dwellings, and various community and sports facilities. There had been other minor material amendment applications to the original permission, as set out in the report.

The proposed variation related to the 20 key worker units and would amend the parking layout to increase the provision of parking spaces from one to two spaces per dwelling, and provide garden sheds for each unit.

The site was located outside the built-up area of Thakeham, east of Storrington Road and north-west of Abingworth Hall Hotel. There was agricultural land to the north, south and east. There were hedgerows and trees along the boundaries, although the southern and part of the northern boundary were more open. Construction works connected to the previous permissions had commenced.

Details of relevant government and council policies and planning history, as printed in 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 raised no objection. 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 included: the impact of the proposal on the layout and appearance of the site; residential amenity; highways and parking; landscaping and trees; and drainage.

Members considered the extent of the amendments and their impact on the overall scheme and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED

- (i) That a legal agreement, in the form of a Deed of Variation, be entered into to amend the legal agreement attached to DC/15/2547.
- (ii) That on completion of (i) above, planning application DC/16/1393 be determined by the Development Manager. The view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

APPLICANT: MR JOSEPH FOWLER

The Development Manager reported that this application sought a variation of condition 1 of previously approved planning permission DC/15/1382 for 45 dwellings (Minute No. DCS/69 (17.11.15) refers). The variation was a minor material amendment to the site access and would remove the previously permitted new surgery access, and introduce vehicular access to the surgery via the new development access road. The permitted development access would have been from Roman Way through the current surgery car park, with additional parking for the surgery to compensate for the loss of parking caused by the new site access.

The application site was located to the south of Roman Way and had been used as allotment gardens. There was a brook running close to the southern boundary of the site. The current access was from Little East Street.

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 raised no objection to the application and no 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 impact of the alternative access on highways and parking, and appearance.

The proposal would allow existing vegetation to be retained. Members concluded that the proposal would have limited impact on the permitted scheme and was therefore acceptable.

It was noted that whilst a new permission would be required, the legal agreement attached to DC/15/1382 securing affordable housing and infrastructure contributions remained enforceable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1528 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMS/44 **DC/16/1082 - LAND AT COOMBELANDS LANE, PULBOROUGH (WARD: PULBOROUGH & COLDWALTHAM) APPLICANT: DR SIMON BURTON**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought outline permission for the construction of two dwellings and associated access, with all matters other than the principle of the development reserved for future determination.

The application site was located outside the built up area in a rural location east of Coombelands Lane which was, at this point, a narrow country lane characterised by sporadic, isolated dwellings. The boundary to the South Downs National Park was to the west. It was an open paddock with a hedgerow along the Coombelands Lane boundary and a wooded copse on its eastern boundary. There was a grade II listed building, Oak House Farmhouse, to the south.

Details of relevant government and council policies, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. There was no relevant planning history associated with the site.

The responses from statutory internal and external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee. Members were advised that the Highways Authority no longer raised an objection and therefore the fourth recommended reason for refusal regarding visibility splays was no longer relevant.

The Parish Council had objected to the application. Eleven letters of objection had been received. Two applicants both addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. 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; its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; its impact on a heritage asset; highways; and ecology.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1082 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development would be located outside of a built-up area boundary on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or in an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposed development would therefore be inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development set out within the Horsham District Planning Framework. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).
- 02 The site lies within a rural location outside the limits of any existing settlement and does not constitute a use considered essential to such a countryside location. The proposal would therefore conflict with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the

Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.

- 03 The proposed dwellings by reason of their siting, plot subdivision, and associated domestic paraphernalia would be out of keeping with the character of the area and would represent a form of development which would be detrimental to the rural appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and policies 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.

DMS/45 **DC/16/1415 - 1 WOODCOT, NEW ROAD, BILLINGSHURST (WARD: BILLINGSHURST & SHIPLEY) APPLICANT: MR PETER COULSTOCK**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the construction of a detached three bedroom dwelling with access onto New Road. It would have a ridge height of six metres, with accommodation in the roof space.

The application site was located outside the built-up area along the northern side of New Road and east of 1 Woodcot, which was a semi-detached 2-storey dwelling with detached garage and a stable block to the rear. There was a hedgerow between this property and the application site. There were two 2-storey semi-detached dwellings opposite.

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 applicant had supplied a Transport Statement, as requested by the Highways Authority. In response to this the Highways Authority had requested a speed survey to indicate the size of the required visibility splays in this location.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Two letters of objection 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 character and appearance of the surrounding area; and highway impacts.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1415 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development would be located outside of a built-up area boundary on a site not allocated for development within

the Horsham District Planning Framework, or in an adopted Neighbourhood Development Plan. The proposed development would therefore be inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development set out within the Horsham District Planning Framework. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3 and 4 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and to the National Planning Policy Framework (2012).

- 02 The site lies within a rural location outside the limits of any existing settlement and does not constitute a use considered essential to such a countryside location. The proposal would therefore conflict with Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and with Policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 03 The applicant has failed to demonstrate that appropriate visibility splays can be provided on the site and that the proposed development would provide a safe and suitable access. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 04 The site is enclosed by a hedgerow and mature planting on each of its boundaries. It is considered that the enclosure of the site would result in shading and a minimal outlook for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling. The proposal would therefore result in a form of development which would have an adverse impact on the residential environment of future occupiers. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.

DMS/46 **DC/16/1418 - MANTON STUD, OAKHURST LANE, BILLINGSHURST
(WARD: BILLINGSHURST & SHIPLEY) APPLICANT: JACKY MATLOCK**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a timber building for use as a daytime mess and changing area with toilet, in the same style as a timber stable block on the site, which the new building would replace.

The application site was located outside the built-up area surrounded by fields, agricultural land with sporadic residential dwellings along Okehurst Lane, which ran along the southern edge of the site. Minstrels Wood, a Grade II listed building, lay further to the south.

Access was from a track off Okehurst Lane which also served Oakwood Farm. An area of hardstanding was to the north of the existing stables.

There were a number of structures already on the site including a barn, two stable blocks, tack room and feed store, and also a sand school north of a yard

area. There was also a mobile home occupied by the applicant that did not have planning permission.

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 objected to the application. Six letters of objection 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; amenities of neighbouring properties; and its impact on a listed building.

Members also considered the proposal in the context of application DC/14/2663, which had been dismissed at appeal, for living accommodation in a similar timber structure.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1418 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMS/47 **DC/16/1347 - TOWNE HOUSE, THE VILLAGE, ASHURST (WARD: STEYNING) APPLICANT: MR AND MRS E TAMLYN**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a detached two storey 3-bedroom dwelling and garage. The overall height of the building would be 8.46 metres. A shared access with Towne House, with the access drive extended to the new dwelling was proposed.

There would be a detached double garage measuring six metres squared south-east of the dwelling. Additional hard and soft landscaping along the site boundaries and to enhance the driveway and hardstanding were also proposed.

The application site was located outside the built-up area, to the east of the B2135 and north of Towne House. The site was open grassland bounded by hedging and post and rail fencing. There were properties along the northern edge of the site comprising a mix of terraced and detached dwellings.

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. Since publication of the report the Council's Environmental Management, Waste and Cleansing Team

had raised no objection to the proposal. The Parish Council objected to the application and one letter objecting to the proposal 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; the character of the site and surroundings; amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties; and traffic and parking.

Members considered the proposal in the context of policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework in particular with regard to its location outside the built up area boundary, its scale and mass and how it would relate to the surrounding area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1347 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development is located in the countryside, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this proposed development would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. Consequently, it represents unsustainable development contrary to Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 02 The proposed two storey dwelling when considered against the pattern and character of the surrounding development would represent an unsympathetic form of development out of character with the surrounding development. The scale, bulk, mass and design of the proposal in particular, would be unrelated to the built form of the surroundings, which due to its bulk and lack of articulation would appear visually overbearing within the context of the built surroundings, contrary to Policies 32, and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework.

DMS/48 **DC/16/1356 - THE PIGGERY, WEST END LANE, HENFIELD (WARD: HENFIELD) APPLICANT: MR AND MRS LEE MCCATTY**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a four-bedroom dwelling for use in connection with the B1 light industrial business that operated on the site. The workshops associated with the business would be retained, and the hardstanding re-built and extended up

to the proposed dwelling. The dwelling would be single storey with a pitched roof accommodating attic space, and would include two oak gable features.

The application site was located outside the built-up area of Henfield to the rear of a ribbon of residential development along West End Lane. The surrounding landscape included an orchard and a number of mature trees, with open countryside to the south. A local joinery business operated from the site, which comprised three workshops and two sheds used for storage.

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 raised no objection to the application. Fifty letters of support had been received, and there had been seven letters from five households objecting to the proposal. The applicant and the applicant's agent both 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 character of the site and its surroundings; amenity of neighbouring occupiers, and that of future residents; and parking and traffic conditions.

Members considered the proposal in the context of policies within the Horsham District Planning Framework and discussed the nature of the site and its proximity and relationship to the adjoining business. Whilst the design of the building was considered sympathetic and there was local support for the proposal, Members concluded that there was insufficient justification to allow a residential property, which was not essential to its location, outside the built-up area boundary.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1356 be refused for the following reasons:

- 01 The proposed development is located in the countryside, outside of any defined built-up area boundary, on a site not allocated for development within the Horsham District Planning Framework, or an adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The Council is able to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and consequently this proposed development would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchy approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore, the proposed development is not essential to its countryside location. Consequently, it represents unsustainable development contrary

to policies 1, 2, 3, 4, and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

DMS/49 **DC/16/1389 - WOMENS HALL, 81 HIGH STREET, BILLINGSHURST (WARD: BILLINGSHURST & SHIPLEY) APPLICANT: MRS SUE SAMSON, TRUSTEE**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for a single-storey side extension accommodating WC facilities, including a disabled WC and ramp access. The extension would project four metres from the side elevation and include a half-hipped roof to match the main roof, with a ridge height of approximately seven metres. A small veranda over the southern elevation, including a new ramped access was also proposed.

The application site was located on the eastern side of Billingshurst High Street and related to a community building. The curtilage of the building was above street level, with a set of steps at the front. The surrounding area included dwellings of mixed character and commercial units of varying uses, styles, and ages.

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 raised no objection to the application. Five letters of objection had been received, and two letters supporting the proposal had also been received. Two members of the public and the applicant spoke in support of the application and a representative of the Parish Council also spoke in its support.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were: the design and appearance of the proposal; its impact on neighbouring amenity; and highway safety.

Members noted that the Women's Hall had been classed as a Community Asset and considered the benefits that the proposal would bring to many users of the hall. Members weighed the benefits against concerns regarding parking and concluded that the proposal was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1389 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported.

DMS/50 **DC/16/1702 - LITTLE PADDOCKS, CRAYS LANE, THAKEHAM (WARD: CHANCTONBURY) APPLICANT: MR DAVID PERRY**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for disabled facilities including a one and a half storey rear extension, single storey side extension and roof alterations to existing dormers, following refusal of application DC/16/1171. The rear extension would project approximately 10.2 metres towards the rear boundary of the site, with a half hipped roof with a maximum ridge height of 7.3 metres (1.2 metres below the dwelling's ridge height).

The application site was located outside the built-up area of Thakeham on the north-west side of Crays Lane. Little Paddocks was a detached one and a half storey dwelling with stone facing on the ground floor and a steep pitched roof. The site was above street level, behind some vegetation screening. The surrounding area included sporadic development of detached dwellings of varying styles and ages.

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 raised no objection to the application. Six letters of support, including one from the applicant's doctor, had been received.

Members considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal were the design and appearance of the proposal and its impact on neighbouring amenity. Members considered the extent to which the proposal sought to overcome the reasons for refusal of application DC/16/1171.

Members noted the scale and bulk of the proposal, which would significantly increase the footprint and massing of the dwelling, and considered this in the context of the applicant's personal circumstances, and concluded that the proposal was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1702 be refused for the following reason:

The proposed rear extension, by virtue of its scale, massing, and design, would represent a dominant, and inappropriately scaled addition to the site, which would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling within the wider surrounding area, and is therefore considered inappropriately designed and unsympathetic in character, contrary to Policies 28 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework, and Paragraph 60 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting closed at 4.15 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm

CHAIRMAN