

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held remotely by the Zoom Virtual Platform on Thursday 14th January 2021, commencing at 7.00 p.m.

Present: Mrs. A. Worthington-Leese in the Chair, Mr. B. Dent, Mr. R. Eves, Mr. A. Head, Mr. R. Jerman and Mr. P. Oakham.

Also Present: Mr. D Bentley.

Attendees: 1 Member of the Public.

57. **Apologies for Absence.** There were no apologies for absence.

58. **To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members.** Mr. Oakham declared an interest in the amended planning application numbered DC/20/2143: Storrington Squash Club.

59. **To Approve and Sign the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 1st December 2020.** Mr. Jerman noted that Minute No. 46. (c) stated that the signage had been removed from The Glebe and in fact they were still in situ. With this amendment made, the minutes were duly **APPROVED** as being a correct record of the proceedings thereat and would be duly signed by the Chairman when possible.

Deputy Clerk's Update.

60. (a) **Minute No.46 (c) The Glebe.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese and Mr Jerman attended a zoom meeting on Friday 8th December and will update Members further under Chairman's Announcements. It was however reiterated that a drainage survey of the area should be undertaken and any issues highlighted and rectified prior to the Parish Council considering taking responsibility for this open space.
- (b) **Minute No. 46 (f): Ash Tree Die-back.** The Deputy Clerk informed Members that Ashley of Sussex Tree Surgery had been to view the Ash trees at The Glade and reported that all the Ash trees within the woodland were now affected by Ash die back, which thankfully only counts for around 10% of the woodland trees. As all the Ash trees have symptoms, there is no immediate rush to fell them. If there were a number of Ash trees in the area that were not showing symptoms, he would advise a fast response to preserve those, but in this case, there were none. That said, they will need to be felled by approximately March/April 2021, to prevent them from becoming dangerous by means of structural defects. A quotation for the felling of all the Ash trees within The Glade suffering from Ash dieback was received and forwarded to Members on 13th January. This quotation was for the sum of £2,610 – and included Ashley along with three fully certified Arborists, for five days to complete the works, chip waste and remove all timber from the site.
- (c) **Minute No. 46 (g): Woodland Trust – Tree Packs.** There had been technical problems with the Woodland Trust's website, which meant that the tree packs could not be ordered. The technical issue was still on-going and ordering of trees had been delayed; the Deputy Clerk would keep Members informed of any updates.
- (d) **Minute No. 46 (c): Replanting Schedule.** The Deputy Clerk confirmed that the two donated silver birch trees had been collected and planted by our Premises Manager and Mr. Jerman around the pond during December.

- (e) **Minute No. 48: To discuss the responsibility for and maintenance of Fryern Dell.**
There was no update on this matter, however enquiries were still on-going.
- (f) **Minute No. 49: To Review and make comment on WSCC & SDNPA's Proposed Modifications to the Soft Sand Review.** The Deputy Clerk confirmed that Members' comments had been forwarded prior to the closing date and a confirmation e-mail along with a unique representation number had been received on 6th January. This confirmed that all representations would be submitted for review by the Planning Inspector.
61. **To Ratify Comments sent to HDC on 23rd December 2020 for Planning Applications Numbered: DC/20/2125, DC/20/2143, DC/20/2280, DC/20/2379, DC/20/2417, DC/20/2488, DC/20/2502 and DC/20/2536.** The comments for DC/20/2125, DC/20/2280, DC/20/2379, DC/20/2417, DC/20/2488, DC/20/2502 and DC/20/2536, which had been collated, agreed by Members and sent to HDC on 23rd December, were duly ratified.
Members had received an e-mail from the applicant of DC/20/2143, stating that they had revised the application details to accommodate the Parish Council's concerns. Members were asked to give their views. Mrs. Worthington-Leese still objected to the proposal, Mr. Eeva concurred, Mr Head had concerns that the outline permission for flats seemed to have been ignored. Mr. Oakham declared an interest and took no part in the discussions and Mr. Dent expressed his concern, however taking the application at face value, he had no objection. With mixed opinions this application went to vote. With three objections and two no objections, the motion was carried and it was **AGREED**: that Members' previous comments remained and those comments were duly ratified.
62. **To Review and Agree the Tree Budget for the 2021/2022 Financial Year.** It was reported that due to the current pandemic, no tree works had been undertaken within the current year's budget. That said, some outstanding works would require payment prior to the new financial year. This included the previously agreed quotations for works at the Hormare Field (£1,140) and the removal of the dead Sorbus at Sullington Rec. (£200). There was also the recently received quotation of £2,610 for the removal of all the diseased Ash trees at the Glade, although this should be paid from The Glade budget. With this in mind and the fact that the large oak to the front of the Parish Building was due a decay evaluation in June (which cost £420 back in 2018) Mrs. Worthington-Leese proposed and Mr. Head seconded that the budget for 2021/20022 remain at £6k. This was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED**.
63. **Planning Applications awaiting Comment – Appendix I.**
- (a) **DC/20/0907: Land to the West of Northlands, Fryern Road.** This was an amended application due to additional information having been received. Members agreed that the additional information was not useful and noted that photographs and videos of the horrendous flooding had been sent to HDC along with numerous complaints about the inadequate culvert. Comments received from Members regarding this application included: *"It seems to have taken 4 months (July to December) to get a formal response on the technicalities of this matter, which clearly indicates the construction of the culvert is contrary to the guidance. The reference documents on Riparian ownership make clear the obligations with respect to flooding and that culverts cannot be constructed without authority. The latest 'supporting documents' don't change anything. I really don't understand why the landowner is being permitted to drag this out for months when there are demonstrable and recorded consequences from his actions and neglect."* *"My measurement of the exit pipe is 280mm bore; not 450mm. The drainage calcs (if that is what they are) provided by the applicant are based on 1.5ft, i.e. 450mm diameter, and*

20% full, so hard to see the relevance. Guidance is opposed to culverts & states that 450mm is the minimum; will be larger if the situation requires it. The upstream/entry of the culvert is badly obstructed by debris. Part of the track on the downstream side is missing, exposing the culvert.

“The culvert is sub-standard. The entrance and track are unnecessary. Why do grazing sheep need a tarmac track?? Why is a second entrance necessary, when there is already one on the corner of Northlands Lane & Greenhurst Lane....which the applicant was seen using when gaining access to fell the oaks!!” Members also noted and agreed with Thakeham’s objections to the application. After discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the above reasons, supporting Thakeham Parish Council’s comments and requesting that this application go to Committee for discussion, should HDC be minded to permit it.*

- (b) **DC/20/2167: 13, Amberley Road, Farthing Cottage.** This was an amended application was for the erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of ground floor veranda and erection of a porch to front elevation. Members had viewed the details prior to the meeting and all agreed that the amendments looked the same as the previous ones and that all our previous comments remained. As such, and after a short discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the previous objections and requesting that this application go to Committee for discussion, should HDC be minded to permit it.*

- (c) **DC/20/2488: Little Coppice, Sandgate Lane.** This was an amendment to the previously submitted plan. Members had been informed that the applicant had acknowledged that the measurements of the building heights on the original plans were incorrect and that revised plans had been sent to HDC with a new deadline for comments of 21 January. It was noted that there had been a few objections from residents. Members had reviewed the revised documents and all agreed that it was down to HDC to determine whether plans were correct before being validated and not the duty of the Parish Council. That said, Members agreed that their previous comments remained regarding the height, design and size of the property. Having reviewed the drawings, Members felt that the flat roof design considerably enlarged the apparent mass of the main building and that the rendered wall at the roadside was not in keeping with the area. After discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, reiterating our previous comments, listing all of the above reasons and requesting that this application go to Committee for discussion, should HDC be minded to permit it.*

- (d) **DC/20/2493: 7, Reed Close.** This application was for surgery to 1 x cherry and 2 x beech trees. Mr. Jerman reported that he had undertaken a site visit as Members had expressed their concern that the works requested seemed somewhat excessive. He reported that the works were indeed excessive and that bar a clean-up of dead wood to the Beeches and about a metre off the top of the Cherry, nothing else needed to be done. He also expressed his concern regarding the application - in Section 4 the applicant had high-lighted “Yes” to the question of diseased/fears of falling, however they had not, as

required, provided “information from an appropriate expert” nor had they completed Section 3: Agent Details. (obviously have not yet approached Tree Rangers Limited who are mentioned later on.) They do state in Section 4 that the Cherry T3 is leaning and if it fell would hit the roof of the adjacent bungalow. It is certainly leaning (quite safely as it has a disproportionally thick trunk) but would not reach the bungalow if it fell. The Beeches were very poorly cut back in 2018. The branches do not lean over the garages as stated to any extent and have grown very little since the last surgery. For all of the above reasons Mr. Jerman proposed a comment of strong objection and Members fully concurred. After discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the above reasons.*

- (e) **DC/20/2519: 29, School Hill.** This application was for the conversion of an ancillary building to a self-contained commercial unit (Class E) with new shopfront and door alterations to existing floor levels and window and door openings. Members had viewed all the plans prior to the meeting and had made the following comments: this was an historic building, being formerly a school room and was in the Conservation Area (as amended in 2018). The proposed alterations would strip it of its historical features and I do not consider it to be large enough to create a useful commercial premises. I also do not consider the pedestrian access to be particularly safe. Members reported that some work had already started, the chimney had gone and the exposed roof structure at that point seemed unprotected (this had been reported to HDC’s Senior Conservation Officer who would be taking the matter up with his Enforcement colleagues). Concerns were also expressed relating to the risks from excavations to lower the floor: (1) the adjacent twitten is used for cars, and (2) the site is at the foot of a sloping site and it was doubted that No. 29 and the neighbouring property had modern footings. The proposed new shopfront/entrance leads straight onto the road next to a busy car park. Class E covers most kinds of business and the application has not been completed regarding operating hours. Is there a need for a commercial site here? E.g. the upper floors of Havant House have changed from offices to residential, and the precinct upper floor is predominantly residential. This building has no obvious connection to other commercial sites, being clearly part of the residential area. Whilst this area is very unattractive and neglected, the design of the shopfront is not considered to be an improvement. Members did not feel that this was an appropriate location for a commercial unit. Mrs. Worthington-Leese reminded Members that in 2008 there had been a proposal to convert this building to a house which was refused by HDC and at Appeal. The inspector stated is his refusal decision:

Appeal Decision APP/Z3825/A/08/2088726

of its limited size and the constraints of the site, does not lend itself to residential conversion for independent occupation.

6. Although the area to which this appeal relates has recently been separated from No 29 School Hill, its origins are essentially those of a single roomed outhouse at the bottom of the short sloping garden to that property. I regard the existing building as of some historic interest and of some townscape value however, these are not sufficient reason for granting planning permission for the appeal proposal especially as there could be a range of uses in association with No 29 that might ensure its being retained. I also note that this proposal involves the removal of the chimney. This removes an original feature of the building which makes an identifiable, if small, townscape contribution.
7. I note that objections have been raised on the basis of financial contributions not having been made towards transport improvement and community facilities and that in a recent letter the appellant has expressed a willingness to make such payments. In light of this statement from the appellant and of the matters discussed above which lead me to dismiss this appeal, I have not looked further into this aspect of the Council’s case.

Simon E Gibbs

Inspector

It was also mentioned that the proposal was not in keeping with the surrounding area, was in the conservation area and faced directly onto vehicle movement. After lengthy discussions, it was **AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the above reasons, including the extract from the Planning Inspector and requesting that this application go to Committee for discussion, should HDC be minded to permit it.*

- (f) **DC/20/2603: The Amberley, New Town Road.** This application was for surgery to an oak tree in the Conservation Area. Mr. Jerman reported that he had undertaken a site visit and that whilst he did not have a problem with the small branch removal and raising the crown to 18ft, he did not agree with cutting back the tree as much as 3 to 4 metres. He also stated that it should be noted that no agent details were submitted with the application. As the tree was in good shape and the term used “nearly encroaching upon the property” was no reason for the works to be so severe, he felt that 2 metres would probably be quite sufficient. As such he proposed a comment of objection to the outlined surgery. Members thanked Mr. Jerman for his report and it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all the reasons and recommendations mentioned above.*

- (g) **SDNP/20/04892/HO: Hazelgrove, Wiggonholt.** This was an amended application due to a revised plan being submitted. Members had viewed the amendments and made the following comments: the revised plan was better; however Members were unsure why the extension had a different roof pitch from the existing building, and expressed some concern at the industrial nature of the profile sheet garage, that said, it was felt that with a suitable colour it should be acceptable. After a short discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the above comments.*

64. **Planning Application Decisions – Appendix II.** These were duly **NOTED.**
65. **Planning Applications, Comment Summary – since the meeting of 1st December – Appendix III.** These were duly **NOTED.**
66. **Enforcement Matters.**
- (a) **DC/19/1638: South of Kithurst Lane. Case No. EN/20/0384.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese had asked Emma Parkes of HDC to find out the latest situation regarding any request for a judicial review or other route the applicant may decide to take regarding this matter. She was currently waiting on an update. Mrs. Worthington-Leese informed Members that she had told HDC she expected enforcement action to be taken if the applicant was not pressing ahead with a judicial review.
- (b) **EN/20/0440: Heatherdown, 17, Bramber Avenue.** As a planning application for this site had been received (DC/20/2379), the Enforcement Case was now closed. All comments had been collated and forwarded to HDC on 23rd December and ratified as per minute 61. above.

- (c) **Fryern Park Farm, Fryern Road.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese gave an update on this site, all Members had received a copy of Barbara Childs' letter of response to Mrs Worthington-Leese's letter. Mrs. Worthington-Leese had a zoom meeting with Barbara Childs and Emma Parks earlier in the week, during which various cases of enforcement matters and the lack of action were covered.

67. Chairman's Announcements.

- (a) **Update on Virtual Meeting with HDC's Director of Place.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese gave Members a brief update on her discussions regarding various planning issues, a few of which have been mentioned above. HDC had agreed to look into why we were not receiving notification of some applications and decision notices. HDC would confirm details on Fryern Park Farm appeal date and decisions were expected by the end of this month for Northlands Lane, Little Rock Cottage and Heatherdown. Mrs. Worthington-Leese expressed her concern regarding the lack of enforcement action taken and whilst HDC sympathised, they appeared reluctant to follow matters up as swiftly as expected. As regards our report on the poor quality of some of the plans, we were told to inform the relevant Case Officer of any issues and they would deal with them accordingly.
- (b) **Update on DC/20/0455, retrospective application for the change of use of land for the siting of a copper cabin and ancillary geodesic dome for use as short-term holiday accommodation, with associated access, car parking and landscaping. The Copper Cabin and Geodesic Dome, land to the east of Fryern Road.** Again this was discussed at the virtual meeting mentioned above. A decision to refuse this site had been made on 24th September, yet the Parish Office had been receiving reports that the site was still in use. Complaints had been made and forwarded to HDC regarding light and noise intrusion, and HDC had been in contact with the owner who apologised and said they would have a word with the family member who was self-isolating at the time. HDC were told that Appeal information was close to completion and would look into whether this paperwork had been lodged yet and update Members on the latest position. They did say however, that if there was evidence of the site continuing to be used, they could put a stop notice on the site.
- (c) **Update on continual flooding at Land to the west of Northlands Lane, Fryern Road. DC/20/0907: Retrospective application for the creation of an access and track.** Again this was discussed at the virtual meeting mentioned above. Mrs. Worthington-Leese expressed her concern again about the apparent lack of action at this site, despite videos and photographs of the dreadful flooding in this area and the fact that no decision had been made despite the determination deadline of 8th September. HDC responded by saying that they were awaiting feedback from Highways and once this had been received, they anticipated a decision would be made by the end of the month. 2 District Councillors had called this in to Committee.
- (d) **Update on Flooding Issues at The Glebe.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese reported that she had had a zoom meeting a week or so ago to discuss the issues at this site. She stated that she would be writing to HDC and the Developer to state that an independent drainage report should be undertaken, for which the Developer and/or HDC should pay for and that once measures had been put in place to rectify any issues/concerns, a reserve fund should be set up by the developers as a guarantee that if after a period of time (say 3-5 years) the area floods again, monies from said reserve fund would pay for the repair.

The Clerk had sent photographs of the site to Adrian Smith (HDC's Major Applications Team Leader) earlier today. The first depicted the situation prior to the installation of the bund and the second (taken today) showed how the water was lying on the field. The current weather conditions could not be classed as extreme. These were forwarded to HDC Drainage Engineer and Millwood Homes, and as a result, a site meeting had been arranged for Monday 18th January at 11am. In attendance would be Adrian, HDC's Drainage Engineer and Millwood Homes' Engineer. Mr. Jerman had volunteered to attend on behalf of the Parish Council. Mrs. Worthington-Leese told Members she had asked the Clerk to put this matter on the next Full Council Agenda for discussion.

- (e) **Update on Footpath on Fryern Road.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese informed Members of the exchange of e-mails that she had had with County Councillor Paul Marshall regarding this footpath, along with some complaints she had received from local residents, regarding the footpath being used by skateboarders/cyclists, which affected their privacy and the peacefulness of the area. Members considered this to be a gross waste of money at £15k. Many questions were asked regarding who was consulted, how many people supported and objected to the proposal, was it considered necessary/value for money, was any survey done regarding the use of the proposed footpath etc. and if a no skating/cycling sign could be erected? A lengthy response had been received from Tom Collins, County's Senior Engineer, Improvements Highways, Transport and Planning. However it did not answer all Mrs. Worthington-Leese's questions, so she had written again on 8th January, (attaching photographs which showed the footpath going nowhere and the terrible state the grass verge had been left in). As of today no response had been received.
- (f) **Various Letters received regarding Ravenscroft site.** Members had been copied in on a number of letters from residents regarding their objections to the proposed redevelopment of the Ravenscroft allotment site. Whilst all of the comments were being collated, the Deputy Clerk had responded stating that the Planning Committee were unable to make comment until such time as an application had been submitted to and verified by HDC. As soon as an application was received, it would be put on the Planning & Development Committee Meeting's Agenda for discussion and anyone would be welcome to attend said meeting (via Zoom) at that time. Once the application had been submitted they should submit their comments to HDC Planning, detailing the appropriate planning reference number. In the meantime, the Deputy Clerk was asked to redact personal information and send the collated comments to A2 Dominion.
- (g) **DC/20/2377: Prior notification for the re-surfacing of an existing track for delivery of trees and associated goods to create new woodland. Furzedown Field Kithurst Lane.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese stated that whilst this was a prior notification, HDC were taking comments from third parties and as such, Members wished to make a representation of strong objection. All comments were collated agreed and sent to HDC yesterday.
68. **Documents for Councillors to Read.** There were no documents to read.
69. **Any Other Business.** No other matters were raised.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.15pm.