

Planning Committee (North)
6 DECEMBER 2016

Present: Councillors: Liz Kitchen (Chairman), Karen Burgess (Vice-Chairman), John Bailey, Toni Bradnum, Peter Burgess, John Chidlow, Roy Cornell, Leonard Crosbie, Matthew French, Billy Greening, Tony Hogben, Christian Mitchell, Godfrey Newman, Connor Relleen, David Skipp and Tricia Youtan

Apologies: Councillors: Andrew Baldwin, Alan Britten, Christine Costin, Jonathan Dancer, Adrian Lee, Josh Murphy, Stuart Ritchie, Simon Torn and Claire Vickers

Also Present:

DMN/65 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 1st November 2016 were approved as a correct record and signed by the chairman.

DMN/66 **DECLARATIONS OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

There were no declarations of interest.

DMN/67 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DMN/68 **APPEALS**

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

DMN/69 **DC/16/1371 - SWAN WALK SHOPPING CENTRE HORSHAM (WARD: DENNE) APPLICANT: C/O AGENT**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the part demolition of the existing centre and its re-building/remodelling to provide:

- A multiscreen cinema with six screens and up to 850 seats in total plus foyer/café and concessions area.
- Four restaurant units totalling approximately 1581m²; with access directly from Springfield Road.
- A reconfigured retail unit on the first floor only totalling approximately 1641m².

- The re-configuration of part of Swan Walk – providing a more legible internal layout.
- An improved entrance to Swan walk from Springfield Road.

The proposed development would result in a loss of 1,730m² of retail space and 2,707m² office space.

The new access would be gained via a glazed entrance along Springfield Road. From this location escalators and a lift would provide access to the upper floors, leading to the retail centre at first floor and cinema at second floor. Access would be available to Swan Walk car park for the public from the first floor and for servicing the cinema from the second floor. The basement service yard was to the rear of the Springfield Road restaurants.

The proposed scheme would result in a larger building than at present to accommodate the entrance extension on the Springfield Road elevation and the cinema screens on the top floor.

The proposed site was in the town centre and comprised of a commercial property forming the westernmost part of the Swan Walk Shopping Centre, lying at the junction of Springfield Road and West Street in the pedestrianised part of the town centre. The ground and first floor were used for retail, being occupied by Wilkinson's with office accommodation above.

The site faced the site of the former Rising Universe fountain and retail premises along West Street and Worthing Road, the Lynd Cross with flats above on the corner of Springfield Road and Bishops Weald house, a mixed commercial and residential building on the opposite corner.

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. Eleven letters of objection had been received. One member of the public spoke in objection to the application and the applicant addressed the Committee in support of the proposal. A representative of the Neighbourhood 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 Capitol; the reduction in retail floorspace; loss of office accommodation; design and impact on the surrounding streetscene; heritage assets; facilities for those with disabilities; neighbour amenity; and highways and parking.

Members concluded that although the design of the proposed building was not necessarily aesthetically pleasing, the proposal could be acceptable with some further alterations to the design.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/1371 be granted subject to further design improvements to be delegated to the Development Manager, Chairman, Vice Chairman and Ward Members, in consultation with the other Committee Members.

DMN/70 **DC/16/2340 - FISHER CLINICAL SERVICES UK LTD WOOD ROAD
HORSHAM (WARD: HOLBROOK WEST) APPLICANT: FISHER CLINICAL
SERVICES LTD**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought minor material amendments to planning application DC/16/0564.

The application sought the following amendment to application DC/16/0564:

- To increase the floor level of the proposed building by 1m through the reduction of excavation works. This would significantly reduce the amount of soil that would need to be removed from the site as a result of the proposal.
- Removal of all windows to south, north and west elevations of the new building and removal of majority of proposed windows to east elevation.

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 considered the officer's planning assessment which indicated that the key issues for consideration in determining the proposal was whether the revised scale and appearance, including the removal of some windows and additional planting, was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2340 be granted subject to the conditions set out in the officer's report.

DMN/71 **DC/16/2247 - COOMBDAL TWO MILE ASH ROAD BARNES GREEN
(WARD ITCHINGFIELD, SLINFOLD AND WARNHAM) APPLICANT: MR &
MRS VERNON JENNINGS**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought permission for the construction of two dwellings along with garages and the stopping up of the existing vehicular access at the junction of Trout Lane and Two Mile ash road and the relocation of the existing hedgerow on a revised line to allow for the improved visibility at the junction.

The application site formed part of land within the ownership of the owners of Coombdale, a property located 460m from the built up area boundary of Barns Green. The site was surrounded by Two Mile Ash Road to the North, Coombdale to the East, agricultural fields to the South, and Trout Lane to the West.

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. Twelve letters of support had been received. Three members of the public spoke 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; its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; affordable housing and infrastructure contributions; highway impacts; and ecology.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2247 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, 4 and 40 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 intensification of 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 character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and policies 25, 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 04 Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development can take place without harm to any protected species which may reside or forage within the site. In the absence of this information it has not been possible to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with the provisions of Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

DMN/72 **DC/16/2200 - GATE LODGE STANE STREET SLINFOLD (WARD: ITCHINGFIELD, SLINFOLD AND WARNHAM) APPLICANT: MR SAM BAKER**

The Development Manager reported that this application sought full planning permission for the cessation of the commercial uses on the site, the removal of the associated buildings and the construction of three, detached dwellings with garaging and landscaping.

Two of the dwellings would be on a site previously granted permission for the construction of the three small bungalows (DC/15/0911), with the third dwelling proposed on land partially in a former commercial use and partially domestic curtilage associated with Gate Lodge. A fourth dwelling is proposed to be constructed to the immediate rear of Gate Lodge (DC/16/2201).

The application site was to the west of the A29, 860m from the built up area boundary of Slinfold. The site measured 0.24 hectares and was well hidden from the A29 due to existing mature planting.

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.

Nine letters of support had been received. One member of the public, the applicant and the 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; its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; highway safety; contamination; trees; and ecology.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2200 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, 4, 26 and 40 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 proposal, by reason of the number of dwellings proposed, their size and scale, and their relationship with site boundaries, represents a contrived, cramped overdevelopment of the site which would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and policies 25, 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 04 Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development can take place without harm to any protected species which may reside or forage within the site. In the absence of this information it has not been possible to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with the provisions of Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

DMN/73 **DC/16/2201 - GATE LODGE STANE STREET SLINFOLD (WARD: ITCHINGFIELD, SLINFOLD AND WARNHAM APPLICANT: MR SAM BAKER)**

The Development Manager reported that application DC/16/2201 sought full planning permission for the construction of one detached, four bedroom dwelling with garaging and landscaping.

A further three dwellings of the same scale and design were proposed to the immediate rear of Gate Lodge (DC/16/2200). Two of the dwellings would be located on the site previously granted permission for the construction of the three small bungalows, with the third dwelling proposed on land partially in a former commercial use and partially domestic curtilage associated with Gate Lodge.

The application site was to the west of the A29, 860m from the built up area boundary of Slinfold. The site measured 0.1 hectares and was well hidden from public view due to mature planting.

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. Ten letters of support had been received. One member of the public, the applicant and the 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; its impact on the character and appearance of the surrounding area; highway safety; trees; and ecology.

RESOLVED

That planning application DC/16/2201 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, 4, 26 and 40 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 proposal, by reason of the size and scale of the dwelling proposed and its relationship with site boundaries, represents a contrived, cramped overdevelopment of the site which would be detrimental to the rural character and appearance of the area. The proposal therefore conflicts with paragraph 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and policies 25, 26, 32 and 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.
- 04 Insufficient information has been submitted with the application to demonstrate that the proposed development can take place without harm to any protected species which may reside or forage within the site. In the absence of this information it has not been possible to demonstrate that the proposal would comply with the provisions of Policy 31 of the Horsham District Planning Framework 2015 and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting closed at 7.22 pm having commenced at 6.00 pm

CHAIRMAN