

NUTHURST PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Planning Meeting,
held on Wednesday 20th March 2019, at 7.30pm,
at Mannings Heath Village Hall, Mannings Heath

Present: Cllr V Court (Chairman) Cllr O Hydes (OBE)
Cllr J Assassi Cllr T Nelson
Cllr F Boulter Cllr S Turner
Cllr J Chaytor
Cllr G Dixon
Cllr A Gaffney

The Clerk to the Parish Council, Sarah Hall, and seven members of the public also attended the meeting.

PC016/18-19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

It was **RESOLVED** that apologies for absence from Cllr J McClean and Cllr J Mercer be **APPROVED**.

PC017/18-19 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

No declarations of interest, as defined under the Localism Act 2011 and the Parish Councils Code of Conduct, were made.

PC018/18-19 APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

It was **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 20th February 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and be recommended for approval to the Full Parish Council.

PC019/18-19 PRESENTATION BY MATTWELL HOMES

Mr Helliwell and Mr Matthews, the directors of Mattwell Homes, addressed the meeting. Following HDC's decision not to grant planning permission for 3 (pairs) x 3 bedroom semi-detached dwellings (DC/18/1849) the applicants proposed three alternative options for the site (appendix PC019/18-19)

Option 1

3 x 4/5 bedroom detached dwellings, improved site plan and softer option with weatherboard and tile hangings.

Option 2

3 x 4 bedroom detached dwellings, lowered roof line, installation of dormers, improved site plan and softer option with weatherboard and tile hangings.

Option 3

2 (pairs) x 3/4 bedroom semi-detached dwellings improved site plan and softer option with weatherboard and tile hangings

The Chairman advised that because the site was in the BUAB the Parish Council felt they had to support the application for development on the site (DC/18/1849). However, a low-level development would be visually less obtrusive in the country side location and the Neighbourhood Plan specifies 'smaller dwellings'. The

applicants have submitted an appeal against HDC's decision not to grant planning permission.

The Councillors agreed to wait for the outcome of the appeal and if the applicant wished to submit a planning application in the mean-time the Parish Council would submit their comments accordingly.

The Chairman thanked My Helliwell and Mr Matthews for attending the meeting and putting their proposals forward.

PC020/18-19 PUBLIC SESSION

Following Mattwell Homes presentation, a member of the public asked why bungalows were not being built on the site? the land had been purchased speculatively, the proposals were not consistent with the Neighbourhood Plan and not serving the community.

Mr Helliwell and Mr Matthews replied that it was not commercially viable to build bungalows on the site, the Neighbourhood Plan cannot stop development on 'windfall sites' in the BUAB, the original planning application (DC/18/1849) was for 3 (pairs) x 3 bedroom semi-detached dwellings and the site was too small for four bungalows.

PC021/18-19 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

<u>DC/19/0455</u> 28.02.2019 RESOLVED	Conversion of existing residential outbuildings into a single dwelling and the creation of a new access onto Birchenbridge House Birchenbridge House, Brighton Road, Mannings Heath The Parish Council strongly objects to this application for the reasons given below. <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The site has not been allocated for development in the "made" Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan (NNP) or the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF).2. The proposed dwelling is not needed in the Parish as the NPP provides the required housing needs for the Parish. Furthermore, Horsham District Council (HDC) has a five year supply of housing.3. The site is well outside the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB) of Mannings Heath and therefore in the countryside. The proposed development has not been demonstrated as being essential to such a countryside location.4. The proposed development would lead to an intensification of development and use of the site because of its siting and relationship to Birchenbridge House and the adjacent Birchenbridge Cottage. It would result in significant harm to the residential amenity of these properties.5. The existing access, slightly amended, from the A281 to Birchenbridge House would serve the proposed new dwelling. The proposed new access from the A281 would serve Birchenbridge House. Creating a third access to the very busy A281 in about 50 metres (the other two accesses are to Birchenbridge House and Birchenbridge Cottage) is regarded as unsatisfactory and unsafe and dangerous to users of the A281.6. The proposed dwelling is unsatisfactory because it is out of keeping with the two surrounding buildings (Birchenbridge House and Birchenbridge Cottage) in
---	---

contravention of policy 10 of the NNP and the overarching aim of the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement (NPDS).

7. The Parish Council also considers that the title of the application is misleading in two respects:

- There are no “existing residential outbuildings”. The proposal is actually for the conversion of a swimming pool house and a storage building to a residential dwelling.
- The proposed new access is onto the A281 Brighton Road. It is not onto Birchenbridge House, but it is to serve Birchenbridge House.

8. The Applicant’s Planning Statement cites the granting of planning permission for DC/17/0954 (The Old School, Brighton Road, Lower Beeding) as a reason for granting planning permission for this application. However, the significant difference is that Lower Beeding does not have a Neighbourhood Plan. Whereas Birchenbridge House is covered by the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan in which development proposals are required to conform to policies in respect of control of development in the countryside. This proposal does not conform to the policies listed in point 10 below.

9. Finally, a previous outline planning application to convert the same outbuildings into a residential dwelling was turned down by HDC for very good planning reasons. This new application has failed to overcome any of those reasons. Therefore those reasons apply equally to this current application.

10. Combining the Parish Council’s reasons for objection in points 1 to 6 above with the reasons for refusing the previous planning application, the Parish Council urges HDC to refuse DC/19/0455 because;

i) The proposed development is located in the countryside, outside the defined built-up area boundary of any settlement, on a site which has not been 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 scheme would be contrary to the overarching strategy and hierarchical approach of concentrating development within the main settlements. Furthermore the proposed development has not been demonstrated as being essential to its countryside location. Consequently the proposal represents unsustainable development contrary to policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015), policy 1 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan (2015) and would fail to meet the definition of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework (2018).

ii) The proposed development, by reason of the siting and relationship with the host dwelling and neighbouring property, would lead to an intensification of the use that would therefore result in significant harm to residential amenity and is contrary to policy 33 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015). It would also be out of keeping with those two dwellings because it does not reflect the architectural and historic character and scale of the surrounding buildings contrary to policy 10 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan (2015) and the overarching aim of the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement (2016).

	<p>iii) The proposed development would create a third access onto the very busy A281 within 50 metres. This would reduce the safety of users of the A281 and would result in harm to those users of the public highway contrary to policies 33, 40 and 41 of the Horsham District Planning Framework (2015).</p>
<p><u>DC/19/0499</u> 04.03.2019</p> <p>RESOLVED</p>	<p>Prior approval for a proposed change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling house Copsale Stables, Copsale Road, Copsale</p> <p>The Parish Council strongly objects to this prior approval (Class Q) application for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) The proposal is contrary to paragraph (g) of Class Q which does not allow for extension beyond any external dimensions of the existing buildings. This is because the proposal appears to require a rebuild of the tractor bay with an extension to the rear and alteration in height so that the roof would extend in line with the existing stable block.</p> <p>2) The proposal is contrary to paragraphs (d) and (e) of Class because the site is occupied by a thriving small agricultural business, which the Parish Council understands is part of a tenancy agreement.</p> <p>3) No structural report has been submitted to demonstrate that the buildings are capable of conversion. Given the limited construction of the barn it is considered that it is unlikely to be capable of conversion to a dwelling without major reconstruction work.</p> <p>4) The agricultural barn and stables form part of a thriving small agricultural business keeping goats, sheep and chickens. One of the over-arching aims of the Parish's Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is to support local businesses, including agricultural businesses. Conversion of these actively used buildings into a dwelling is therefore unacceptable and contrary to the NP.</p> <p>5) The proposed development is located outside a built up area boundary in a rural location outside of the limits of any existing settlement. The site is not allocated for development in the Horsham District Planning Framework (HDPF) or the NP. HDC has a five year supply of housing so this dwelling is not needed.</p> <p>6) There is no demonstrated need for a dwelling in this countryside location and it does not constitute a use considered essential to a countryside location.</p> <p>7) The application constitutes inappropriate backland development. The Independent Examiner of the Parish's NP required the removal of a site in Nuthurst from the draft NP purely because it was a backland development. He said the proposed site was behind a row of large houses in large plots, the development would appear incongruous in its setting, out of character with the nearby houses and would fail to protect the rural character of the area. These reasons apply equally to this site at Copsale Stables.</p> <p>8) The conversion of the agricultural barn and stables into one very unattractive dwelling would result in harm to the open and rural landscape character of the area and would be totally out of keeping with the surrounding buildings fronting</p>

	<p>Copsale Road in contravention of policy 10 of the NP and various policies in the HDPF. It would also be contrary to the over-arching aim of the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement to make sure that new developments fit in well with the rural nature of the Parish.</p> <p>9) There would be a significant loss of habitat for wildlife, particularly migratory birds such as swallows and swifts, if these open buildings were converted to a dwelling.</p> <p>Conclusion The Parish Council urges HDC to refuse prior approval (Class Q) on the following grounds:</p> <p>1) The proposed development is contrary to paragraphs (d), (e) and (g) of Class Q for the reasons given above.</p> <p>2) The proposed development would mean the loss of a thriving agricultural business contrary to one of the over-arching aims of the HDPF and the Nuthurst NP.</p> <p>3) The proposed development would be located outside of a built up area boundary on a site not allocated for development in the HDPF or the Nuthurst NP. The proposed development would therefore be inconsistent with the overarching strategy for development within the HDPF. The proposed development is therefore contrary to policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 26 and 40 of the HDPF, policy 1 of the Nuthurst NP and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).</p> <p>4) The site lies in a rural location outside the limits of any existing settlement and does not constitute a use considered essential to a countryside location. The proposal would therefore conflict with paragraph 79 of the NPPF and policies 1, 2, 3, 4 and 26 of the HDPF.</p> <p>5) The proposed development would result in harm to the open and rural landscape character of the area and the visual amenities of the site and the wider area and would be out of character with the surrounding buildings. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies 25, 26, 31, 32 and 33 of the HDPF and policy 10 of the Nuthurst NP and the overarching aim of the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement.</p>
--	--

PC022/18-19 PLANNING UPDATES

- i) DC/18/0846 Land North of Keatings
The applicants have appealed against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of two detached dwellings including associated landscaping, amenity space, garages and parking with widening of existing access off Nuthurst Street.
- The single planning application was submitted by the landowners of Keatings and Hollyhocks and the proposed dwellings would be built in their gardens, therefore being a householder application.
- The decision notice, issued in October 2018, states that householder appeals must be submitted with 12 weeks and all other appeals within 6 months.
- RESOLVED** to write to the Planning Inspectorate and request for the appeal to be disallowed because it is out of time.
- ii) Planning Inspectorate Event Dates

DC/17/2524 Micklepage - The event date has been arranged but no details.
DC/17/2294 Dun Horse – The event date has been published as 27th March 2019.
As an interested third party the Parish Council would like to attend each event.

RESOLVED to write to the Planning Inspectorate and request for the date, time and place of each event.

PC023/18-19 MINOR MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS TO BE REFERRED TO ON THE NEXT AGENDA

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** that the Councillors did not request for any items to be included on the next Planning Committee agenda.

The meeting closed at 8.10pm