

STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held in the Chanctonbury Room, The Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington on Wednesday 9th September 2021, commencing at 7.00 p.m.

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

14. **Apologies for Absence.** Apologies for absence had been received from Messrs. A. Head and Mr. R Jerman (prior engagements). The reasons for absence were duly approved.
15. **To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members.** Mr. Oakham declared an interest in application number DC/21/1994, Hawthorns, Hurston Lane.
16. **To Approve and Sign the Minutes of the Meeting held on the 16th June 2021.** These minutes were duly **APPROVED** as being a correct record of the proceedings thereat and were duly signed by the Chairman.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. David Bentley onto the Committee.

Deputy Clerk's Update.

17. (a) **Minute No. 6 (a): DC/20/0455: The Copper Cabin and Geodesic Dome, Land to the East of Fryern Road and 6 (b) DC/20/2019: Barnwood Stables, Hurston Lane.** Both Appeals have now been validated by the Planning Inspectorate.
- (b) **Minute No. 6 (c): Tree Matters.**

Remaining Tree Works at Storrington Memorial Pond. Works now completed and a seat and bench had been made out of the stumps.

Tree Planting Schedule. All requested information had been sent to Ashley at Sussex Tree Surgery and the Deputy Clerk was awaiting receipt of the completed schedule.
- (c) **Minute No. 12 (a): DC/20/2488: Little Coppice.** Mr. Oakham attended HDC's Planning Committee where this application was permitted.
- (d) **Minute No. 12 (b): Rampion 2 Statement of Community Consultation.** The Committee's draft response had been approved by Full Council on 4th August and submitted accordingly.
- (e) **Minute No. 12 (c): Letter from HDC's Head of Development and Building Control.** Various e-mails had been exchanged regarding the delays and issues within HDC's planning department. Members had been copied in on all correspondence, including the latest one which stated that they were all caught up as far as registering and validating planning applications was concerned. That said, due to Case Officers' caseloads doubling, it was likely that we will continue to see some delays in decision-making until their officer workloads return to normal levels. It was also noted that a couple of applications had been validated twice under different application numbers recently.
- (f) **SDNP The Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document.** Comments were collated, approved and sent to the SDNPA on 27th August.

- (g) **2021 Review of Parliamentary Constituencies.** A letter expressing the Parish Council's objections to becoming part of a new constituency known as Shoreham rather than coming under Arundel and South Downs had been sent to the Boundary Commission on 19th July.
18. **Public Participation – Members of the Public may comment on items on the agenda.** There were no Members of the Public present.
19. **Tree Matters. To Consider and Review Tree Condition Report received from Gale Tree Consultancy for the Oak at the front of the Parish Hall.** Members had been sent a copy of Andrew's report, which recommended that whilst the aerial assessment suggested the decay present was advancing, it was not sufficient to warrant any form of remedial work. As such his recommendation was to assess the tree again in two years' time, so that an evaluation of the decay's spread could be made. Members **AGREED** with this recommendation and the Deputy Clerk would diarise this.
20. **Planning Applications awaiting Comment – Appendix I.**

- (a) **DC/21/0749/AMENDED: Land North of Downsvie Avenue.** This was an amended plan which included a revised site plan, landscape strategy, additional planting and other alterations including parking. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments and a lengthy discussion ensued. It was agreed that the amendments were not clear and that clarification should be sought as to whether all of our previous comments had been addressed. It was understood that remains of an enclosed iron age settlement had recently been uncovered within the field and Members were concerned that any proposed development would destroy this. They felt that surely there must be some laws to protect such archaeological history. Again, Members stressed that there should be controls put in place to ensure there would be no parking in surrounding roads/areas, that the footpath should *not* be upgraded to a bridleway and felt all their previous objections remained. As such it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:** that the Deputy Clerk should contact the Case Officer to ensure all of our previous objections had been addressed/resolved, especially regarding house sizes, fences, walls, parking, electric vehicle charging facilities, affordable housing unit mix etc and request clarification of the exact amendments including a comparison of the plans. Until such time as the above issues had been addressed, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to HDC.*

- (b) **DC/21/1687: The Mill House, Chantry Mill, Chantry Lane.** This application was for the erection of a single storey outbuilding. Members had viewed the plans prior to the meeting and Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments. After a short discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, providing materials matched existing.*

- (c) **DC/21/1788: Bearsden, 1, Nightingale Park, Nightingale Lane.** This application was for the felling of 1 x sycamore tree. Members agreed that the report supplied with the application was very thorough. As such it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

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

- (d) **DC/21/1844: 10, Holm Oak.** This application was for surgery to 1 x blue atlas cedar, 1 x silver fir and w x deodar cedar. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comment and it was agreed that the suggested works were good maintenance. As such it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

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

- (e) **DC/21/1869: 2, Brow Close.** This application was to fell 1 x whitebeam and for surgery to 2 x pedunculate oak and 1 x silver birch. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments, which were mixed. Some felt that the reasons given for the felling of the Whitebeam re. light and space were insufficient and that the Whitebeam was a healthy tree. Others had no objections to the proposals. It was also noted that as of 1st September Whitebeam had been added to the new list of world endangered trees published. Discussions ensued and it was **AGREED:**

*That a comment of **OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, reiterating the abovementioned comments about the Whitebeam.*

- (f) **DC/21/1904: Four Acre Field, Hurston Lane.** This application was for alterations and an extension to the existing building to form new stables with a tack room and hay store. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments. Members discussed their concerns regarding the 2-storey element and felt this would be far too easy to convert into a residential property at a later date. This site is in the countryside and Members could see no justification or credible background to support the proposal. Members were unconvinced of the security benefit of the upstairs tack room and doubted there would be much appetite for carrying tack upstairs every time it was used. Having the hay store in the least accessible location also seemed odd, as does the fire risk. After discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, listing the abovementioned comments.*

- (g) **DC/21/1952: 1, Heron Lodge, Kithurst Park.** This application was for the conversion and extension to the existing garage to form an annexe with associated works and the erection of a single detached garage to the rear and formation of new access. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments and after a short discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC.*

- (h) **DC/21/1991: Highwinds, Washington Road.** This application was for the erection of a detached garage with retaining wall. Members noted that the garage was large and appeared to be of an odd shape. After discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **NO OBJECTION** be sent to HDC, providing materials matched existing.*

- (i) **DC/21/1994: Hawthorns, Hurston Lane.** This application was for the construction of a detached double garage to the front of the property. Members noted that there were very few front garden garages in Hurston Lane, and that whilst the proposed garage

would be in front of the building line, it would be screened by the high hedge to the front. As such it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

That a comment of NO OBJECTION be sent to HDC, providing materials matched existing.

- (j) **DC/21/2010: 5, High Street (Old Lloyds Bank Building).** This application was for the change of use from former bank to retail (Class E) and residential (Class C3) to form 3 Flats (within the Conservation Area). Whilst Members had no objections in principle, it was felt that even though the proposed windows and fascia of the roof top extension were set back and partly obscured, they should be sympathetic to the surrounding properties. The suggestion was also made that there should be no pavement displays or activities permitted. As regards Class E Members would wish to see a true RETAIL outlet rather than another estate agent, charity shop, hairdresser etc., in order to help revitalise the High Street. After discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

That a comment of NO OBJECTION be sent to HDC, listing the abovementioned concern/comments and providing materials matched existing.

- (k) **SDNP/21/02425/HOUS: Broomy Cottage, Barns Farm Lane.** This application was for the removal of existing timber staircase and first floor platform, erection of new external balcony to southern elevation of detached annexe with alterations to the ground and first floor windows and doors. Plans were projected and Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments. Whilst the balcony was larger than the previous arrangement it was being done sympathetically with the UPVC doors and windows being replaced by timber ones. After a short discussion, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

That a comment of NO OBJECTION be sent to HDC, providing materials matched existing.

- (l) **SDNP/21/02909/FUL: Hazelgrove, Wiggonholt.** This application was for change of use from garage and garden machinery to a holiday let including revised fenestration and door arrangements. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments and after a short discussion it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

That a comment of NO OBJECTION be sent to HDC, providing a condition is applied tying it to the main house so that it cannot be sold separately.

- (m) **WSCC/028/21: Rock Common Quarry, The Hollow.** This application was for the continued work and processing of sand, the importation of inert classified engineering and restoration material, the stockpiling and treating of the imported material, the placement of the imported material within the quarry void and the restoration and landscaping of the quarry. Mrs. Worthington-Leese read out Members' comments including those of Mr. Head, who attended the exhibition held on 3rd September. Given the intensity of the proposed activities and the potential risk from on-site waste processing as opposed to inert waste Members felt they should oppose the proposal. It was a concern to see that Highways seemed to be connecting past traffic movements with the proposed future movements - the original consented activity was close to its conclusion, meanwhile there has been significant growth in A283 and local traffic; new commitments in WSCC Mineral Plan and of course planned and future housing developments. The proposal is for a new and unrelated activity, not a continuation of an existing one. Highways' suggestion of access traffic controls and speed checks for designing appropriate splays, suggests a lack of

concern for the broader A283 traffic issues. As regards the doubts on safety issues from deep vs shallow water, there are still technical issues to be clarified: would a deep water pit destabilise the steep walls as claimed by the applicant? Would it lead as suggested to pollution from the adjacent pit? Would shallow lakes prevent this pollution? Wouldn't a rise in local groundwater levels, as a result of infill, lead to pollution regardless of the shallow lakes? Members concurred that the major issue regarding this proposal was the extra traffic which would affect the AQMA and put enormous pressure on the already congested A283 and Washington roundabout. After lengthy discussions, it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED:**

*That a comment of **STRONG OBJECTION** be sent to WSCC, listing all of the abovementioned comments and stating that should this application be permitted, a condition be added stating that NO lorries should come through the AQMA within Storrington.*

21. **Planning Application Decisions – Appendix II.** These were duly **NOTED.**
22. **Planning Applications, Comment Summary – since the meeting of 16th June – Appendix III.** These were duly **NOTED.**
23. **Appeals Lodged.**
 - (a) **DC/20/2245: 1, West Wantley Cottages, Fryern Road.** Appeal lodged on 8th July against HDC's refusal of planning consent for the demolition of existing outbuildings and the conversion of barn into a dwelling. *Further information/comments had been collated, agreed and subsequently sent to the Planning Inspectorate on 12th July.*
 - (b) **EN/21/0021: Priory Fields Barn, Land South of Kithurst Lane.** Appeal lodged on 24th June against HDC's service of an Enforcement Notice due to breach of Condition 1 under DC/18/1695 and DC/19/2119 (development should be carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed in the Schedule). *Further information/comments had been collated, agreed and subsequently sent to the Planning Inspectorate on 16th July.*
 - (c) **DC/20/0455: The Copper Cabin and Geodesic Dome, Land to the East of Fryern Road.** Appeal lodged on 19th August against HDC's refusal of planning consent for the retrospective application for 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. *It was agreed that comments should be collated and sent to the Planning Inspectorate prior to the deadline of 23rd September.*
 - (d) **DC/20/2019: Barnwood Stables, Hurston Lane.** Appeal lodged on 31st August against HDC's refusal of planning consent for the demolition of existing stable block and provision of a replacement residential lodge (Class C3), together with associated parking and amenity space. *It was agreed that comments should be collated and sent to the Planning Inspectorate prior to the deadline of 5th October.*
 - (e) **DC/21/0177: Land East of Furzedown, Kithurst Lane.** Appeal papers had been submitted to the Planning Inspectorate on 27th August, against HDC's refusal of planning consent for the construction of a single storey dwelling and garage. The Appeal had not been validated as yet.

24. Appeal Decisions.

- (a) **DC/20/2377: Priory Fields, Kithurst Lane.** The Planning Inspector allowed this Appeal on 5th July.
- (b) **DC/20/1710: Priory Fields, Monastery Lane.** The Planning Inspector dismissed this Appeal on 5th July.
- (c) **DC/20/2250: Priory Fields Barn.** The Planning Inspector dismissed this Appeal on 5th July.

25. Chairman's Announcements.

- (a) **EN/21/0037: Land West of Northlands Lane.** The Planning Inspectorate had confirmed that the outstanding information required for the Appeal to be processed had not been submitted and that the Appeal period deadline had expired. HDC informed the owner that the Enforcement Notice became effective on 2nd August and that steps 1-6 (as listed in the notice) need to be complied with by 27th September and Step 7 by 25th October.
- (b) **East Wantley Barn, Northlands Lane.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese informed Members that on 3rd March 2021 the Barn had been Listed as Grade II under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for its special architectural or historic interest. The Deputy Clerk had already added this to her Listed Buildings document.
- (c) **The Glebe Flooding.** Mrs. Worthington-Leese updated Members on the latest situation regarding this matter. Another site meeting had been requested with various parties in attendance.

26. HDC Draft Local Plan – Update following Meeting with District Councillors and HDC Officers on 3rd September. Mrs. Worthington-Leese reported that this was a lengthy and well attended meeting. The PC's concerns and objections regarding Melton Drive being added to the draft Local Plan were made very clear to all in attendance.

The proposed addition goes completely against the NPPF which states on page 57 *“Any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset (from its alteration or destruction, or FROM DEVELOPMENT WITHIN ITS SETTING) should require clear and convincing justification. Substantial harm to or loss of: a) grade II listed buildings... should be EXCEPTIONAL; b) to grade II* buildings ... should be WHOLLY EXCEPTIONAL. Where a proposed development will lead to substantial harm to (or total loss of significance of) a designated heritage asset, local planning authorities SHOULD REFUSE CONSENT...”*

Paragraph 199 states: *“When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation (and the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be). This is irrespective of whether any potential harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss, or less than substantial harm to its significance.”*

There are THREE grade II listed buildings - West Wantley being grade II*. Previous refusals at Appeal (and English Heritage) concluded that *“West Wantley House remains within an east-west agricultural belt between settlements which appears little changed over more than two centuries.... The isolated rural setting is a very important part of the asset's significance as it provides its historical landscape context.... The proposed development, in such close*

proximity, would inevitably affect this significance due to changes to the character and appearance of the setting and appreciation of the sense of rural isolation.... It would also erode to a harmful degree the separation between the listed building and the built up area of Storrington..... the level of harm would be significant and irreversible.” He therefore found it to be contrary to the NPPF.

Suggestions were made by the PC for HDC to look at other sites including Old Clayton, Lucking’s Yard, Bell Acre etc. as these could be included as part of our target number. They should also contact the SDNPA re making the best use of the Ravenscroft site by increasing the number of dwellings from 35 to 70, as originally suggested by the Neighbourhood Plan. It appeared that those in attendance from HDC were unaware of the pre-application advice sought regarding Old Clayton. The outcome was that HDC would go away and review all the documentation regarding Melton Drive and look at other potential sites and the numbers. HDC would be in contact again with their conclusion in a month’s time.

27. Adjournment. Members of the Public may raise and comment upon items not on the agenda. There were no Members of the Public in attendance.

28. Documents for Councillors to Read. There were no documents to read.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.20 pm.