

**Development Management (South) Committee**  
**15 NOVEMBER 2016**

Present: Councillors: Brian O'Connell (Chairman), Paul Clarke (Vice-Chairman), Jonathan Chowen, Philip Circus, Roger Clarke, David Coldwell, Ray Dawe, Brian Donnelly, David Jenkins, Nigel Jupp, Gordon Lindsay, Tim Lloyd, Paul Marshall, Mike Morgan, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson, Claire Vickers and Michael Willett

Apologies: Councillors: John Blackall, Liz Kitchen and Ben Staines

DMS/62 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18<sup>th</sup> October were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DMS/63 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

DC/16/1974 – Councillors Nigel Jupp, Gordon Lindsay and Kate Rowbottom each declared a personal interest in this item because they knew the applicant, who was Chairman of the Parish Council.

DC/16/1908 – Councillor Nigel Jupp declared a personal interest in this item because he knew some of the public speakers.

DC/16/2127 – Councillor Mike Morgan declared a personal interest in this item because he knew one of the public speakers.

DMS/64 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DMS/65 **APPEALS**

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

DMS/66 **DC/16/2064 - LAND NORTH OF THE ROSARY, PARTRIDGE GREEN (WARD: COWFOLD, SHERMANBURY & WEST GRINSTEAD) APPLICANT: MRS ELIZABETH TOMPKINS**

Application withdrawn.

DMS/67 **DC/16/1974 - VINE COTTAGE, COOLHAM ROAD, COOLHAM (WARD: BILLINGSHURST & SHIPLEY) APPLICANT: MR JAMIE COAD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of 14 residential units and a building of four industrial units, a new access from Coolham Road, and landscaping. The proposal included a children's play area, wildlife pond and a bus stop.

The dwellings would comprise: two 3-bedroom and two 2-bedroom market houses; and two single-storey blocks of flats comprising a total of four 1-bedroom and two 2-bedroom flats, which would be market housing initially made available to locals wishing to 'downsize'. There would also be a two-storey building comprising two 1-bedroom and two 2-bedroom affordable units. Thirty-six residential parking spaces and 14 commercial car parking spaces were proposed. Vine Cottage would be retained.

The application site was located approximately 500 metres south of Coolham crossroads near the centre of Coolham village, which included about 40 properties with a school, village hall and public house. There was sporadic development along the four roads leading from that crossroads. Vine Cottage lay in the southwest corner of the site with its garden extending to the eastern boundary. The existing access was between the dwelling and its detached garage. There were some small outbuildings used for commercial storage within the site, and a builder's yard along the western boundary that operated a business run by the applicant.

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 applicant had submitted additional information regarding: parking and highway access; and ecology and nature conservation. An addendum to the report had been circulated to Members advising them of the Highway Authority's and the Council's Ecologist's responses to this information. In the light of the additional information regarding vehicular parking and access arrangements, the recommended third reason for refusal, as printed in the report, would be amended. The Council's Ecologist had advised that further surveys would still be required and the fourth recommended reason for refusal should therefore remain unchanged.

The Parish Council objected to the application. Twenty-four letters of objection and sixteen letters of support had been received. The Coolham Village Hall Management Committee had commented on the proposal. 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 with regards to Housing and Commercial Use; dwelling type and tenure; impact on landscape character and the visual amenity of the locality; the amenity of existing and future occupiers; land contamination; highways and

parking; nature conservation, ecology and biodiversity; drainage; developer contributions; and the sustainability of the development.

Members concluded that the adverse effects of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and the proposal was unacceptable.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1974 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 & 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 02 The proposal would diminish the rural and open character of this particular part of the landscape, creating a discordant and uncharacteristically urbanised environment harming the landscape 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 It has not been demonstrated that the proposed development would provide safe and suitable access for all people given the location of the site, the needs of the future residents and the increase in non-traffic movements that would be generated by the proposal. The scheme is therefore considered unsustainable development and is contrary to the requirements of Policy 40 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and NPPF.
- 04 Insufficient ecological assessments have been submitted to indicate that the development of this site would not result in a detrimental impact on the habitats of protected species or the ecological value of the site. The scheme is therefore contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).
- 05 Insufficient information has been submitted regarding existing ground conditions and the potential for pollution from land contamination arising from previous uses. The scheme has

therefore failed to demonstrate that the site is suitable for its new use taking account of ground conditions, potential pollution and the sensitivity of the new residential uses. The scheme is therefore contrary to the requirements of Policy 24 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015) and paragraph 121 of the NPPF.

- 06 Insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate the proposal is appropriately flood resilient and resistant, safe for its users for the development's lifetime, and that it would not increase flood risk overall. The scheme is therefore considered contrary to the requirements of the NPPF and Policy 38 of the HDPF.
- 07 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; sports 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.

DMS/68 **DC/16/1963 - HIGH CHAPARRAL, LONDON ROAD, WASHINGTON**  
**(WARD: CHANTRY) APPLICANT: MR S PAGE**

The Development Manager reported that this outline application sought permission for seven dwellings and access, with all other matters reserved for future determination. The dwellings would comprise: four 2-bedroom semi-detached units; one 3-bedroom detached unit; and two 5-bedroom detached units.

The application site was located outside the built-up area on London Road, close to its junction with the A24. The site was south of the detached bungalow, High Chaparral, on greenfield land. There were five detached houses south of the access, which was also a public footpath, and dwellings in Spring Gardens were to the northwest. A sandschool lay to the north, and a stable complex was east of High Chaparral.

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 strongly objected to the application. Seven letters of objection, from six addresses, had 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; impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; affordable housing; highway impacts; and ecology.

Members concluded that the proposed development, outside the built-up area, was not essential to its location and would be detrimental to the character of the area.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1963 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 25, 26, 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 04 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 2015, and to the NPPF, in particular paragraph 50.

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for one detached 2-bedroom dwelling. Matters for consideration under this outline application were the principle of development, access and layout, with all other matters reserved for future determination. The proposed dwelling would be close to the northern boundary of the site, approximately four metres from the flank wall of the host dwelling.

The applicant had indicated parking for two cars, with the host dwelling retaining parking spaces for three vehicles. Indicative plans showed a building of similar ridge height with similarly proportioned windows as that of the host dwelling.

The application site was located in a rural area, approximately 600 metres north of Ashington. The plot was adjacent to a house called Spear Hill, which was accessed along a track off Spear Hill. Spear Hill was a narrow country lane subject to a speed limit of 60mph. There was a dilapidated shed in the far northern corner of the site. A two metre high boundary wall ran along the southern boundary with the host property and an evergreen hedge marked the boundary of the adjacent northern property.

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. One letter 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 surrounding countryside; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and highways.

Members concluded that the proposed dwelling, outside the built-up area, was not essential to its location and would be detrimental to the rural character of the area.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1895 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 development, by reason of its scale, siting and design, would represent a harmful urbanising form of development which would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

DMS/70 **DC/16/1908 - LONGBURY HILL HOUSE, VERAS WALK, STORRINGTON**  
**(WARD: CHANTRY) APPLICANT: MR TIM DRAKE**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of one 4-bedroom dwelling with detached garage, and a new drive to serve the existing property, Longbury Hill House. A large pond would be filled in and a detached garage demolished, and part of the driveway would be upgraded and extended towards the new dwelling to the east of the host plot.

The application site was located outside but close to the boundary of the built-up area of Storrington to the west, south and east. Several neighbouring properties were also outside the built-up area. There was a detached horse-shoe shaped bungalow set at an elevated position from neighbouring properties and a double garage. Access to the host dwelling was off a track which joined Veras Walk approximately 140 metres from the site entrance. There were numerous winding pathways and established landscaping throughout the plot, a pond, swimming pool and a disused timber cabin.

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. A total of 29 letters of objection had been received, together with an objection from Heath Common Residents Association. Four letters of support had also been received. Three members of the public spoke in objection to the application. A representative of the Parish Council also 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 surrounding countryside; the amenity of

neighbouring occupiers; highways; and the design and appearance of the proposal.

Members discussed the special character of Heath Common and the number of recent applications that would have had a detrimental impact on the area if granted. It was suggested that the area could be designated as a Residential Area of Special Character (RASC) as part of the emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Members concluded that the proposed dwelling, outside the built-up area, was not essential to its location and would have a harmful impact on the special character of the area.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1908 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 development, by reason of its scale, siting and design, would represent a harmful urbanising form of development which would be out of keeping with and detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area. The proposal would therefore be contrary to policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).

DMS/71 **DC/16/1930 - HIGH CROFT, HAMPERS LANE, STORRINGTON (WARD: CHANTRY) APPLICANT: SALA NEWPORT**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the erection of a 5-bedroom dwelling with detached double garage and new access driveway. The proposed dwelling would have accommodation within



the roofspace with dormer windows to the front and rear, and balconies on the front, rear and south eastern elevations.

The application site was located outside the built-up area of Storrington to the north of Hampers Lane. Access to the site was shared with Heath Barn to the east, and the property Highcroft also lay to the east. The site was at a higher level than Hampers Lane and was well screened with vegetation on the western boundary.

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 external consultees, as contained within the report, were considered by the Committee. It was reported at the meeting that

The Parish Council objected to the application. A total of 35 letters of objection, 13 of which came from six addresses, had been received. The Heath Common Resident's Association objected to the application. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application. A representative of the Parish Council also spoke in objection 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; the amenity of neighbouring occupiers; and highway impacts.

Members reiterated their concerns regarding the impact of small scale developments on the character of the area outside the built-up area boundary, and concluded that the proposed dwelling was not essential to its location and would have a harmful impact on the special character of the area.

#### RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1930 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 dwelling by reason of its siting, design 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 25, 26, 30 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.

**DMS/72 DC/16/2127 - HENFIELD FUNERAL SERVICES LTD, THE OLD BELL, HIGH STREET, HENFIELD (WARD: HENFIELD) APPLICANT: KAREN JORDON**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission to remove the boundary wall to the rear of the Old Bell to allow access and safe off-street parking for Henfield Funeral Services. The proposal would address the current issue of vehicles loading and unloading on the public highway of Church Lane.

The application site was located on the corner of the High Street to the east and Church Street to the north within the built-up area of Henfield. It was surrounded by a mixture of properties, some of which were listed, including businesses and retail shops on the High Street and housing on Church Street. There was an area of hardstanding to the rear of the application site, with a brick boundary wall separating it from Church Lane.

Details of relevant government and council policies and relevant planning history, as contained within the report, were noted by the Committee. The current application sought to overcome the reason for refusal of DC/15/2598 by removing a fence within the site in order to provide additional internal turning space so that vehicles could enter and leave the highway in forward gear.

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

The Parish Council objected to the application. Five letters of objection, from three individuals, had been received. 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: whether the reasons for refusal of DC/15/2598 had been overcome; townscape character and the visual amenities of the streetscene; the amenities of occupiers of adjoining properties and users of land; and parking and traffic.

In order to ensure that the turning space for vehicles be retained, Members were advised that Condition 5, as printed in the report, should be amended to

remove Permitted Development rights for the erection of walls and fences within the site, as the creation of a parking and turning area of a suitable size was reliant on the removal of an existing fence, and it was therefore necessary to ensure no further means of enclosure would be erected within the yard area.

An additional condition was also recommended to ensure that the access, parking and turning area were for ground floor funeral home use only. This was necessary on account of the very specific case in support of the proposals put forward by the applicant, based on the number and type of vehicles used by the funeral home and the frequency of servicing, and to ensure that the use of the access was not further intensified or additional vehicles parked within the site in connection with the flats above, or with any alternative Class A1 use which may occupy the ground floor in the future.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2127 be granted subject to the conditions and reasons as reported, subject to:

- (i) an amendment to Condition 5 to remove Permitted Development rights for the erection of walls and fences; and
- (ii) an additional condition restricting the access, parking and turning area for use in association with the use of the ground floor as a funeral home only.

*The meeting closed at 3.46 pm having commenced at 2.30 pm*

CHAIRMAN