

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held remotely by the Zoom Virtual Platform on Thursday 11th February 2021, commencing at 7.00 p.m.

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

Also Present: Mr. D Bentley.

70. **Apologies for Absence.** Apologies for absence had been received from Mr. B. Dent (prior engagement). The reason for absence was duly approved.
71. **To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members.** Mr. Oakham declared an interest in the amended planning application numbered DC/20/2143: Storrington Squash Club.
72. **To Approve and Sign the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 14th January 2021.** These 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.

72. (a) **Minute No. 60 (c): Woodland Trust – Tree Packs.** The Deputy Clerk had spoken with a representative of the Woodland Trust who stated that they had been the subject of a very serious cyber attack which had affected all of their systems and website. They agreed to contact her when possible, confirming which tree packs were available and how they would go about ordering them. The Deputy Clerk had created a spreadsheet, showing the grid references of the areas that required planting around the Hormare Field in preparation.
- (b) **Minute No. 60 (e) Responsibility for maintenance of Fryern Dell.** The Deputy Clerk had received a ream of paperwork and previous notes on this matter and was in the process of working through it all.
73. **To Review and Make Comment on the SDNPA Camping and Glamping Technical Advice Note (TAN) Consultation.** Members' comments had been collated and circulated prior to this meeting. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read the comments received to date and requested that prior to these being submitted to the SDNPA, the Deputy Clerk send out a reminder to all Members requesting they forward their comments to her as soon as possible for collation. This was **AGREED.**
74. **To Collate and Agree Members' Comments regarding Rampion 2 Wind Farm Proposals, following presentation.** Members had been sent the link to the virtual presentation and the Deputy Clerk had forwarded notes to all Members, along with Washington Parish Council's comments and any questions which had been raised. An article against the proposal had also been forwarded to all by the Clerk. Questions from Councillors had been forwarded to representatives of Rampion 2 prior to their presentation earlier this evening, some of which were discussed. Members requested that these be answered and sent to the Parish Office for distribution. They were also asked to supply Members with a map of the UK, showing sites of all the windfarms. After discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:** that the Deputy Clerk should send out a further reminder to all Councillors, requesting they forward their comments to her for collation and then submission.

75. **To Ratify Members' acceptance of Quotation to Remove all Diseased Ash Trees at The Glade.** As per Minute No. 62. a quotation had been received for the abovementioned works for the sum of £2,610. Members had agreed electronically that this quotation should be accepted and as such the Contractor was contacted last week, requesting that said works were undertaken as soon as possible in order to avoid the bird nesting season. After a short discussion, this decision was **DULY RATIFIED.**
76. **To Discuss Mr. Jerman's Report regarding any necessary works to tree overhanging Hormare Cottage.** The office had received an e-mail with accompanying photographs regarding overhanging branches being close to the house (potentially touch the roof) causing the cladding to go green, issues with lack of light and requesting a site visit be undertaken. Mr. Jerman reported that he had undertaken a site visit on 3rd February and confirmed the following: whilst the tree was definitely on our land it did not require any works to be undertaken, hence why it was not on our tree works list. Members thanked Mr. Jerman for undertaking the site visit and after discussion it was **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk should write to the residents, stating that at this stage it was not felt that any works to the tree were necessary.
77. **Planning Applications awaiting Comment – Appendix I.**
- (a) **DC/20/2167: Farthing Cottage, 13, Amberley Road.** This was a further amended application due to change of description. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments, which basically stated that they could not see any difference from the previous application details and as such their comments remained. After discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**
- That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, reiterating all our previous comments as sent to HDC on 11th January and requesting that this application go to Committee for discussion, should HDC be minded to permit it.*
- (b) **DC/20/2502: Yaffles, Nightingale Lane.** This was an amended application, due to a change in description. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments. As no additional documents had been submitted and our comment regarding the application not mentioning the extension replacing the conservatory had been addressed, Members agreed that our previous comment of no objection reiterating the issues regarding the glazing and materials should be submitted. After discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**
- That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, providing the glazing for the new bedroom is as drawn and roof is hipped as drawn and materials match the existing.*
- (c) **DC/21/20057: Land at Angells Sandpit.** This application was for the erection of six x double storey dwellings with associated landscaping, drainage and access improvements. Members had been e-mailed letters of objection for this development from both The Wiggonholt Association and Sandgate Conservation Society and prior to the meeting, it was noted that there were in excess of seventeen letters of objection (on the grounds of highways, access traffic, parking etc.) on HDC's website. Mrs. Worthington-Leese reminded Members that the principle of development of this site was established in the Neighbourhood Plan (as added by the Examiner not the Steering Group) however this was for two and three bed houses - the type of housing needed in the village. She felt that by submitting plans for larger houses the developer was not adhering to the NP. She also stated that she did not like the design, it was uninspiring and not complementary to

the nearby listed buildings or characteristic of local design. Concern was expressed about the loss of trees and habitat and whilst Members accepted that any development had this result, this development was adjacent to the Warren - a SSSI. Mrs. Worthington-Leese added that whilst she did not object to the principle of development she did object to the design and the mix of housing. Members concurred and added that the larger buildings, were on the higher ground so would dominate the development. Whilst the layout appeared to meet the 45m separation from Chestnut Cottage, the closeness of plots 3 and 4 homes to the buffer zone is undesirable, even though the ground floors are sunk into the ground at this point. The buffer zone was not meant to be the back garden. Questions were also asked as to why there was a need for chimneys – was this a decorative anachronism and what did ‘self-build’ mean in terms of commitment to planning consent? Mr. Jerman requested that the following Examiner’s recommendation be added to our comments to HDC: “93. *In terms of the capacity of the site, my opinion is that it would not be making the most efficient use of development land to restrict development to just six dwellings, especially if the aspiration of the policy is that the development includes two and three bedroom properties. I propose to amend the capacity to require the site to deliver at least six dwellings.*” Mrs. Worthington-Leese also stated that, should this application be approved, we should request a condition be added stating that NO CONSTRUCTION vehicles are to be routed through the AQMA. Members agreed and after discussion and taking everything into account it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing all of the above reasons, stating that whilst Members did not object to the development of this site in principle, the Developer had not adhered to the Neighbourhood Plan by proposing larger houses than those suggested. Members also request that should HDC be minded to permit this application, it be put to Committee for discussion.*

- (d) **DC/21/0177: Land East of Furzedown, Kithurst Lane.** This was a further application for the construction of a dwelling and garage at this site. Members had viewed all the details prior to the meeting and Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out their comments. Members also question why the application states the Norbertine Order under *Company Name* when Land Registry shows that the applicant owns the land himself? Over the years there have been a number of applications to develop this site which have been declined and/or dismissed at appeal. This current application does nothing to alleviate the previous reasons for objection i.e. the proposal would harm the rural character and appearance of the area. The location is outside of the built up area, is a greenfield site and is not listed in the Neighbourhood Plan as developable. Members can see no reason for a different conclusion to that of the existing barn constructed contrary to consent. Policy 16 of the Storrington, Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan, lists Matt Meadow as a Local Green Space and states that “*Proposals for development in a Local Green Space will be resisted other than in very special circumstances, unless they are ancillary to the use of the land for a public recreational purpose or are required for a statutory utility infrastructure purpose. (e.g. Small areas of car parking).*” – neither of these apply to this site. Members could not see why a house and resident gardener should be required and are unaware of any resident staff maintaining the Warren at Sullington or other similar woodlands. It was also considered that planting should not require a resident gardener either. The application in paragraph 9 refers to 12 light goods parking spaces being reduced to 4, where? Similarly paragraph 16 refers to an existing dwelling on the site; where? Again the applicant states that the Parish Council has said that this site could be considered as a windfall development – as previously stated this is **not** the case; what had been said was that any proposals for 6 or less dwellings

would be considered under windfall sites, not that this site would be considered acceptable. After discussions, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

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

- (e) **DC/21/0238: Brookend House, Manleys Hill.** This application was to fell 2 x Portuguese Laurel and 4 x Conifer and surgery to 1 x Magnolia grandiflora and 1 x Conifer (Works to Trees in a Conservation Area). Mr. Jerman had undertaken a site visit and reported that SE Lighting had informed the owner that works had to be carried out to the trees. The leylandii were both past their sell by date and out of control and the Magnolia was a nice example and would definitely benefit from the surgery requested. As such he had no objections to the proposed works. Members concurred and after a short discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, providing the works were undertaken by a Qualified Tree Surgeon.*

78. **Planning Application Decisions – Appendix II.** These were duly **NOTED.**

79. **Planning Applications, Comment Summary – since the meeting of 14th January – Appendix III.** These were duly **NOTED.**

80. **Appeals Lodged.**

- (a) **DC/20/2245: 1, West Wantley Cottages, Fryern Road.** Mrs Worthington-Leese informed Members that an Appeal had been lodged on 20th January against HDC's refusal to grant planning consent for the demolition of existing outbuildings and the conversion of a barn to a dwelling.
- (b) **DC/20/1710: Priory Fields, Monastery Lane.** Mrs Worthington-Leese informed Members that an Appeal had been lodged on 20th January against HDC's refusal to grant planning consent for the construction of a cottage and garage.

81. **Enforcement Matters.**

- (a) **DC/19/1638: South of Kithurst Lane. Case No. EN/20/0384.** Enforcement update following dismissal of the Appeal for this site. Mrs. Worthington-Leese reported that HDC's Compliance team had reviewed the case and were minded to take enforcement action. That said, they were working on a couple of more urgent cases, but would be instructing their legal team shortly.
- (b) **EN/21/0021: Land West of Matts Wood, Off Cemetery Lane, Monastery Lane.** Alleged retention of unauthorised building following refusal of planning application DC/20/2250. It was noted that the Applicant had submitted an Appeal against HDC's decision to refuse the application, this was yet to be validated by the Planning Inspectorate.
- (c) **EN/21/0022: The Glebe Surgery, Monastery Lane.** Alleged: drainage problems arising from redevelopment of Glebe surgery. Mrs. Worthington-Leese confirm that this issue

was due to flooding of the Glebe Surgery car park and that the Developer of the surgery (as different to the housing) would be looking into the causes and rectifying these in due course.

- (d) **DC/20/2519: 29, School Hill.** Alleged removal of chimney prior to HDC reaching a decision. The Planning Officer was keeping an eye on this, as yet there was no update to report.
- (e) **EN/21/0036: 3, 5 and 9 The Glebe.** Alleged encroachment onto buffer zone in breach of landscaping conditions. The Parish Office was notified of this case on 8th February via the weekly enforcement list from HDC. It was alleged that a complaint had been lodged regarding someone having a wooden swing in their garden which exceeded the boundary.
- (f) **EN/21/0037: Land to the West of Northlands Lane, Fryern Road.** Alleged retention of unauthorised access track following refusal of DC/20/0907. This case had recently been opened due to HDC's refusal to permit the unauthorised track. As predicted an Appeal had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate, awaiting validation and as such, no enforcement action would be taken, pending the Appeal decision.
- (g) **EN/21/0044: Land North of Downsview Avenue.** Alleged display of unauthorised advertisement. Whilst it had been confirmed that the Developer owned the land the signage was on, the sign exceeds what is allowed under advertising regulations and as such required a planning application to be submitted.

82. **Chairman's Announcements.**

- (a) **Update on DC/20/0455, retrospective application the Copper Cabin and Geodesic Dome, land to the east of Fryern Road.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out the response from HDC's Emma Parkes, which stated that her enforcement colleagues did not consider that sufficient on-going harm was being caused by this development to warrant enforcement action at this stage and that it was reasonable to await the submission of an Appeal, which should be forthcoming. The applicant has until the end of March to submit this. Members expressed their disappointment with the lack of action, considering the complaints that had been received.
- (b) **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.** As mentioned under enforcement matters, HDC had refused the application and the applicant had since lodged an Appeal against this decision.
- (c) **Update on Flooding Issues at The Glebe.** Following the meeting on 18th January the developer had agreed to put in three French type drains across the slope of the hill to prevent future flooding. They had also agreed to set up an Escrow account, to help with any future issues; however no figure had yet been discussed.
- (d) **Update on Fryern Road Footpath.** As no response had been received Mrs. Worthington-Leese informed Members that she had e-mailed County Councillor Paul Marshall and both had undertaken a site visit last week. Councillor Marshall stated that the reason the footpath was constructed was to assist with access to the bus stop and to the other side of the road. Mrs. Worthington-Leese disputed this as that area was a quagmire and unlikely

to be used by residents as an access to the village. She asked that the path be removed; however this was thought to be an unlikely option. As a compromise she asked if the path could be covered with a more environmentally friendly surface such as woodchip or stone. County would look into this. Of most concern was that County had not consulted with our adopted Neighbourhood Plan as this area was clearly listed as a protected green gap between Storrington & West Chiltington – Councillor Marshall said he would look into why Highways had clearly overlooked the NP.

- (e) **HDC Planning Committee Meetings.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese informed Members that the following applications were on the agenda for 16th February from 2.30pm: **DC/20/2322: Tickletag Farm, Hurston Lane, DC/20/2143: Storrington Squash Club, Greyfriars Lane** and **DC/20/1923: Little Rock Cottage, Hurston Lane.** All were recommended for approval, with suggested conditions. Mrs. Worthington Leese confirmed she would be attending this virtual meeting. Members discussed the applications and it was suggested that she only represent the Parish Council for DC/20/1923 Little Rock Cottage, all were in agreement and the Deputy Clerk would inform Horsham accordingly.

83. **Documents for Councillors to Read.** There were no documents to read.

84. **Any Other Business.**

- (a) **Land North of Melton Drive.** It was reported that works were being undertaken at the access to the abovementioned area, with trees and shrubbery being ripped out. The contractors had stated that the works had been approved by the owners of Wantley House. Concern was expressed regarding the line of lime trees along both sides of Melton Drive and the Deputy Clerk was asked to check if they were TPO'd and if not, as they were considered of high amenity value, a request should be put in to HDC to protect them. Members raised the question as to whether Wates had sold the land in question and would try to determine if this was indeed the case.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 7.55pm.