

E-Mail: CommitteeServices@horsham.gov.uk

Direct Line: 01403 215465

Development Control (South) Committee

TUESDAY 17TH JANUARY 2012 AT 2.00 P.M.
COUNCIL CHAMBER, PARK NORTH, NORTH STREET, HORSHAM

Councillors: David Jenkins (Chairman)
Sheila Matthews (Vice-Chairman)
Roger Arthur
Adam Breacher
Jonathan Chowen
Philip Circus
George Cockman
David Coldwell
Ray Dawe
Brian Donnelly
Andrew Dunlop
Jim Goddard
Ian Howard
Liz Kitchen
Gordon Lindsay
Chris Mason
Brian O'Connell
Roger Paterson
Sue Rogers
Kate Rowbottom
Jim Sanson

Tom Crowley
Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. Apologies for absence
2. To approve as correct the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 20th December 2011 (attached)
3. To receive any declarations of interest from Members of the Committee – *any clarification on whether a Member has an interest should be sought before attending the meeting.*
4. To receive any announcements from the Chairman of the Committee or the Chief Executive
5. To consider the following reports and to take such action thereon as may be necessary

Head of Planning & Environmental Services

Appeals

Applications for determination by Committee - Appendix A

Item No.	Ward	Reference Number	Site
A01	<i>Chanctonbury</i>	DC/11/1992	Land East of Jackets Hill Storrington Road Thakeham
A02	<i>Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote</i>	DC/11/2110	Beeding Court Shoreham Road Upper Beeding Steyning
A03	<i>Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote</i>	DC/11/1747	24 Manor Road Upper Beeding Steyning
A04	<i>Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote</i>	DC/11/2323	Dene Hollow New Hall Lane Small Dole Henfield
A05	<i>Chantry</i>	DC/11/2529	Storrington Lawn Tennis Club Greyfriars Lane Storrington Pulborough
A06	<i>Chantry</i>	DC/11/2382	Bartons West Chiltington Road Storrington Pulborough
A07	<i>Billingshurst and Shipley</i>	DC/11/2256	Bridge Hill Farm Thakeham Road Coolham Horsham

- 6.** Items not on the agenda which the Chairman of the meeting is of the opinion should be considered as urgent because of the special circumstances

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH) COMMITTEE
20th DECEMBER 2011

Present: Councillors: David Jenkins (Chairman), Sheila Matthews (Vice-Chairman), Roger Arthur, Adam Breacher, Jonathan Chowen, David Coldwell, Ray Dawe, Brian Donnelly, Jim Goddard, Ian Howard, Liz Kitchen, Chris Mason, Brian O'Connell, Roger Paterson, Sue Rogers, Kate Rowbottom, Jim Sanson

Apologies: Councillors: Philip Circus, George Cockman, Andrew Dunlop, Gordon Lindsay

DCS/121 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 15th November 2011 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

DCS/122 **INTERESTS OF MEMBERS**

<u>Member</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>
Councillor Sheila Matthews	DC/11/1250	Personal - she knew one of the objectors.
Councillor Jim Goddard	DC/11/1746	Personal - he knew the applicant.

DCS/123 **ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were no announcements.

DCS/124 **APPEALS**

Appeals Lodged

Written Representations/Household Appeals Service

<u>Ref No</u>	<u>Site</u>	<u>Appellant(s)</u>
DC/11/1386	The Cottage, Highfield, Stane Street, Codmore Hill, Pulborough.	Mr John Holmes
DC/11/1296	21 Penn Gardens, Ashington.	Mr Brian Haulkham
DC/11/1328	Old Oaks, Spinney Lane, West Chiltington.	Mr Dudley Broster
DC/11/0111	Land South of Venters, Storrington Road, Thakeham.	Croudace Homes Ltd

DCS/124 Appeals (cont.)

Appeal Decisions

<u>Ref No</u>	<u>Site</u>	<u>Appellant(s)</u>	<u>Decision</u>
DC/11/0963	Keys, Mill Lane, Partridge Green, Horsham.	Mr and Mrs Burrows	Allowed
DC/11/1500	The White Lodge, Sunset Lane, West Chiltington.	Jane and Phil Andrews	Allowed

DCS/125 **DECISIONS ON LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATES**

DC/11/1407	Homefield, Stane Street, Billingshurst - for the occupation of the property in non- compliance with an Agricultural Occupancy condition attached to the property.	Granted
DC/11/2098	Woodyard, Knepp Castle Estate, Coolham Road, Shipley - for the use of the land as a woodyard.	Granted
DC/11/2109	Brookdale Farm, West Chiltington Lane, Broadford Bridge, Billingshurst – for the erection of a building and its residential use.	Granted
DC/11/2244	Four Oaks, Parkfield Farm, Glaseby Lane, Washington – for the stationing of a mobile home on the land that is used for residential purposes.	Granted

DCS/126 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/2028 - PROPOSED ERECTION OF 5 HOUSES**

SITE: CASTLE VIEW REST HOME, THE STREET, BRAMBER

APPLICANT: MR M WILSON (FIZZLE LTD)

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the erection of five houses. Three of the proposed dwellings would measure 4.9 metres wide by 14 metres deep with a ridge height of 8.4 metres and the other two would measure 4.9 metres wide by 12 metres deep with a ridge height of 8.4 metres.

The proposed site was within the built up area of Bramber and in the Bramber Conservation Area.

Government Policies PPS1, PPS3 and PPS5; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP2, CP3, CP5, CP12 and CP13 and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC9, DC12 and DC40 were relevant to the determination of this application.

DCS/126 Planning Application: DC/11/2028 (cont.)

Relevant planning history included:

DC/11/0958	Proposed five houses at Castle View further to extant permission DC/10/0441.	Refused
DC/10/0441	Demolition and rebuild of existing care home as 8 x 2 bed apartments,	Granted
DC/10/0442	Demolition of Care Home (Conservation Area).	Granted
DC/08/2340	Amendment to previously approved application DC/07/2671 for demolition and rebuild of existing residential care home (Conservation Area Consent).	Granted
DC/08/2339	Amendment to previously approved application DC/07/2670 for demolition and rebuild of existing residential care home with an additional 1.5 metre ground floor rear extension to provide an additional bedroom.	Granted
DC/07/2671	Demolition of rebuild of existing residential care home (Conservation Area Consent).	Granted
DC/07/2670	Demolition and rebuild of existing residential care home.	Granted

The Design & Conservation Officer, Strategic & Community Planning, the County Council's Ecologist and the Highways Department raised no objection and their comments were noted. The comments of English Heritage and the Environment Agency were noted. The Parish Council objected to the proposal and three letters of objection had been received. The applicant's agent and two members of the public spoke in support of the proposal and a representative from the Parish Council spoke in objection to the application.

The main issues in the determination of this application were considered to be the principle of the development, the effect of the development on the amenity of nearby occupiers and the visual amenities and character of the area and conservation area.

Six car parking spaces were proposed on the current application, one for each house plus an additional parking space. Members considered that this was not adequate for five four-bedroomed houses and, as parking in The Street was limited, especially in the evenings when the local restaurants and hotel were busy, there would be insufficient space to accommodate the parking demand for five new dwellings. However, the highway authority had indicated that it considered that there was sufficient space to accommodate the parking demand for the new dwellings and, therefore, there were insufficient grounds to justify refusal in this respect.

DCS/126 Planning Application: DC/11/2028 (cont.)

The proposed terraces were large in size and, in total, would be wider than the approved scheme (DC/10/0441). It was, therefore, considered that the proposal would result in the over-development of the site which would be detrimental to the street-scene and Members considered that the proposal was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/2028 be determined by the Head of Planning & Environmental Services, in consultation with the local Members, to seek a reduction to four dwellings. The preliminary view of the Committee was that the application should be refused unless the scheme was suitably altered.

DCS/127 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/2124 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AT 23 KITHURST PARK AND CONSTRUCTION OF A REPLACEMENT DWELLING AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING WORKS**
SITE: TREVELLAN, KITHURST PARK, STORRINGTON
APPLICANT: MRS B HODGSON

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the demolition of the existing dwelling at 23 Kithurst Park and construction of a replacement dwelling and associated landscaping works. The replacement dwelling would measure 18.4 metres wide by 8.7 metres deep, with a ridge height of 7.8 metres. The rear conservatory would measure 3.4 metres by 4 metres, with a ridge height of 4.6 metres.

The site was proposed to be split up with the replacement dwelling having a triangular rear garden measuring 14 – 21 metres deep by approximately 34 metres wide. The rest of the rear garden was likely to be subject to another planning application in the future, which would seek development of the site for further housing.

The main differences between the current proposal and the previous application (DC/11/1388) were that the south eastern roof gable had been hipped in order to reduce the impact on No. 22 Kithurst Park; the ridge height had been reduced from 8 metres to 7.8 metres and the dwelling had been moved slightly to the north west, giving between 4 – 8 metres gap to the south east side boundary of the site. The dwelling would be sited 2 metres further back than the current dwelling.

The driveway for the replacement dwelling and the potential access through the site would be narrower at 4.5 metres wide compared to the double driveway opening proposed in the previous applications which measured 12 metres wide. This would result in the removal of less hedging to the front boundary than the previous scheme.

DCS/127 Planning Application: DC/11/2124 (cont.)

The site was located within the built up area of Storrington on the southern side of Kithurst Park. The site currently consisted of a large detached two storey house with attached double length garage to the side and a rear garden in excess of 100 metres by 37 metres. The southern boundary of the site adjoined the South Downs National Park and open countryside, with the South Downs beyond.

Government Policies PPS1 and PPS3; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1, CP3, CP5, CP12 and CP13, and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC9 and DC40; the South Downs Management Plan 2008-2013 and South Downs Planning Guidelines 2008 were relevant to the determination of this application.

Relevant planning history included:

DC/11/1388	Demolition of the existing dwelling at 23 Kithurst Park and construction of a replacement dwelling and associated landscaping works.	Refused
DC/11/1387	Construction 4 No. dwellings and associated landscaping works on land to the west of Trevellan, 23 Kithurst Park.	Refused
SR/26/77	Construction of a detached 3 bedroom bungalow and a double length garage.	Granted
SR/30/73	Demolition of the existing bungalow and erection of a 4 bed detached dwelling.	Granted
SR/24/73	Application for 3 building plots.	Refused

West Sussex Highway Authority raised no objections and their comments were noted. The comments of Southern Water and Natural England were noted. The Parish Council objected to the proposal and 18 letters of objection had been received. A letter of comment had been received from the applicant's agent. Two members of the public spoke in objection to the proposal.

The main issues in the determination of this application were considered to be the principle of the development, the effect of the development on the amenity of nearby occupiers and the visual amenities and character of the area.

It was acknowledged that many of the objections to the proposed scheme raised concerns that this application would facilitate a new access for potential applications to develop the rest of the existing plot. However, the current application had to be assessed on its own merits and any decision on this application would not act as a precedent for the development of the remaining site for housing purposes.

It was considered that the current proposal would not have a material effect on the character of the National Park; that the proposed replacement dwelling would not be disproportionate to the size of the existing dwelling on site; and that it

DCS/127 Planning Application: DC/11/2124 (cont.)

would not be out of keeping with the character and pattern of the local area. The proposal allowed sufficient gaps to the boundaries with neighbouring dwellings and would not give rise to a greater degree of overlooking than the current situation on site.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable subject to the applicant being advised that the access was only considered acceptable to serve a single dwelling.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/2124 be granted subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|----|-----|---|
| 01 | A2 | Full Permission |
| 02 | M1 | Approval of Materials |
| 03 | D5 | No windows |
| 04 | E3 | Fencing |
| 05 | L1 | Hard & Soft Landscaping |
| 06 | O1 | Hours of Working |
| 07 | O2 | Burning Of materials |
| 08 | H10 | Cycling Provision |
| 09 | J10 | Removal of permitted development – dwellings |
| | | “Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Classes A, B, C, D, E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the order shall be erected constructed or placed within the curtilage of the dwelling hereby permitted so as to enlarge improve or otherwise alter the appearance or setting of the dwelling(s) unless permission is granted by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to an application for the purpose.” |
| 10 | H4 | On Site Parking |
| 11 | | Before development commences detailed cross sections from east to west and north to south through the site showing the finished floor levels of the dwelling in relation to the existing levels within the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. |
| 12 | | Prior to the commencement of development which may affect bats or their breeding sites or resting places, a |

DCS/127 Planning Application: DC/11/2124 (cont.)

detailed mitigation strategy shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All works shall then proceed in accordance with the approved strategy with any amendments agreed in writing.

REASONS

IDP1 The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the development plan.

ICAB2 The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the area.

DCS/128 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/2078 - SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING HOUSE**
SITE: TEDFOLD HOUSE, TEDFOLD STUD FARM, ROWNER ROAD, BILLINGSHURST
APPLICANT: MRS INGRID DUNCAN

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the construction of a single storey extension to the eastern side of the semi detached two storey dwelling. The proposed extension would measure 16.5 metres long, with a maximum width of 12.6 metres, a maximum height of 5.6 metres and a clock tower design feature at a height of 1.9 metres.

The property was located in a countryside setting outside the village settlement of Billingshurst. Dwellings within the area were varied in size.

Government Policy PPS1; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CP3; and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC9 and DC28 were relevant to the determination of this application.

In 2007, an application for the construction of a single storey extension to the existing house had been granted (DC/07/2753).

The Parish Council raised no objection to the proposal. One letter of objection and one letter of comment had been received.

The main issues in the determination of this application were considered to be the effect of the development on the character of the existing dwelling and impact on the surrounding countryside setting.

The application was a resubmission of a previously approved application (DC/07/2753). Although there had been a lapse of time from the date the

DCS/128 Planning Application: DC/11/2078 (cont.)

permission ran out to the date of resubmission, the current proposal was identical to the original scheme.

The existing dwelling had a gross external floor area of approx 226m² and the proposed extension would add a further 120m², which represented an increase in floor area of 53 per cent. However, it was considered the scale, bulk and design of the proposal would be subservient to the dwelling and would be adequately

stepped away from the shared boundary so as not to cause a long term impact on the amenity of the neighbouring dwelling.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/2078 be granted subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|----|----|-----------------------|
| 01 | A2 | Full Permission |
| 02 | M1 | Approval of Materials |

REASONS

- IDP1 The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Development Plan.
- ICAB2 The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers or character and visual amenities of the locality.

DCS/129 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/2066 - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING OUT BUILDING TO BE REPLACED WITH NEW SINGLE STOREY LAUNDRY**
SITE: EASTRIDGE MANOR NURSING HOME, WINEHAM LANE, BOLNEY
APPLICANT: SOUTH COAST NURSING HOME LTD

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the demolition of an existing dilapidated building and erection of a laundry room in its place. The laundry room would measure 4.6 metres by 6.5 metres, with a maximum height of 4.5 metres. The proposed building would sit on almost the same footprint as the existing building, although it would extend slightly further to the west.

The application site was located outside the built up area in a rural location to the west of Wineham Lane and was currently used as a nursing home. To the south, west and east of the site there were open fields with hedges and trees marking the boundaries and providing additional screening. To the west of the application site was located the neighbouring property 'Oakfield Farm'.

DCS/129 Planning Application: DC/11/2066 (cont.)

Government Policies PPS1 and PPS7; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3 and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC1, DC2 and DC9 were relevant to the determination of this application.

Relevant planning history included:

CF/37/03	Planning permission for a two storey extension to provide day care facilities, 7 bedrooms and 4 staff bedrooms.	Granted
DC/06/2825	Planning application for a two storey linked extension to form 22 bedrooms, bathrooms, dining area, lounge and kitchen.	Withdrawn
DC/07/1202	Planning permission for a single storey linked detached annexe extension with 2 x dormer windows to form 16 bedrooms, bathrooms, dining area, lounge and separate kitchen extension.	Granted

The comments of Environmental Health were noted. The Arboricultural Officer raised no objections and his comments were noted. The Parish Council raised no objections to the proposal. One letter of objection had been received and a member of the public spoke in objection to the proposal.

In terms of the impact on neighbouring properties, whilst it was acknowledged that there would be some impact visually, it was considered that the increase in size of the building would not have a significant impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties. However, concerns were raised relating to the hours of working and noise levels.

It was considered that the proposed building was relatively modest in size and had been designed as a functional building for use as a laundry. The proposed structure would be sited where an existing building was currently located and its simple design would be in keeping with the nursing home as a whole.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable in principle.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/2066 be determined by the Head of Planning & Environmental Services, in consultation with the local Members, to consider additional conditions relating to hours of working and noise prevention. The preliminary view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

DCS/130 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/2131 - RETENTION OF TEMPORARY STORAGE UNIT TO REAR OF EXISTING BUILDING WITH TIMBER FENCE**
SITE: PETROL FILLING STATION, HORSHAM ROAD, FIVE OAKS
APPLICANT: STUDIO 5 ARCHITECTS LTD

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the retention of a temporary storage unit to the rear/northern elevation of the existing building, with a 2.7 metres high feather edge timber close boarded fence finished with 0.4 metre of barbed wire.

The building was required to provide storage lost within the store from the development of disabled toilets and was a short term option for two years initially, until such time as long term options could be considered.

The property was located directly opposite the entrance to Hayes Wood on the Horsham Road, Five Oaks and comprised an existing service building, a petrol station canopy and parking to the rear.

Government Policy PPS1; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CP3 and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policy DC9 were relevant to the determination of this application.

There was no relevant planning history.

The Parish Council raised no objection to the application. One letter raising concerns had been received.

The main issues in the determination of this application were considered to be the effect of the development on the character of the surrounding area and its visual impact upon the street scene setting.

Although the design and finish of the domestic timber fence panels shielding the storage container appeared to be unusual, given the commercial nature of the site, due to the temporary nature of the development, it was not considered the proposal would detract from the semi urban character of the site nor would it detract from the street scene setting.

The retention of the unit for a 2 year period was considered to be acceptable, provided that the applicant would be actively monitoring the use of the facility and considering a more permanent solution.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/2131 be granted subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|----|----|---|
| 01 | A3 | Temporary Permission (building) (9/12/13) |
| 02 | M5 | Timber and Wall Treatment |

DCS/130 Planning Application: DC/11/2131 (cont.)

REASONS

- IDP1 The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the Development Plan.
- ICAB2 The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of the amenities of the neighbouring occupiers or character and visual amenities of the locality

DCS/131 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/0751 - COLD STORE FACILITY TO STORE APPROXIMATELY 50 - 60 CARCASSES PER WEEK, INSTALLATION OF AN EMERGENCY SUPER SILENT GENERATOR, TOILET, CHANGING AREA AND 2 NO. DEEP FREEZES**
SITE: DOWNSVIEW FARM, CLAY LANE, COOTHAM
APPLICANT: MR RICHARD SCOTT

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application had first been reported to the Committee on 19th July 2011, when it had been resolved to delegate the application for approval, in consultation with the local Members, to clarify the power supply to the development and the use of the generator. Subsequently, information regarding the power supply and use of the generator had been received from the applicant and sent to the local Members. It was, therefore, considered that these issues had been resolved satisfactorily.

However, since the Committee meeting, a pre-action protocol letter had been received from a solicitor representing a local resident, seeking to take a judicial review of the Council's decision to grant permission. The judicial review process was considered premature as the application in question had not been finally determined. However, the main points of challenge were:

- 1) The failure to comply with the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Directive 85/337/EEC
- 2) Planning Conditions permitting change of use
- 3) The need to act as agent for the National Park.

A letter dated 3rd August 2011 had been sent to the solicitor for the complainant addressing these issues. A further letter, dated 14th September 2011, was received from the complainant's solicitor. A letter dated 15th November 2011 was then received from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, which stated that: "given the comprehensive nature of this Screening Opinion, the issues raised do not call into question the validity of the planning authority's assessment that an EIA is not required and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government therefore declines to issue a screening direction in this case." It was considered that this satisfactorily addressed the first part of the challenge.

With regard to the second point, the application site was located outside the boundary of the South Downs National Park. Planning permission was not

DCS/131 Planning Application: DC/11/0751 (cont.)

required for its use as a pig farm as its existing use was for agricultural purposes, therefore there had been no change of use. The current application was for a building of 88 square metres on a part of a site that measures 20.2 hectares in total. As such, a very small part of the land was affected by this building. The only land affected by the after use condition was that part of the land where the building was situated. The after use of the rest of the land was unaffected. The building would be located on an area of hardstanding, and so its removal would be unlikely to require remedial works of a nature that would materially affect the character and appearance of the area.

Circular 11/95 stated that where permission would not normally be granted, there could be strong personal or compassionate reasons which would justify a condition restricting benefit to a named individual. It was accepted that in practice personal conditions were often applied to small scale businesses in residential or rural areas. In this case, therefore, it was perfectly acceptable to impose a personal condition.

With regard to the third point, the South Downs National Park had discharged the planning services duty to this Council, and as such this Council acted as agent for the National Park. The relevant planning policies referred to in the protocol were: the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted February 2007), the Site Specific Allocations of Land 2007, the Local Development Framework, General Development Control Policies Document (December 2007), the Adopted Village and Parish Design statements, Parish Plans and Planning Obligations Planning Document 2007. The relevant policies had been applied in this case.

A further letter dated 19th December had been received from the solicitor representing a local resident, stating that, if the Council granted permission, in his view it would be unlawful and subject to review. The letter was before the Members of the Committee when the item was considered.

The applicant spoke in support of the application.

It was considered that the Council had acted properly with regard to its obligations as Agent to the South Downs National Park and in accordance with the agreement between the parties.

Therefore, it was considered that the proposal would still accord with Policy DC1 of the General Development Control Policies 2007 and Policy CP15 of the Core Strategy 2007. The proposed building was fairly small in scale with a low level roof and it would be sited on land at a lower level to the surrounding fields, reducing its visual impact on the area. The Screening Opinion had also concluded that, whilst there were some potential environmental impacts arising from the farming operation, these were not considered likely to give rise to significant detrimental environmental effects by virtue of their size, nature or

DCS/131 Planning Application: DC/11/0751 (cont.)

location. The Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government had also concluded that given the comprehensive nature of this Screening Opinion, the issues raised did not call into question the validity of the planning authority's assessment that an EIA was not required and had, therefore, declined to issue a screening direction in this case.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/0751 be granted subject to the following conditions:

- | | | |
|----|----|--|
| 01 | A2 | Full Permission |
| 02 | J5 | Personal Limitation 'The use (Cold store facility to store approximately 50 - 60 carcasses per week, installation of an emergency super silent generator, toilet, changing area and 2 No. deep freezes by Scott - Free Range) hereby permitted shall be carried on by Mr R Scott (Scott Free Range) only and shall be for the period during which the premises are occupied by Mr R Scott Only.' |
| 03 | | In the event of the building hereby permitted ceasing to be utilised /occupied in connection with the pig / sheep business at Downsview Farm, it shall be removed from the site and the land shall be restored to a condition which has previously been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. |
| 04 | M1 | Approval of Materials |
| 05 | L1 | Hard & Soft Landscaping |
| 06 | D6 | Finished Floor Levels |
| 07 | O2 | Burning of Materials |
| 08 | O1 | Hours of Working |

REASONS

- IDP1 The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the development plan.

DCS/132 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/1250 - PROPOSED NEW BUILDING INCORPORATING SHOP, COFFEE SHOP, KITCHEN, STORE, OFFICE AND WCs**
SITE: BIRCHFIELD NURSERY, KIDDERS LANE, HENFIELD, WEST SUSSEX
APPLICANT: MR ROBERT DUNCKLEY
(Councillor Sheila Matthews declared a personal interest in this application as she knew one of the objectors).

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the erection of a building which would comprise a reception/library area, staff and toilet facilities, offices, coffee shop and restaurant, retail shop and storage area.

The building would be octagonal in shape with a hipped roof and central atrium. It would be constructed predominantly of timber and glass with a fully glazed roof. The building would have a gross external floor area of 694 square metres. The highest point of the roof would be just over 11 metres. The building would be located on the eastern boundary of the site and set back some 24 metres from the road frontage. Parking would take place within the boundaries of the site and a total of 27 car parking spaces would be provided.

Birchfield Nursery was sited in a countryside location on the western side of the A281, immediately south of its junction with Kidders Lane. Parking currently took place on a large grass verge to the front of the site entrance.

Government Policies PPS1, PPS6 and PPS7; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP15 and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC1, DC2, DC9, DC25 and DC38 were relevant to the determination of this application.

Relevant planning history included:

HF/53/92	Erection of 2 polythene tunnels, re-siting of water tank and installation of additional tank.	Granted
HF/54/93	Erection of polytunnels.	Granted
HF/66/96	Erection of polytunnels.	Granted
DC/06/1903	Erection of a glasshouse with adjoining propagation/potting shed.	Granted

The Head of Public Health & Licensing and the Council's Equalities Officer had no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions. The County Surveyor had objected to the plans as originally submitted but had withdrawn his objection following the submission of further information and plans. The Parish Council had no objection to the proposal and their comments were noted. One letter of comment and eleven letters of objection to the proposal had been received. The applicant's agent and two members of the public spoke in support of the proposal and two members of the public spoke in objection to the application.

DCS/132 Planning Application: DC/11/1250 (cont.)

It was considered that the main issues in the determination of the application were whether the principle of development was acceptable having regard to development plan policies and the effect of the development on the character of the area.

Birchfield Nursery was an established nursery business currently employing six full-time staff and two part-time staff. However, the existing staff and toilet facilities were considered inadequate with one portaloo to serve the staff and general public. Also there was no existing place to prepare or store food.

The application had also been submitted with a view to allowing the applicant to diversify by way of a retail area, coffee shop and restaurant, in order to ensure an all-year-round income.

It was proposed that the nursery would open between the hours of 0830 hours to 1730 hours on Mondays to Saturdays and 0900 hours to 1700 hours on Sundays and Bank Holidays. The shop would sell garden-essentials only including garden forks, rakes, seeds, bulbs, grass-seeds, fertilizers, sticks, baskets, pots, wall-ties and books of a gardening nature.

It was stated that the proposal would also be of community benefit and could be used as a meeting room for local community groups and societies. Furthermore, one of the objectives of the proposed development was to inspire and foster local interest in gardening and the information centre and reference library would serve to educate and help cement that interest.

Whilst it was acknowledged that the proposal was not small in scale, it was an innovative scheme in terms of design and appearance and was directly related to the operation of the nursery enterprise. It was anticipated that the proposed development would lead to the creation of an additional 15 jobs with the staff being employed in the offices, shop and café/restaurant. Such facilities were to be found in most garden centres and would enable the business to expand and contribute to the local economy in terms of job creation.

The proposed range of goods to be sold was considered to fall within the remit of products that were relevant to the operation of a garden centre business. In this respect, it was not considered that the proposal would damage the viability and vitality of neighbouring retailing village centres.

In terms of visual impact, the proposed building would be well screened from the highway, even during the winter months, given the level of screening provided by the mature trees and hedging along the site frontage. It was, therefore, considered that the proposal would not detract from the visual amenities of the surrounding area.

It was considered that the proposal would enable the applicant to diversify and expand his business without detriment to the viability of nearby village centres and the amenity of the surrounding countryside.

DCS/132 Planning Application: DC/11/1250 (cont.)

Members, therefore, considered that the application was acceptable, in principle.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/1250 be determined by the Head of Planning & Environmental Services, in consultation with the local Members, to allow further consideration of possible overlooking of neighbouring residents and the type of goods to be sold on the site. The preliminary view of the Committee was that the application should be granted.

DCS/133 **PLANNING APPLICATION: DC/11/1746 - ERECTION OF HORSE STABLES TO REPLACE EXISTING CATTLE PEN.**

SITE: BRAMBER BROOKS, THE STREET, BRAMBER

APPLICANT: MR G MARSHALL

(Councillor Jim Goddard declared a personal interest in this application as he knew the applicant).

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that this application sought planning permission for the erection of a detached single storey stable building comprising a hay barn, tack room and four stables. The proposed building would incorporate an 'L' shaped layout and be traditionally clad in timber cladding. The proposed stable building would be accessed via an existing crossover to the south of the site through a five bar gate onto The Street. The proposal would involve the construction of a chalk and planings track which would run alongside the existing public footpath to the east of the site.

The application site was located outside the built up area and comprised a grassed expanse of land situated behind a number of residential properties lining the northern side of The Street. The area of land to the west of the proposed stable building incorporated a Scheduled Ancient Monument comprising a group of Salterns and a moat which formerly fell within the grounds of Bramber Castle.

Government Policies PPS1 and PPS7; Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP3 and Local Development Framework General Development Control Policies DC1, DC2, DC7, DC9, DC10, DC29 and DC40 were relevant to the determination of this application.

In 1990, a planning application for stable buildings, equestrian storage and accommodation for a groom and family had been refused (BM/11/90) and this application had subsequently been dismissed on appeal.

The Council's Public Health & Licensing Department had no objection to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions. The Environment Agency had no comments to make on this application. The comments of West Sussex County Council's Highways and Archaeology Departments were noted. English Heritage raised no objection and their comments were noted. The Parish Council had no

DCS/133 Planning Application: DC/11/1746 (cont.)

objection to the current proposal. Three letters of objection and one letter of representation had been received. The applicant spoke in support of the proposal and a member of the public spoke in objection to the application.

It was considered that the main issues in the determination of the application were the effect of the development on the countryside setting and the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

Originally it had been proposed to build the stables on the site of the cattle pen enclosure in the south-eastern corner of the application site, which had raised concerns regarding public health implications as they would have been only nine metres from the boundaries of adjoining residential properties. The revised position of the stable building was now approximately 47 metres and 25 metres from the boundaries of the nearest neighbours, and Members considered that this would result in sporadic development in the countryside.

Members also expressed concerns regarding the suitability of the site to keep horses, as it was within the flood plain, and the increase in traffic generated by the proposed development, particularly with regard to the proximity of the access to neighbouring properties.

Members, therefore, considered that the application was unacceptable.

RESOLVED

That application DC/11/1746 be determined by the Head of Planning & Environmental Services, in consultation with the local Members and Cllr Sue Rogers, to allow reasons for refusal to be formulated. The preliminary view of the Committee was that the application should be refused.

DCS/134 **VARIATION OF SECTION 106 AGREEMENT (SEC 106/1559) TO ALLOW
OCCUPATION OF A RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY BY A PERSON OF LESS
THAN 60 YEARS OF AGE**

SITE: 5 CASTLE VIEW, CHURCH STREET, AMBERLEY

APPLICANT: MRS CAROLINE J HOLDER

The Head of Planning & Environmental Services reported that a request had been received seeking to vary Section 106 agreement 1559 which related to Castle View, Amberley. Castle View comprised a five unit development of retirement homes granted permission in 2008 and constructed the following year.

The relevant part of the agreement in question stated that at least one member of each household must be aged 60 years or over.

The request sought a temporary suspension of the clause requiring occupation

DCS/134 Variation of Section 106 Agreement Sec 106/1559 (cont.)

by at least one member of the household aged over 60 years. The reason given for the request was that since the applicant's acquisition of the property, she and her husband had separated and her husband would not be living at the property. The applicant was in her early 50s and her husband was in his early 60s.

In support of the request, it was further stated that while the planning agreement made provision for occupation of the property by an occupier aged less than 60 years where their partner aged 60 years and over had died, it did not make provision for the circumstances in which the applicant now found herself.

The Parish Council supported the proposal to vary the condition but did not wish it to become a precedent for future buyers.

It was considered that the main issue in the determination of the proposal was whether the occupancy of the dwelling by the applicant would conflict with development plan policies.

As the applicant was not over 60 years old and no longer lived in the property with someone of over 60 years, she did not comply with the requirements of the legal agreement. However, since the dwellings had been constructed they had not sold as quickly as it had been anticipated. Only one of the five units had been sold during the local marketing period to a couple with a local connection. The current applicant had purchased the property with her husband outside of the local marketing period.

A preliminary request had been made to the Council to remove the age clause altogether in July 2010 although this had not been formally followed up. At that time, local estate agents had stated that the age restriction clause had had a negative impact on the sale of the property to local people.

In light of this wider concern about the age restriction clause and the apparent lack of local interest in the properties when locally marketed, it was considered that a temporary suspension of the age restriction clause in respect of unit 5 could be supported having regard to the particular circumstances of the applicant. It was stressed that this would not remove the age restriction clause permanently for the dwelling nor at all for the other units.

RESOLVED

That the relevant clause of the legal agreement SEC106/1559 be varied to allow occupation of 5 Castle View by the current occupier on a temporary basis, to reflect the particular circumstances of the occupier

DCS/134 Variation of Section 106 Agreement Sec 106/1559 (cont.)

REASON

The temporary variation of the clause is not considered to depart from current policies to warrant a refusal of the current request.

The meeting closed at 4.13pm having commenced at 2.00pm.

CHAIRMAN

DEVELOPMENT CONTROL (SOUTH) COMMITTEE
17TH JANUARY 2012
REPORT BY THE HEAD OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES

APPEALS

1. **Appeals Lodged**

I have received notice from the Department of Communities and Local Government that the following appeals have been lodged:-

2. **Written Representations/Householder Appeals Service**

- DC/11/0567 Conversion of stable and outbuildings into residential unit.
Hatches House, East Street, West Chiltington, Pulborough, RH20 2JY.
For: Mr Ian Walter
- DC/11/1630 Outline application proposing the erection of 2 two-storey dwellings together with associated access and parking (Land North of Downsvie Nurseries).
Land West of Downsvie, New Hall Lane, Small Dole, BN5 9YJ.
For: Mr K Vangelov
- DC/11/1210 Construction of a tennis court with associated landscaping works (South Downs National Park).
Bellows, Bramlands Lane, Woodmancote, Henfield, BN5 9TG.
For: Mrs Karen Robbins
- EN/11/0331 Without planning permission, the construction of a fence and gates of a height in excess of 1 metre on the western boundary adjacent to the public highway.
The Holt, Merrywood Lane, Thakeham, Pulborough, RH20 3HD.
For: Mr J Gamble
- EN/11/0244 Without planning permission, the creation of earth bunds and the construction of a pond.
Sopers Farm, Peppers Lane, Ashurst, Steyning, BN44 3AX.
For: Mr G Harrison

3. **Public Inquiry**

- EN/11/0177 Without planning permission, the use of the building constituting a mobile home with cladding for residential purposes (Enforcement Notice 1) .
Without planning permission, the construction of a building consisting of a mobile home with cladding (Enforcement Notice 2).
Sussex Topiary, Naldretts Lane, Rudgwick, Horsham, RH12 3BU.
For: Mr D Hatch

4. Appeal Decisions

I have received notice from the Department of Communities and Local Government that the following appeals have been determined:-

- DC/11/0149 Erection of two bedroom bungalow and garage, and new detached garage to serve Ty Gwyn.
Ty Gwyn, Nightingale Lane, Storrington, Pulborough, RH20 4NU.
For: Mr and Mrs White
Appeal: **DISMISSED** (Officers Recommendation Overturned at Committee)
- DC/11/0834 Erection of 1 x 3-bed chalet bungalow and attached garage (Land to the north of 2 Bohemia Cottages Georges Lane Storrington).
2 Bohemia Cottages, Georges Lane, Storrington, Pulborough, RH20 3JH.
For: Mr and Mrs D Crouch
Appeal: **DISMISSED** (Delegated)
- DC/11/1296 Two-storey side extension with enclosed front porch.
21 Penn Gardens, Ashington, Pulborough, RH20 3AR.
For: Mr Brian Haulkham
Appeal: **ALLOWED** (Delegated)
- DC/11/1123 Single storey extension and raised roof to provide to provide first floor accommodation.
Woodcrest, Crossways Park, West Chiltington, Pulborough, RH20 2QZ.
For: Mr and Mrs N Coughtrey
Appeal: **ALLOWED** (Delegated)
- DC/11/1328 Demolition of existing detached garage block with living accommodation on upper floor and replacement with new double garage and accommodation within existing site curtilage.
Old Oaks, Spinney Lane, West Chiltington, Pulborough, RH20 2NX.
For: Mr Dudley Broster
Appeal: **ALLOWED** (Delegated)



DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning & Environmental Services

DATE: 17th January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Erection of stable block and hay barn to replace existing planning for four stables, tack and feed room granted under DC/10/0220. Retrospective permission for relocation and enlargement of sand school permitted under DC/10/0220 from 20 x 40m to 25 x 60m and retrospective permission for a rolled stone track and hard standing area.

SITE: Land east of Jackets Hill, Storrington Road, Thakeham

WARD: Chantonbury

APPLICATION: DC/11/1992

APPLICANT: Mr Angus Gordon (ASAP Investments)

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON AGENDA: Category of Development

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission & authorise enforcement action against the unauthorised development carried out so far.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 The application seeks permission for the erection of a stable block and hay barn to replace existing planning for four stables, tack and feed room granted under DC/10/0220 but not implemented and retrospective permission for the relocation and enlargement of sand school permitted under DC/10/0220 from 20 x 40m to 25 x 60m and retrospective permission for a new rolled stone track and hard standing area.

- 1.2 The proposed barn would be in two main parts. The larger barn element would measure 24m by 6.5m with a ridge height of 7.4m. The secondary element would measure 24m by 10m and would have a ridge height of 4.88m. The overall floor area of the building would measure 396 metres squared. The building would have a block wall, box profile coated steel sheeting to the side elevations and the roof would be clad in natural grey profile fibre cement sheeting.
- 1.3 Amended plans have been received which alters the internal layout of the barns providing 4 internal stables, a tack room, a feed room and the rest of the floor area would be used solely for agricultural purposes. Although the amended plans reduce the number of stables proposed, the overall size of the barns would remain the same.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.4 The site is located in a countryside location to the north of Storrington and to the south of Thakeham. The site consists of two fields to the east of Storrington Road. There is an access track to the south of the site which gives access to Leaves Cottage, Little Thakeham Farm and Meadow Farmhouse. The southern boundary of the site consists of a native hedgerow with scattered oak trees, the eastern boundary of the site currently consists of a 1.8m high close boarded fence, the northern field within the application site rises up quite steeply and the western boundary consists of fencing.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.5 Application DC/09/1247 for private stables and exercise school facilities for 4 horses, withdrawn December 2009.

Application DC/10/0220 for private stables and exercise school facilities for 4 horses, permitted April 2010.

Prior Notification DC/11/1392 for the erection of an agricultural farm building, prior approval not required August 2011.

Application DC/11/1862 for temporary siting of a caravan for use during construction works and for overnight site security, refused October 2011.

Prior notification DC/11/1971 for the erection of an agricultural farm building was withdrawn in October 2011.

There is no other relevant planning history for the site.

2. INTRODUCTION

RELEVANT POLICY

- 2.1 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

2.2 PPS1 & PPS7.

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

2.3 The following policies of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted February 2007) are relevant in the assessment of this application: CP1 – Landscape and Townscape Character & CP15 – Rural Strategy.

2.4 The following policies of the Local Development Framework, General Development Control Policies Document (December 2007) are relevant in the assessment of this application: DC1 – Countryside Protection & Enhancement, DC2 – Landscape Character, DC9 – Development Principles, DC29 – Equestrian Development.

3.0 **OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS**

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

3.1 Horsham & District Access Forum has commented that “It is noted that some of the customers are disabled people. Is the car park and hard standing area accessible to allow for easier access into the venue? Also are there accessible/disabled toilets on site for the disabled customers?”

3.2 Public Health & Licensing has commented that “This department has no objections to this proposal but would like to offer the following recommendations for your consideration:

Construction

1. No burning of materials should take place on site.
2. Hours of construction activities (including deliveries and dispatch) should be limited to 08.00 – 18.00 Monday until Friday, 09.00 – 13.00 Saturdays and no activity on Sundays or Bank Holidays.

Operation

1. Satisfactory provision shall be made for surface water drainage and control of leachate.
2. All manure/stable waste/slurry shall be deposited of at regular intervals and in such a manner so as not to cause nuisance.
3. Burning of any stable waste is not permitted.
4. Waste must be stored well away from the neighbouring properties
5. No floodlighting shall be installed which causes nuisance to the neighbouring properties.”

- 3.3 Strategic & Community Planning has commented that “This application has been considered against the Local Development Framework, in particular policies in the Core Strategy (2007) Development Plan Document and the General Development Control Policies (2007) Development Plan Document. National and regional policies are also relevant to the consideration of the application, in particular those within *PPS4: Planning for Sustainable Economic Growth*, *PPS1: Delivering Sustainable Development* and elements of *PPS7: Sustainable Development in Rural Areas* which were not incorporated into *PPS4*.

The key LDF planning policies relating to the proposals for the application site are Policies CP15, Rural Strategy, DC25, Rural Economic Development and DC29, Equestrian Development.

The basis for Policy CP15 is the wish to ensure sustainable rural economic growth and to meet the needs of people who live and work in rural areas. The intention is to seek to balance the development necessary to sustain and ensure future economic diversity and prosperity whilst maintaining the continued protection of the countryside’s environment and character. This is strengthened through policy DC25 which supports appropriate development in countryside locations provided it sustains the rural character of an area.

Equestrian development is supported through DC29 provided that the proposal is of a scale in-keeping with its location and surroundings and that it does not result in an intensification of buildings in the countryside.

The proposals must also be in compliance with policies DC1 and DC5 which restrict development in countryside locations if it is not considered essential or it would cause an adverse impact on the biodiversity on site. With this in mind, the Case Officer must be satisfied that the proposals would not increase the overall level of activity in that location in terms of noise, traffic and footfall.

It is noted that there is concern from local residents that the level of traffic using the B2139, would be greater than proposed in the application. With this in mind, it is down to the Case Officer to determine whether the proposals are in accordance with policy DC40. The proposed use must be of a scale appropriate to the surrounding area and must make adequate provision for all users.

On the grounds outlined above, I have no objection in principle to the proposed application, however, I emphasise that you as Case Officer must be satisfied that there is a functional need for the relocation of the Equestrian Centre to the proposed site, that the business will continue to be a profitable rural enterprise, that the proposals would not harm the rural character of the area by virtue of the level of activity involved and that the surrounding road network could accommodate such development. The proposal must also be consistent with all other development control policies including DC2: Landscape Character and DC40: Transport.”

- 3.4 The Arboricultural Officer has commented that:

“I visited the site on 5th January 2012 and report accordingly.

- A new trackway has been installed running east/west in close proximity to the hedge line on the northern side of the lane running to Little Thakeham Farm.
- The trackway runs in a very straight line, on average 4m from the original hedgeline on the north side of the lane. Along a small bank is a traditional hedge formed primarily of blackthorn, hawthorn, oak, and some Field maple. This hedge does not appear ancient, but has clearly been part of the landscape for some decades at least.
- Within the hedgeline are 18 large semi-mature field oaks of considerable size. Average trunk diameters are around 650mm, though at least one tops 1000mm. The new trackway comes to within 3m of the closest tree, though it should be pointed out that the track falls within the root protection area (RPA) of ALL of the trees, save for the last two, the furthest east.
- Trackways can be constructed within the RPA's of trees successfully, provided they are constructed favourably, limiting root damage, either directly or by subsequent compaction. I have no information as to how the track was constructed, but note a sub-base of hardcore surfaced with black scalplings, edged by gravel boards of 150mm depth. Excavations even as little as this depth can cause root damage, and ideally should be avoided.
- However, in this case I note a small rise in the land level between the new trackway and the light scrub area just north of the main hedgerow, and strongly suspect that this might represent an old plough line. If this is accurate, I would expect the land to have been ploughed to a greater depth than the trackway excavation, which would suggest that the works have not caused any further damage.

In summary, I have found no clear evidence that the works needed to construct the trackway have caused any damage to roots of the oaks along the lane, and furthermore I suspect that decades of ploughing may have discouraged root growth in the area in any case. I therefore register no objection to the works.

However, though I am given to understand that consent for an opening in the hedgerow has been granted, the gap I found to be 12m wide. If this is in excess of that permitted under planning permission, this might constitute an offence under the 1997 Hedgerows Regulations. Can I suggest that this is examined further.”

- 3.5 The Landscape Officer's comments will be reported verbally at the committee meeting.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.6 Natural England has commented that this proposal does not appear to affect any statutorily protected sites or landscapes, or have significant impacts on the conservation of soils, nor is the proposal EIA development.
- 3.7 The Environment Agency has commented that they have no comments to make.
- 3.8 Southern Water has commented that “the applicant is advised to consult the Environment Agency directly regarding the use of a septic tank drainage which disposes of effluent to sub soil irrigation. The owner of the premises will need to

maintain the septic tank to ensure its long term effectiveness. The planning application form makes reference to drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS).

Under current legislation and guidance SUDS rely upon facilities which are not adoptable by sewerage undertakers. Therefore, the applicant will need to ensure that arrangements exist for the long term maintenance of the SUDS facilities. It is critical that the effectiveness of these systems is maintained in perpetuity. Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system, which may result in the inundation of the foul sewerage system.

Thus, where a SUDS scheme is to be implemented the drainage details submitted to the Local Planning Authority should:

Specify the responsibilities of each party for the implementation of the SUDS Scheme;

Specify a timetable for implementation;

Provide a management and maintenance plan for the lifetime of the development.

This should include the arrangements for adoption by any public authority or statutory undertaker and any other arrangements to secure the operation of the scheme throughout its lifetime.”

- 3.9 WSCC Ecologist has stated “The proposed track appears to run under the canopy of mature trees. The plans submitted with the application do not provide enough information to determine whether there would be an impact on the root areas supporting these trees. There is no indication that there is any intention to protect the trees. Q15 of the application form has been marked positive but no Tree Protection Plans or other arboricultural documents have been submitted to support the application. The application may be counter to BS5837:2005. Therefore, I strongly recommend consultation with Will Jones, Arboricultural Officer (Development). With exception of the tree issue there are not expected to be any other ecological issues affecting the implementation of this development.”
- 3.10 WSCC Highways Authority has commented that “the proposed development at this site would not be anticipated to increase vehicle movements to the point where a highway safety issue would arise.”

PUBLIC COMMENTS

- 3.11 8 letters of objection have been received in opposition to the application on the grounds of:
- The building appears to be overly large for the maintenance of this plot and the hay baleage quoted is excessive for the land. Notwithstanding that keeping livestock will of course reduce hay production. The building must be reasonably required for the purposes of agriculture;
 - We were happy with DC/10/0220 because it was a private yard and would not have had much of a visual impact on us;

- Permission was granted under DC/10/0220 for a modest building incorporating 4 stables and a hay/feed store in the south western corner of the field for private use only. This followed a previous application DC/09/1247 for a much larger development located further east than DC/10/0220 but was withdrawn following concerns raised by officers about the unacceptable scale and location of the development;
- The current development is positioned in the south eastern corner of the premises that generates the need for an excessively long access track and hard standing;
- The proposed development is excessive in size and runs wholly counter to the efforts of the officers in securing a reduction in size and relocation of the DC/10/0220 development;
- The proposed building is excessive in size with a ridge height of 7.65m which will represent an intrusive development. The permitted stable block only had a ridge height of 3m;
- The stables are likely to be used for commercial purposes that would generate a level of activity and traffic flows that would harm the character of the area;
- The development is contrary to policies DC1, DC2, DC9, DC13 and DC29;
- The applicant states that the development has to be sited at the eastern end due to flooding, however the field has never flooded, the ditches and drainage channels just need to be maintained. Therefore, this is not a sufficient reason to site the development away from the access.
- The proposed development would be highly visible & intrusive within the landscape;
- Agricultural land on the hillside would be lost;
- Significant increase in traffic to the area;
- Any external lighting would be highly visible;
- An application for a caravan has been refused permission but a log cabin has been erected on site;
- The site would be very busy with traffic movements including clients, liveries, lorries, trailers etc
- Buying & selling horses involves people coming to try the horses;
- Will they do what they did at Pulborough Equestrian Centre, ie, Pony Parties, Camps, Clinics, Pony Days and shows?
- A commercial business on this scale is not appropriate in this location
- This area supports a large population of owls (tawny, little and barn) but the development has reduced this activity;
- The hedging between fields 1 and 2 has been grubbed out and replaced by a non native laurel hedge which will not sustain any form of wildlife (removing the wildlife highway);
- The applicant has already built a tarmaced track, enlarged sandschool, hardstanding, log cabin with septic tank, stables and 1.8m high close boarded fencing without the benefit of planning permission;
- Light Pollution;
- Noise Pollution;

3.12 Thakeham Parish Council originally objected to the application on the grounds of:

“1) Development in the countryside should be related to agriculture or forestry, this application represents a change of use to equestrian. Furthermore the conditions attached to the permission granted under DC/10/0220 state that the stables and sand school shall not be used for commercial purposes or in connection with any form of riding establishment whereas this application is clearly for a commercial equestrian business.

2) The proposal constitutes sporadic development in the strategic gap between Thakeham and Storrington and would be detrimental to the rural landscape.”

3.13 Thakeham Parish Council submitted revised comments stating “No objection in principle on the basis of assurances received from the applicant that the stables will be for private use as permitted under DC/10/0220 and not used for commercial purposes.”

3.14 Thakeham Village Action has objected on the following grounds:

1. “Changing the open agricultural fields into a commercial equestrian centre with buildings, hardstanding and hard surface tracks would not be in keeping with the countryside character of the location and its surroundings.
2. The scale of the proposal and the level of activity would seriously harm what has been quiet farmland. It would lead to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in this countryside location. As the applicant has said that he wants to move Pulborough Equestrian Centre to this location, it indicates that the ultimate aim would be to operate all activities currently taking place at PEC such as pony parties, horse camps and show jumping events.
3. It would result in sporadic development leading to an intensification of buildings in the countryside.
4. It would be visually prominent from roads and rights of way including the well used footpath alongside the site.
5. It does not constitute farm diversification as the two fields are not part of a farm.
6. It would result in a loss of trees and hedgerows, not only harming the countryside character of the area but also resulting in a loss of biodiversity.”

3.15 18 letters of support have been received from the applicant’s customers stating:

I am a customer of the applicant’s and they run a small, professional operation that will benefit the village;
Nearly all the current customers live closer to the new proposed site which will mean shorter driving journeys;
The new venue will also create a professional all weather arena that can be hired and will be a great facility for the local riding community;
The new stables and arena are designed for the horse and rider to achieve maximum performance and training in a safe and professional environment;

The development is far enough away from neighbouring properties not to devalue them;

- 3.16 No other representations have been received to public notification on the application at the time of writing this report. Any further comments received will be reported verbally at the committee meeting.

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 The main issues in determination of this application are considered to be the effect of the development on the visual amenities and character of the rural area and whether the development materially affects neighbouring occupiers

- 6.2 Policy DC29 (Equestrian Development) states:

Planning permission will be granted for equestrian related development if:

- a) it can be demonstrated that the re-use of existing buildings on site for any related equestrian use is not appropriate before new or replacement buildings are considered;
- b) the proposal is appropriate in scale and level of activity and in keeping with its location and surroundings and does not result in sporadic development leading to an intensification of buildings in the countryside particularly in an urban fringe location.

- 6.3 The applicant bought the application site in approximately September 2011 from what comprised a much larger agricultural farming unit. The application site has previously been in agricultural use. The applicant seeks consent for a stone track measuring 330m in length, a hard standing area measuring 40m by 18.5m, a sandschool measuring 25m by 60m and a barn which would comprise of internal stables, tack room, toilet and feed room. The proposed barn would be in two main parts, the larger barn element would measure 24m by 6.5m with a ridge height of 7.4m. The secondary element would measure 24m by 10m and would have a ridge height of 4.88m. The overall dimensions of the barns would measure 24m by 16.5m giving a floor area of 396 metres squared.

- 6.4 The applicant originally sought to relocate Pulborough Equestrian Centre to the application site where he would offer liveries (Grass, Part & Full Livery), Lessons, Horse Sales & professional facilities for hire. The applicant ran Pulborough Equestrian Centre until the lease expired on 1st January 2012. The applicant stated that he had 25 horses which consisted of 10 livery and the rest riding school horses and sale horses. However, the applicant has submitted amended plans and details which remove the horse walker from the application and amend the internal layout of the barns. Instead of proposing 14 stables, tack room, office and toilet to the lean too element of the barn, the amended plans now propose 4 larger stables, tackroom and feedroom to 50% of the floor area of the lean too and the other half would be used as an agricultural barn along with the higher full length part of the main barn. The applicant has stated that the site and buildings would be used for private use and not in connection with the commercial equestrian use he has run from Pulborough Equestrian Centre. Therefore, the letters of support from customers carry little weight in the determination of the application.
- 6.5 A previous planning application (DC/10/0220) granted consent for a stable block comprising 4 stables and a hay/feed store. The stable block was sited in an 'L' shape and measured 8.5m by 14.4m and had a floor area of 69.48 square metres. The ridge height of the building was 3m. A sand school was also permitted which measured 20m by 40m and was sited adjacent to the stables at the western end of the field adjacent to the field access. This application followed the withdrawal of application DC/09/1247 which sought consent for a larger 'U' shaped stable block with a floor area of 134.64 square metres and sandschool. The stable block was considered too large, the creation of a permanent access track across the field was considered to harm the rural character of the area and the siting of the building was considered to be inappropriate. Discussions took place with the applicant at that time to reduce the size of the stable block, remove the long access track and re-site the building to the south west corner of the field thus retaining the open character of the rest of the field.
- 6.6 An agricultural prior notification was submitted under DC/11/1392 for the erection of an agricultural farm building in July 2011. This building measured 18m by 25m. It was considered at the time that the building was reasonably required for agricultural purposes and that the building be constructed in accordance with the plans and details contained within the Prior Notification providing that all requirements of Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 relating to agricultural permitted development were complied with. In July 2011, the Local Planning Authority was not aware that the applicant ran a commercial equestrian business. However, the applicant submitted another agricultural prior notification under DC/11/1971 for the erection of another agricultural farm building but the applicant withdrew this application in October 2011 as he stated that the agricultural barn would not meet his equestrian needs and would therefore not be reasonably necessary for agricultural purposes as required by Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning Order 1995.
- 6.7 Your officers have undertaken numerous site visits over the last couple of months and it would appear that no agriculture is being undertaken on the unit. The site consists of 10 hectares / 25 acres and the applicant states that 7.28 ha / 18 acres have been sown for hay and the remaining land (7 acres) would be used to keep

livestock, build the barn, sand school, hardstanding and access track. If the applicant has 7.28 ha (18 acres) of land used for hay production with approximately 7 tonnes of hay per ha produced (51 tonnes in total with each bale requiring 7 cubic metres) that gives a storage requirement of 357 cubic metres. Based on the storage requirements for hay taken from 18 acres of land, it is clear that the barn is over and above that required for hay storage on this unit. The barns have a cubic content of 1054.8 cubic metres (measuring to the eaves, not including the stable area) which is substantially greater than the 357 cubic metres required for the stated land area. When a site visit was undertaken on Wednesday 4th January 2012, the access track was laid, the hardstanding was down, the sand school had been built, a log cabin was situated on site and the applicant is currently residing within it and 8 stables were erected on site, all without the benefit of planning permission. There were also 15 horses on site, 9 of which were in a field to the west of the application site which the applicant is renting. It is questionable whether there is sufficient grazing at the site to support the number of horses on the site as the British Horse Society recommends a minimum of 1 – 1.5 acres per horse.

- 6.8 The development would introduce a large permanent building and an access track and hardstanding that is already in situ in what was an otherwise undeveloped stretch of rural land. The thrust of the policies in the LDF is to protect the countryside and its landscape character from development inappropriate in form and scale. Moreover, it would amount to additional sporadic development in this location and its scale would result in a significant increase in the level of activity at the site. All those things would further erode the open countryside and its landscape character.
- 6.9 It is considered that the size of the building is excessive for the size of the site. A previous application (DC/09/1247) for a 'U' shaped stable block with a floor area of 134.64 square metres and a sand school was recommended for refusal due to its size and siting, however this application was eventually withdrawn before a smaller more appropriately sited stable block was permitted under application DC/10/0220. The floor area of the proposed barn under this current application would be 326.52 square metres larger than the approved stable block. Therefore, it is considered that the size, design and siting of the barn, access track and hard standing would represent an unacceptable form and scale of development that would have a detrimental impact on the rural character and visual amenities of this countryside location. Furthermore the proposal would constitute an undesirable element of sporadic development in the rural area.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission be refused on the following grounds & enforcement action authorised against the unauthorised development carried out so far.

- 1) The proposed barns and the retention of the sandschool, access track and hard standing by reason of their size, siting and design would represent an unacceptable form and scale of development that would have a detrimental impact on the rural character and visual amenities of this countryside location. Furthermore the proposal would constitute an undesirable element of sporadic development in the rural area. The proposal thus conflicts with policies DC1, DC2, DC9 and DC29 of the Horsham District Council Local Development Framework: General Development Control Policies (2007), and policies CP1 and CP15 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework Core Strategy (2007).

Background Papers: DC/11/1992, DC/09/1247, DC/10/0220, DC/11/1392 & DC/11/1971

Contact Officer: Kathryn Sadler



DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT



TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning & Environmental Services

DATE: 17th January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Renovation of redundant farm building and change of use to residential accommodation (South Downs National Park)

SITE: Beeding Court, Shoreham Road, Upper Beeding

WARD: Bramber, Upper Beeding & Woodmancote

APPLICATION: DC/11/2110 (Planning) & DC/11/2112 (Listed Building Consent)

APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Jon & Louise Bunning

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON AGENDA: Neighbour request to speak

RECOMMENDATION: To grant planning permission subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure Community Facilities and Transport Infrastructure Contributions.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 The applications seek planning permission and listed building consent for the renovation of a redundant farm building and change of use to residential accommodation. The building is an old piggery which is within the grounds of Beeding Court which is a Grade II Listed farmhouse. The building is a timber framed structure, with three flint walls and one open side. The building currently has a corrugated fibre cement roof. It is proposed to convert the building into a 2 bed residential unit with lounge, kitchen, bathroom and en-suite. The new roofing material for the building would consist of hand made clay tiles, the three flint walls would be made good and the southern elevation would be infilled with oak weatherboard which would be left to age. The existing walls would be retained and

a new structural inner frame erected internally. The existing ridge beam would be retained to ensure the shape and undulations of the existing roof are retained.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.2 The site is located within a countryside location and is located within the South Downs National Park. Beeding Court is a Grade II Listed Farm House and the application site is an old piggery building that is within the grounds of Beeding Court. The application site measures approximately 11m by 55m in area and the piggery building measures 21.2m by 4.1m and has a ridge height of 3.5m. The site is fairly vegetated with mature trees and brambles and shrubs. Access to the site would be achieved via the existing access to Beeding Court and The Old Granary. Beeding Court is located to the west of the site and The Old Granary is located to the north of the site. The Old Granary was converted into a dwelling in 1995 under applications UB/24/95 and UB/25/95. The site is located approximately 215 metres from the built up area boundary of Upper Beeding.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.3 Listed Building Application DC/11/1282 for the renovation of the redundant farm building and change of use to residential accommodation was withdrawn in August 2011.

Planning Application DC/11/1037 for the renovation of the redundant farm building and change of use to residential accommodation was withdrawn in August 2011.

There is no other relevant planning history for the site.

2. INTRODUCTION

RELEVANT POLICY

- 2.1 Town and Country Planning Act 1990

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 PPS1 & PPS3.

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.3 The following policies of the Local Development Framework Core Strategy (adopted February 2007) are relevant in the assessment of this application: CP1 – Landscape and Townscape Character & CP15 – Rural Strategy.
- 2.4 The following policies of the Local Development Framework, General Development Control Policies Document (December 2007) are relevant in the assessment of this application: DC1 – Countryside Protection & Enhancement, DC2 – Landscape Character, DC4 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, DC9 – Development Principles, DC13 – Listed Buildings, DC24 – Conversion of Agricultural and Rural Buildings for Industrial, Business or Residential Uses & DC40 - Transport.

- 2.5 The South Downs Management Plan 2008 – 2013 and South Downs Planning Guidelines 2008 are relevant material considerations in the determination of this application since the South Downs National Park's creation in April 2010. The guidance contained within the documents reflects government guidance which seeks to give maximum protection to the most valuable landscapes.

3.0 **OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS**

INTERNAL CONSULTEES

- 3.1 Building Control have stated that "It appears that the agent / structural engineer has made a reasonable solution to the structural support of the roof and associated works that had been raised on the report from the first planning application. Building Regulations concerns regarding escape feature window required to Bedroom 2 and adequate provision for both surface and foul water drainage."
- 3.2 Building Control's additional comments regarding the raft foundation issue raised by the neighbour state "Further to my thoughts regarding the foundation design on the above application the nominated structural engineer appears to have satisfied all my concerns."
- 3.3 The Head of Public Health & Licensing has raised no objections to the proposal subject to conditions restricting hours of works and no burning of waste materials.
- 3.4 The Arboricultural Officer has commented that "I visited the site on 26th April 2011 pursuant to a request from a neighbour to inspect the area for the suitability of any trees on the plot for a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). I have subsequently examined the development proposals, most particularly the Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) as compiled by Broad Oak Tree Consultants Limited, dated 17th May 2011, with attendant plans. I note the following:
- Virtually the whole of the plot is presently covered in trees, ranging from some large old field edge specimens, to what appear to be deliberately planted ornamental specimens, and a great deal of self-seeded infill, dominated by sycamore. Collectively, therefore, the area appears as a belt of deciduous foliage with some exceptional evergreens. This swathe of green (as it is outside the dormant season) is visible from Shoreham Road to the east, the main area of public access, and is within the South Downs National Park; but is in my judgement not especial. The larger sycamore, T25, is certainly noticeable, but obliquely from the highway, to the south, and is not of any outstanding merit or amenity value per se. From the property to the immediate north, The Old Granary, clearly the foliar cover is prominent and indeed dominant; however, its quality remains poor, and in overall amenity terms, I did not form the view that it was collectively worthy of a TPO. Nor did I conclude that any one or more individual specimens met the required criteria at that time. No TPO was subsequently served on the area.
 - For any new dwelling to blend into the area, it is important that the main of the premier tree stock is retained. However, a fair number of smaller trees will need to be removed, and surgery undertaken to others. I have examined the

submitted proposals for this, and am satisfied that this is being handled sensitively.

- As the footprint of the building is not being altered, I have no concerns in regard to damage to retained trees around it.
- Extensive damage could occur to retained trees from the construction of the required new access driveway and turn-on-site. However, such hard surfaces can be successfully installed within the root protection areas of trees if implemented using 'No-Dig' surfacing, and I am pleased to note that full details of this technique have been submitted.
- Due to the shape of the plot, the position of the existing piggery, and the retained tree cover, there is a concern as to the amount of naturally-lit amenity space. However:
 - Some surgery to the trees to the immediate north of the building are likely to be required or desirable, to minimise leaf fall and shading (as well as possibly safety concerns) over the building footprint. However, I see no problem with this per se, and would suggest that some surgery is carried out prior to the implementation of the building works. Proposals for surgery have been put forward under para.10.1 of the AIA, which appear suitable. It would also be prudent to ensure that gutter guards and leaf traps are installed on all open rainwater systems.
 - The patio area to the immediate south of the dwelling is small, but faces south and has access to unrestricted sunlight, once the foliage is removed as intended, despite being at the base of the small slope. Although this will represent the only area on the plot unaffected by tree canopy shading, I feel that this is a reasonable and unobjectionable percentage of the plot curtilage in the circumstances.

I therefore feel on balance that the scheme represents a creditable effort at developing this unusually narrow and heavily tree'd plot. However, can I advise of the following:

- The alteration of the plot to residential use may well, despite the open amenity area to the south of the building, represent a threat to many of the retained trees. Although not considered worthy of a TPO at this time, situations change, and certainly the complete removal of the trees on the plot would in my view be undesirable. Hence I suggest the use of standard condition L8 protecting the trees for a limited period, paying due regard to the Secretary of State's view that such a condition should be time-limited.
- The use of the 'No-Dig' construction method for the driveway is imperative, and hence I suggest the use of standard condition L10, re-worded to reflect the AIA. A separate supplementary Arboricultural Method Statement is in my view not required, due to the inclusion of details pursuant to tree protective fencing and services within the submitted AIA. Due to the inclusion of this condition, the use of L2 is not required. However, I also recommend the use of L6 to prevent the burning of material on the site, which could damage retained trees.

Subject to the use of the above suggested conditions, I feel that this scheme is deliverable in arboricultural terms without causing excessive tree loss or

unreasonable post developmental pressures. I therefore feel that the scheme meets with the recommendations of BS 5837 'Trees in Relation to Construction' (2005), guidance at chapter 5 of the publication Tree Preservation Orders - A guide to the Law and Good Practice (*DETR, March 2000*), and with the provisions of policy DC9 of the General Development Control Policies Framework document (*December 2007*). Accordingly I register no objection to the scheme."

- 3.5 The Design & Conservation Officer has commented that "This application seeks to address the reasons for recommended refusal for DC/11/1282 which was withdrawn. These points and solutions are below:

Access road: The proposed access via the existing track does not create a further intrusion from Shoreham Road. The proposals for the turning point and parking car do not significantly alter the existing arrangement to the setting of the listed buildings' detriment.

Fence: The wire fence in the previous application has been replaced with a timber post and rail fence – similar to those already in the vicinity.

Use as residential: Alternative uses have been explored and are not viable. As the building has some historic significance, a case could be made for sympathetic conversion.

Elevation details: These have been redesigned to reflect a simpler, ancillary and more rural appearance to the building. The design does not detract from the character of the building, or the setting of the listed building – it will still be viewed as ancillary and of simple vernacular construction, sympathetically converted.

The information in the Design and Access statement, including reference to current conversion guidance from English Heritage and the information regarding the commercial viability of alternative uses further reinforces some of the issues in the previous application. Together with the reasons above it would be difficult to refuse the application based on the impact on the character of the barn or the setting of the listed building, Beeding Court, especially as the other former ancillary agricultural farm buildings (including "The Courtyard" and "The Old Granary" previously attributed to the estate of Beeding Court, have been converted. In conclusion, the application meets the requirements of DC13 and therefore I raise no objection. Please request by way of condition samples of materials to be agreed prior to commencement of development."

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.6 The Environment Agency has no comment to make.

- 3.7 West Sussex Highway Authority has commented that “I refer to your consultation in respect of the above planning application and would provide the following comments.

You will be aware that pre-application advice was given in by WSCC for this site in April 2011. In addition a planning application was submitted in July 2011 under DC/1037/11 for the renovation of the redundant farm building and COU to residential accommodation, to which WSCC raised no objections from the highway point of view.

Under the pre-application advice given, WSCC deemed the proposed new access to Beeding Court overbearing and considered it would be appropriate for the LPA to assess the access in relation to the street scene. This latest proposal has confirmed that access to the court will be via the existing entrance which from an inspection of the plans offers acceptable visibility in both directions.

Taking into account the pre-application advice that was given earlier in the year and the most recent WSCC response to the application, no concerns would be raised to this proposal from the highway point of view.

I would advise that the previous conditions applied under DC/1037/11 to this proposal would still apply.”

- 3.8 Southern Water has stated “Any new connections will require a formal application for a connection to the public sewer to be made by the applicant or developer. We request that should this application receive planning approval, the following informative is attached to the consent:

“A formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Atkins Ltd, Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, SO23 9EH. (Tel 01962 858688) or www.southernwater.co.uk

The Council’s Building Control officers technical staff or Environment Agency should be asked to comment on the adequacy of soakaways to dispose of surface water from the proposed development.”

- 3.9 Natural England has commented that “This application lies within the South Downs National Park. However, given the nature and scale of this proposal, Natural England raises no objection to the proposal being carried out according to the terms and conditions of the application and submitted plans on account of the impact on designated sites.”
- 3.10 WSCC County Ecologist has commented that he has no ecological objection subject to conditions. The bat report provided is compliant with Natural England’s Standing Advice. The ecological report has recommended some minor ecological enhancements for bats. The implementation of the recommended enhancements would satisfy PPS9 paragraphs 12, 14 and S40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

3.11 Upper Beeding Parish Council has no objection.

3.12 3 letters of objection have been received on the grounds of:

- Lead to urbanisation of the site;
- Direct impact on the occupiers of The Granary;
- The topography will not allow the flow of sewage and rain water to the main waste in the Shoreham Road;
- The floor would have to be lowered by 30cm;
- The building could be used for other storage uses;
- The topography of the Long Barn will not allow the flow of sewerage and rain water to the main waste in Shoreham Road;
- The applicant is looking to use a raft foundation which cannot be adopted on this type of land;
- Removal of trees;
- Impact on setting of listed building;
- More traffic accessing Henfield Road;
- The building has very limited space at both front and rear and no garage;

3.13 1 letter of support has been received on the grounds of:

- It would tidy up a site which is visible from our property and also a piece of comparatively unkempt land at the entrance as well as giving us greater comfort on security out of office hours.

3.14 No other representations have been received to public notification on the application at the time of writing this report. Any further comments received will be reported verbally at the committee meeting.

4. **HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS**

4.1 Article 8 (Right to respect of a Private and Family Life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (Protection of Property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to this application, Consideration of Human rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. **HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER**

5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

6.1 The main issues in determination of this application are considered to be the principle of the development, the effect of the development on the amenity of nearby occupiers and the visual amenities and character of the area.

6.2 Policy DC24 (Conversion of agricultural and rural buildings) states:

Outside the defined built up area, conversion of agricultural, forestry or rural buildings for business, commercial or residential development will be permitted where:

- a) the building is suitably located in that it is not in an isolated position in relation to infrastructure, amenities and services;
- b) the building is of suitable scale for the level of activity proposed, and of suitable construction which is not so derelict as to require substantial reconstruction, and for proposals for residential use, is of traditional construction and/or architectural/historic interest;
- c) the buildings are proved to have been in use for a period of 10 years or more;
- d) the proposed use will maintain or enhance the architectural character of the buildings and the character of their settings; and
- e) the proposed use can be accommodated in the existing buildings and car parking requirements can be accommodated satisfactorily within the immediate surrounds of the buildings.

6.3 The building is a timber framed structure, with three flint walls and one open side. The building currently has a corrugated fibre cement roof. It is proposed to convert the building into a 2 bed residential unit with lounge, kitchen, bathroom and ensuite. The new roofing material for the building would consist of hand made clay tiles, the three flint walls would be made good and the southern elevation would be infilled with oak weatherboard which would be left to age. The existing walls would be retained and a new structural inner frame erected internally. The existing ridge beam would be retained to ensure the shape and undulations of the existing roof are retained.

6.4 A previous planning application for the conversion of the building (DC/11/1037) was withdrawn in August 2011 following extensive consultations. The agent was asked to address certain issues which included: removing the separate vehicular access to the barn, re-design the southern elevation of the barn to be more in keeping with the English Heritage Guide on the 'Conversion of Traditional Farm Buildings', explore non residential uses and provide a comprehensive structural report on how the barn is capable of conversion.

6.5 This new application has addressed all of the issues raised previously and this report will go through these issues. Firstly, the potential for non residential use within the barn has been explored but the applicant has found that the estimated costs of renovation to storage use would not be justifiable. The agent has stated that the occupants of Beeding Court are unlikely to require 70 sq m of domestic storage space as there is sufficient storage already on the site. The barn is narrow, has limited head height and restricted door openings which would not make it ideal for any commercial B8 storage use. Commercial rents for storage would not justify the cost of conversion. The Courtyard (next door) is a complex of barn conversions which offer commercial office space and these buildings have been empty for two years. The agent has contacted a commercial agent who suggested a potential rental income of £12 per square foot. Assuming 100% rental occupancy, the agent

has demonstrated that it would be uneconomic to consider development for commercial purposes. It is also considered that a commercial use would be inappropriate given the proximity of the barn to other residential properties.

- 6.6 It is now proposed that vehicular access to the barn is achieved via the existing entrance, with access filtering off the main drive and negotiating around the existing trees. The access would be formed through a no dig construction with a loose rolled gravel surface. This approach would retain the majority of the mature trees on site. The Arboricultural Officer has commented that he has no objection to the proposal. The South Downs National Park Liaison Officer has also assessed the application has no objections to the proposal.
- 6.7 The southern elevation has been designed to take on board English Heritage Guidance and the Design & Conservation Officer's comments. A full Heritage Statement has been submitted with the application. The Design & Conservation Officer has no objections to the planning and listed building applications and considers that the concerns previously raised on the previous applications have been addressed and overcome.
- 6.8 The application is accompanied by a Structural Engineers Report which highlights how the barn is to be converted. The Head of Building Control has commented that "It appears that the agent / structural engineer has made a reasonable solution to the structural support of the roof and associated works that had been raised on the report from the first planning application. A letter of representation has raised concerns over the use of a raft foundation, however additional details from the Structural Engineer regarding the use of a raft foundation have been received and the Head of Building Control has commented as follows: "Further to my thoughts regarding the foundation design on the above application, the nominated structural engineer appears to have satisfied all my concerns."
- 6.9 The barn is considered to accord with the requirements of Policy DC24 in so much that the barn is not in an isolated location being approximately 220 metres from the built up area of Upper Beeding being classified as a Category 1 settlement under Policy CP5. The barn is considered to be of a scale that would be able to provide residential accommodation without extensions and it has been demonstrated that the building is capable of conversion without substantial reconstruction. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal meets the requirements of Policy DC9, DC13 and DC24 of the General Development Control Policies 2007.

7. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement to secure community facilities and transport infrastructure contributions and the following conditions:
- 1) A2 Full Permission
 - 2) M1 Approval of Materials
 - 3) Before development commences precise details of the design, the materials and method of glazing for the windows & doors shall be submitted to and

approved by the local planning authority in writing. The windows & doors thereafter shall conform to the approved details.

Reason – M1 reason

- 4) D5 No windows
- 5) E3 Fencing
- 6) L1 Hard & Soft Landscaping
- 7) L8 No Felling
- 8) L10 Arboricultural Implications Assessment – Please insert Arboricultural Implications Assessment instead of Arboricultural Method Statement.
- 9) L6 Burning of Materials
- 10) O1 Hours of Working
- 11) O2 Burning Of materials
- 12) J10 Removal of permitted development – dwellings
 “Notwithstanding the provisions of Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any order amending or revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification) no development falling within Classes A, B, C, D, E of Part 1 of Schedule 2 to the order shall be erected constructed or placed within the curtilage of the dwelling hereby permitted so as to enlarge improve or otherwise alter the appearance or setting of the dwelling(s) unless permission is granted by the Local Planning Authority pursuant to an application for the purpose.”
- 13) Prior to occupation or use of the completed development, as part of its renovation and in accordance with recommendations made within the bat survey, an Ecological Clerk of Works will be commissioned to oversee the provision of bat roosts within the development. These bat roosts shall be implemented on site and retained and maintained in perpetuity.

Reason: To protect bat species that maybe on the site during construction and to enhance bat roosting opportunities in accordance with PPS9 paragraph 14, and Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006.

- 14) No trees or shrubs shall be removed between March to August inclusive in any year, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Where vegetation must be cleared during the bird breeding season a check for nesting birds by a suitably qualified ecologist will be required. Any vegetation containing occupied nests will be retained until the young have fledged. The location details of the compensatory nesting provision shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority for approval in writing prior to their erection.

Reason: To safeguard breeding birds in accordance with policy DC5 of the General Development Control Policies 2007.

- 15) S4 Surface Water Details (Option A) Please add “Foul water drainage” too

Note to Applicant

The applicant is advised that a formal application for connection to the public sewerage system is required in order to service this development, please contact Atkins Ltd, Anglo St James House, 39A Southgate Street, Winchester, S023 9EH. (Tel 01962 858688) or www.southernwater.co.uk

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION:

IDP1 The proposal is consistent with the provisions of the development plan.

ICAB2 The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers or the character of the area.

Background Papers: DC/11/2110 & DC/11/2112

Contact Officer: Kathryn Sadler



**Horsham
District
Council**

serving our towns and villages

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning and Environmental Services

DATE: 17th January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Retention of a timber structured tree house

SITE: 24 Manor Road, Upper Beeding, Steyning

WARD: Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote

APPLICATION: DC/11/1747

APPLICANT: Miss Teresa Sanders

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: Applicant request to speak.

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 This application seeks retrospective planning permission for the erection of a timber structured tree house within the rear garden of this dwelling. This tree house has been in situ since late June 2011, and this application follows on from a complaint and a subsequent planning compliance investigation.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.2 This dwelling is located on the eastern side of Manor Road and is located within the designated built-up-area of Upper Beeding, and as such is subject to the relevant policies of the Horsham District General Development Control Policies Document 2007. This site comprises a semi-detached, 2-storey dwelling with a long rear garden measuring approximately 25m in length. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character with dwellings of varying scale and type along Manor Road and the cul-de-sacs which lead off from this road. College Road is located to the east of this site and the rear gardens of these terraced dwellings are located to the east of this site. There is an attached neighbouring dwelling located to the north of this dwelling and further neighbouring dwellings are located to the south of this site.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 PPS1.

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.3 The relevant policies of the Horsham Development Control Policies (2007) are DC2 and DC9.

- 2.4 The relevant policies of the Horsham District Council's Core Strategy are CP1 and CP3.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.5 No relevant planning history

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 None received.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.2 None received.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.3 Upper Beeding Parish Council have been consulted on this application, and they state that the Parish Council see no reason to recommend refusal of the application.

- 3.4 The occupier of the adjoining neighbouring dwelling has written in to object to this proposal, and they state that they object to the retention of the tree house on the following grounds:

- As the tree house has been erected directly on the boundary fence between the 2 properties and is at a height that exceeds an overall height of 4m which they believe is a breach of their privacy.
- Their rear garden has been extensively landscaped to create a large patio area, barbeque and entertainment area, this is currently surrounded by an 8ft hedge and 7ft panel fence to afford this area the privacy they desired. The tree house has been erected in a manner which directly overlooks this entire area and removes all privacy.
- They also object as the tree house provides a direct line of sight into the bedroom and bathroom on the rear elevation of their dwelling which they consider to be a breach of privacy.
- If the structure were to moved elsewhere on or around the tree it would result in structural changes being made to the existing established trees, which is something they would not like to see, furthermore, any repositioning of the tree house would still potentially breach their privacy in respect of the direct sight into their rear bedroom and bathroom.

- 3.5 The occupier of a neighbouring dwelling has stated that they support this application. They state that they have no objection to the child size tree house in their neighbours garden. They state that there has not been any adverse impact upon their home. The tree house is built within the canopy of a leylandi tree and is stained dark brown, and as such cannot be seen. Furthermore they state that they are able to look out onto and overlook the applicants garden from the 2 bedroom windows located on the first floor of the rear elevation of their dwelling.

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of The First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of human rights is an integral part of the planning assessment set out below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

It is not considered that the proposal would have a material impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

- 6.1 The principal issues in determining this application are the siting and form of the development, and the effect of the development on the residential amenity of neighbouring residents and the character of the area.
- 6.2 The tree house has been erected within the northeasternmost corner of the rear garden of this property and is in close proximity to the boundary of the attached neighbouring dwelling to the north. The boundary consists of a 1.8m high close boarded fence and the tree house is situated approximately 1m from this boundary fence. The tree house measures approximately 3.5m in height, 1.8m in width and 1.3m in depth. The tree house is not built within a tree or on the branch of a tree, rather it is built on stilts adjacent to an existing tree located along the rear boundary of this site. The tree house has been built for use by a 6 year old boy.
- 6.3 The tree house currently has an open doorway as the entrance into the tree house and a window on the front (west) elevation of the structure, the tree house is accessed via a wooden ladder situated below the doorway. The applicant has advised that should the retention of the tree house be permitted a timber door would be fitted and a clear plastic cover would be fitted to the window. The timber frame of the tree house has been stained dark brown and the applicant has advised that they intend to also paint the existing ladder with the same wood stain.
- 6.4 Given the height of the structure, the doorway and the window of the tree house are located above the boundary fence of the neighbouring dwelling and as such the rear garden of the attached neighbouring dwelling is visible from inside the tree house from the doorway and the window. The rear garden of the neighbouring dwelling has been landscaped and there is an existing patio, barbeque and seating area in the easternmost half of the garden. Due to the height and siting of the tree house, this private amenity area is highly visible from the tree house, and this private amenity area can be easily overlooked. Whilst it is granted that a child may not wish to overlook this area the presence of the tree house and the position of the openings would be intrusive and give the perception of overlooking to the occupiers of the neighbouring dwelling. It is therefore considered that the tree house would have an adverse impact upon the residential

amenities of the occupiers of this neighbouring dwelling, and as such would be contrary to the development principles of policy DC9.

- 6.5 The tree house is partially obscured by the branches of the adjacent tree, however, this does not provide adequate screening to the neighbouring garden. The applicant has provided a photograph of the tree house which was taken in the summer months, and although it is acknowledged that in the summer months some additional screening is provided by the trees, this does not overcome the concerns regarding the loss of privacy and overlooking to the rear amenity space of the neighbouring dwelling.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

The tree house by virtue of its height and siting in close proximity to the rear garden and private amenity space of the neighbouring dwelling results in a structure that appears overbearing, gives rise to overlooking and has an adverse affect upon the existing residential amenities of the occupiers of the attached neighbouring dwelling to the north. As such the proposal would conflict with policy DC9 of the Horsham District General Development Control Policies (2007).

Background Papers: DC/11/1747



**Horsham
District
Council**

serving our towns and villages

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning and Environmental Services

DATE: 17 January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: To add a new floor to the existing bungalow with pitched roof, dormer windows to the front and double height glazed section to the rear

SITE: Dene Hollow New Hall Lane Small Dole Henfield

WARD: Bramber, Upper Beeding and Woodmancote (within Small Dole part of Henfield Parish)

APPLICATION: DC/11/2323

APPLICANT: Mrs Audrey Pearson

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: Agent request to speak

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1.1 To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

1.2 The application seeks to erect a first floor to the existing bungalow. The proposal would see the introduction of a cat slide roof on the front elevation with two dormer windows and a full height rear elevation with double height 'hay cart' style access. The proposed change to the property would see the height increase from approximately 4.5metres to 8.2metres, although the overall footprint would remain the same. The proposed development would see the introduction of timber beams and rendering on the front with low level brickwork, the rear and side elevations would be timber clad at first floor level with render and low level brick work at ground floor level.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

1.3 The application site is located within the Built up Area

1.4 The application site is a detached bungalow located to the south of New Hall Lane. The rear of the property is brick built and the front has been rendered with a tiled shallow pitch roof. The property has been previously extended at both the front and rear. The boundary of the property is marked by hedges at the front and close

boarded fencing to the side. There is parking at the front of the property for a number of cars and to the rear is a large garden with open fields beyond.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 Planning Policy Statement 1: Delivering Sustainable Development

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.3 Policy CP3 (Improving the quality of new development) of the Core Strategy 2007
- 2.4 Policy DC9 (Development Principles) of the General Development Control Policies 2007

PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.5 HF/35/88: In May 1988 planning permission was granted for front and rear single storey extensions, replacement garage, new covered way
- 2.6 HF/60/90: In August 1990 planning permission was granted for single storey extensions
- 2.7 HF/93/97: In December 1997 planning permission was granted for the change of use of land to the keeping of horses and construction of a sand school

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 Henfield Parish Council has no objections to the application
- 3.2 No responses have been received from neighbouring properties

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of The First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of human rights is an integral part of the planning assessment set out below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

- 6.1 The key considerations in the determination of this application are the impact of the proposal in terms of design, neighbour amenity and on the street scene and wider area.
- 6.2 Policy DC9 of the General Development Control Policies states that proposals should *“ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and layout and where relevant relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, open spaces and routes within and adjoining the site.”* It is considered that the increase in height of the proposals and the insertion of a full height rear elevation would result in a bulky addition which significantly changes the character of the original house.
- 6.3 It has been noted that the street as a whole is made up of properties of varying sizes and architectural styles, and as such the design in general is not out of keeping with properties within the wider street scene, however properties with a similar design to that proposed are generally situated within larger plots. The key concern is that it appears overly large given the width of the plot, and the scale and mass of the development would result in an unsympathetic addition to the property. In addition to this the proposed roof extension seeks to almost double the existing floor space of the dwelling house; this coupled with the previous extensions on the property would cumulatively result in a property more than double the size of the original dwelling house.
- 6.4 In terms of the impact on the street scene, the properties adjacent to the application site are set further back from the road than the application site itself. Whilst it is acknowledged that the neighbouring properties have existing first floors, the overall footprint of the properties are more modest both in width and depth than that of the application site and therefore have less of an impact on the street scene. It is considered that the proposed roof extension which is the subject of this application would result in a dwelling house which is overly dominant and ultimately has an adverse impact on the street scene.
- 6.5 The application site sits within a residential area, and there are neighbouring properties either side of the application site. The additional windows on the first floor side elevations would be obscure glazed bathroom windows, and as such it is unlikely that they would result in an unacceptable level of overlooking. Whilst it is acknowledged that the introduction of a first floor would create some overlooking into the neighbouring gardens from the rear, this would be at an oblique angle. The increased height of the bungalow is also likely to create some overshadowing; however given the orientation of the site this is likely to be limited. In terms of the overall impact on neighbour amenity, whilst it is acknowledged that there would be some impact on neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and overshadowing, this alone is not considered enough to justify a refusal.
- 6.6 The proposed roof extension would have no impact on the existing parking provisions, and as such the proposal is acceptable in this regard.

- 6.7 Overall it is considered that the proposed alterations by virtue of their scale, bulk and mass would have a detrimental impact on and ultimately overpower the existing dwelling house, and those in close vicinity to the application site. As a result it is considered that the proposals do not meet the aims of planning policy and it is recommended that the application is refused.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 That planning permission is refused

1. The proposed roof extension by virtue of its scale, bulk and design would have a detrimental impact on the character and would over power the existing dwelling house. It is considered that the cumulative impact of development on the application site would result in a dwelling house significantly larger than the original dwelling house. In addition to this it is considered that the proposed development would adversely impact on the street scene. As a result it is considered that the proposal is contrary to Policy CP3 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policy DC9 of the General Development Control Policies (2007)

Background Papers: DC/11/2323

Contact Officer: Emma Greening



**Horsham
District
Council**

serving our towns and villages

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning and Environmental Services

DATE: 17 January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Construction of single mini tennis court (Resubmission of application ref DC/11/1770)

SITE: Storrington Lawn Tennis Club Greyfriars Lane Storrington Pulborough

WARD: Chantry

APPLICATION: DC/11/2529

APPLICANT: Storrington Lawn Tennis Club

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON THE AGENDA: Officer Referral

RECOMMENDATION: To refuse planning permission

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 This application seeks to erect one mini tennis court to the south of Court 8, close to the southern boundary of the site. The proposed court would measure in total 7.5metres by 15metres and would be surrounded by a 2.7metre high fence. The proposal would see the construction of a 450mm retaining wall between the southern boundary and proposed court which would be constructed in fairfaced block work, and there would be an additional retaining wall of approximately 350mm between court 8 and the proposed mini court.
- 1.2 The mini court would be accessed via a gate on the eastern boundary. The courts would be constructed of porous macadam, with the playing surface painted red, blue and tan.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.3 The application site is located within the Built up Area of Storrington, although the southern and western boundaries of the site border the countryside. The South Downs National Park lies approximately 300 metres to the south and 100 metres to the south east of the site. The tennis club is located to the west of Greyfriars Lane

and is accessed via a single track to a large car park which is shared with the squash club. There are currently 8 full size tennis courts.

- 1.4 The southern end of the site consists of a grass bank which is approximately 2.5 metres in height and marks the boundary from Court 8 to the countryside beyond. The eastern boundary is marked by substantial vegetation and screens the tennis club from the properties beyond. The southern boundary is marked by a 1 metre mesh fence and the western boundary by a hedge approximately 1 metre in height, beyond this is a vineyard and open fields.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.2 Local Development Framework (Core Strategy 2007): CP1- Landscape and Townscape Character, CP2- Environmental Quality and CP14- Protection and Enhancement of Community Facilities and Services
- 2.3 Local Development Framework (General Development Control Policies 2007): DC2- Landscape Character, DC9- Development Principles and DC22- New open space, sports and recreation

PLANNING HISTORY

- 2.4

SR/67/95	Erection of new club house Site: Pavilion Greyfriars Lane Storrington	PER
SR/41/00	Erection of floodlighting Site: Storrington Lawn Tennis Club Greyfriars Lane Storrington	PER
DC/08/0949	Installation of floodlighting for courts 6, 7 and 8	WDN
DC/08/1465	Surgery to 5 Lime trees	PER
DC/08/1892	Installation of floodlights on Courts 6 and 7 to include the erection of 6.5 metre poles and 1000 watt lights	PER
DC/11/1576	Variation of Condition 2 (The floodlighting hereby approved on Courts 6 and 7 shall only be illuminated from 16:00 to 20:00 Monday to Friday and from 16:00 to 18:00 Saturdays and Sundays) of planning permission DC/08/1892 (Installation of floodlights on Courts 6 and 7 to include the erection of 6.5m poles and 1000w lights) to extend hours to 22:00 weekdays and weekends	PER
DC/11/1770	Construction of two 'mini tennis' courts	WDN

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 The Head of Housing and Community Services supports the application.
- 3.2 The Landscape Architect has raised concerns:
"The existing tennis courts are separated by a broad grassed embankment from the adjoining vineyard. This provides a useful green buffer between the urban feature of the existing tennis courts and the adjoining more open countryside.

The proposed additional tennis court will result in substantial erosion of this buffer leaving, once the French drain and retaining wall are taken into account, only 0.7m-1.3m width in which to achieve appropriate native species hedgerow and medium-large hedgerow tree planting to provide visual screening. This is an inadequate space in which to achieve such planting - more like 5m + would be needed.

Whilst there is already some visual intrusion from the existing courts this proposal will exacerbate adverse visual impact. The proposal is also contrary to landscape character policy as it cannot be said to conserve and enhance the local landscape character of the area"

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.3 Storrington and Sullington Parish Council has raised no objection to the proposal
- 3.4 There have been 8 letters of support for the application, the main reasons are:
- The location of the proposed court does not encroach on the vineyard boundary and has been carefully considered
 - It also appears that the space for this development is more than adequate Impact on the surrounding area and our neighbours has been carefully considered and accommodated
 - Increased landscaping will enhance the area
 - The proposal is hardly visible from properties nearby and other visibility is only from such a great distances that there would be minimal impact
 - The club provides a vital role in the local community with a lot of emphasis on encouraging children to play sport and would be a meaningful legacy
 - As part of the Governments big society agenda, we need to encourage such youth developments, especially in the light of major cuts already happening to the WSCC youth service
 - If we engage our young people at an early age in positive activities, we are much more likely to help change the next generation. If we delay we may not only lose the LTA grant but also budding young sport stars
 - Amazed at the fuss being made over the minimal extension of playing surfaces for the benefit of the young people
 - The benefit to the club, children of between 5 & 9 years of age and the local Storrington community is not in dispute
- 3.5 Any further responses received will be reported verbally at the committee meeting.

4. HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS

- 4.1 Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of The First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of human rights is an integral part of the planning assessment set out below.

5. HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER

- 5.1 It is not considered that the development would be likely to have any significant impact on crime and disorder.

6. PLANNING ASSESSMENTS

- 6.1 The main consideration in the determination of this application is the impact on the character of the adjoining countryside and the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining properties.
- 6.2 The proposal is a resubmission of DC/11/1770 which sought to build two mini tennis courts to the south of Court 8. This application was withdrawn following Officer concerns over the possible over development of the site and the adverse impact on the countryside beyond, as well as the lack of information supplied with the application.
- 6.3 The proposed mini court would be for the under 8 age group as defined by Lawn Tennis Association standards. The club wishes to provide coaching and tuition to young children on a purpose built Lawn Tennis Association mini court. The Lawn Tennis Association have agreed to grant assist in the cost of constructing the court.
- 6.4 The application currently under consideration would see the number of mini courts reduced to one; to be located on the eastern section, south of Court 8. This is an existing bank which currently marks the distinction between the built up area and the countryside beyond. The proposal would involve cutting into the bank to create a level surface, this would involve the insertion of a French drain and retaining wall to the south of the proposed court, and an additional retaining wall to the north of the proposed court. The Design and Access Statement has stated that the level of material to be removed from the site would be approximately 75m³.
- 6.5 Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed scheme is an improvement on the previously submitted scheme, there remain concerns that the location of the proposed court would intrude on the countryside beyond. Policy DC2 states that *"Development will be permitted where it protects and/or conserves and/or enhances the key characteristics of the landscape character area in which it is located"*. The application has sought to mitigate against the impact of the proposed court and loss of part of the bank with additional screening on the boundary. The Landscape Architect suggest that the proposal will result in substantial erosion of the bank. Once the French drain and retaining wall have been taken into account there would only be between 0.7metre to 1.3metres width in which to achieve appropriate native species hedgerow and medium- large hedgerow tree planting to

provide visual screening. This is considered an inadequate space in which to achieve such planting. It is therefore considered that the proposal would have an adverse visual impact, thereby not meeting the requirements of DC2. In addition to this, it is considered that the proposed screening would create overshadowing onto the proposed court, thus impacting on the users of the court and thereby not providing effective mitigation measures.

- 6.6 In terms of the impact on the amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties, the nearest properties are located approximately over 20metres from the application site. Whilst the fencing would be visible from these properties, it is not considered that it would have a significant impact on these properties and no flood lighting is proposed. It is therefore considered that the proposal would be unlikely to have a significant impact on neighbour amenity and the proposals are considered acceptable in this regard.
- 6.7 Overall it is considered that whilst this application is an improvement on the scheme previously submitted, there are still concerns that the proposed tennis court would represent over development of the site and remove in part the natural buffer between the tennis club and open countryside beyond. As a result it is considered that the proposal does not meet the aims of planning policy and it is recommended that the application is refused.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 That planning permission is refused

1. It is considered that the proposed mini tennis court would adversely impact on the visual amenities and character of the area including the adjoining countryside. In addition to this it is considered that the proposal would result in overdevelopment of the site. As a result it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policies CP1, CP2 and CP14 of the Core Strategy (2007) and Policies DC2, DC9 and DC22 of the General Development Control Policies (2007).

Background Papers: DC/11/1770 and DC/11/2529

Contact Officer: Emma Greening



Horsham
District
Council

serving our towns and villages

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning and Environmental Services

DATE: 17th January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Conversion of single storey bungalow to two storey house

SITE: Bartons
West Chiltington Road
Storrington

WARD: Storrington and Sullington

APPLICATION: DC/11/2382

APPLICANT: Mr John Kennedy

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON AGENDA: Member request – Councilors Sanson and Mason

RECOMMENDATION: To grant planning permission subject to the receipt of amended plans deleting the doors allowing access to the terrace area

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the extension and alteration of Bartons to form a two storey house in a modern style. The proposed extension would result in the extension of the existing 3 bed room property to form a 5 bed room house. The dwelling would be extended to the north east with a single storey extension replacing the existing detached outbuilding and lean to, and to the south west by infilling an existing car port. A second floor would be added to the central original part of the dwelling and would be 10.6 metres wide at its widest point and 10.4 metres long. The height of the building would be 5.5 metres with a flat roof, some 1.4 metres higher than the existing property.
- 1.2 The application also proposes to render the external walls of the ground floor, and provide cedar tongue and groove cladding to the first floor. The application would result in the change in appearance of the property from a simple single storey bungalow to a modern, functional two storey house. The application also seeks

permission to demolish the existing outbuilding and replace it with a home office and bathroom.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.3 The application site is situated on an area of land between West Chiltington Road and Greenhurst Lane. A public footpath runs along the road providing access to the site. The property is an individually designed detached bungalow and is one of 3 properties located on an area of raised land between the two roads. The site is screened from West Chiltington Road by mature hedge and planting. To the rear of the site the garden slopes down towards Hareswith Pond with a post and rail fence forming the boundary. The existing dwelling has a low pitched roof with a car port to the south western side. A detached flat roofed double garage is located to the north east of the main house. A detached outbuilding and glass lean to are located to the rear of the garage.
- 1.4 Green Hedges to the north of Bartons is a single storey bungalow, whilst Hareswith Holt to the east is a two storey detached dwelling.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.5 There is no recent history relating to the site.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Town & Country Planning Act 1990

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 PPS1, and PPS7

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.3 Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CP1 (Landscape and Townscape Character), CP2 (Environmental Quality) CP3 (Improving the Quality of New Development), and CP19 (Managing travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport) are considered relevant to this application.
- 2.4 General Development Control Policies DC1 (Countryside Protection and Enhancement), DC2 (Landscape Character), DC9 (Development Principles), and DC28 (House Extensions, Replacement Dwellings and Ancillary Accommodation) are also considered relevant to this application.

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 None undertaken

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.2 None undertaken

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.3 Storrington and Sullington Parish Council have objected to the application on the grounds that it is completely out of keeping with the area and with surrounding properties and that there would be overlooking of Hareswith Hall from the upstairs window.
- 3.4 Two letters has been received supporting the application noting that it would be an improvement to the current property and that the extended property would not be visible from Hareswith Cottage.
- 3.5 One letter has been received commenting on the application with regards to highway access and parking. It notes that the highway access is dangerous and the 30mph speed limit should commence on the southern side of Harewith Hill.

4. **HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS**

Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of Human Rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. **HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER**

It is not considered that the proposal will have any material impact on crime and disorder issues.

6. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

- 6.1 This application for the extension and alteration of the existing single storey property to form a two storey house would be judged against the rural and design policies of the development plan. The application site is situated outside of the defined built up area boundary as defined in the Horsham Local Development Framework Proposals Map. Policy DC28 of the General Development Control Policies relates to house extensions outside of the defined built up area boundary and requires that any extension should be in sympathy with and subservient to the scale and character of the existing dwelling. Policy DC9 is also relevant to the application in that it requires developments to not cause unacceptable harm to the amenities of occupiers of nearby property and land, and to ensure that the scale, massing and appearance of the development is of a high standard of design and

layout and where relevant relates sympathetically with the built surroundings, open space and routes within and adjoining the site.

- 6.2 The proposed extension and alterations to the existing single storey dwelling would result in a change to the overall appearance of the building. At present the existing building is inconspicuous and unobtrusive, with no strong design features. Due to the position of the building and the height of the land the property is generally screened from the road, although it is clearly visible from the public footpath which runs along the front of the site. The proposed extension and alteration of the property would create a more distinctive building with clean lines and a flat roof. The building would be contemporary in design and in its use of materials. The ground floor extensions to the property would be built over the footprints of an existing outbuilding and an existing car port, and it is not considered that these extensions would harm the overall character of the area or the amenities of adjoining properties.
- 6.3 With regards to the proposed first floor element it is considered that any addition of a first floor to a single storey property would by its nature be difficult to reconcile as subservient to the scale and character of the existing dwelling. However due to the flat roofed design of the extension the property would only be some 1.4 metres higher than the existing dwelling and it is considered that this and its modern design would result in the building not appearing obtrusive in its landscape setting and would not harm the overall character of the area. It is considered that the proposed materials would weather and would therefore further lessen the impact of any views of the building. The application building is situated within a small group of houses which are all individual in design, it is therefore considered that a modern contemporary design would not appear out of keeping in this instance. The first floor extension would have windows in its western elevation, however it is not considered that these would have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties due to the mature planting to the western boundary and also the position of Hareswith Cottage. A further window has been placed on the corner where the south and east elevation meet. It is considered that this window would not result in an unacceptable level of overlooking of Hareswith Holt as the window would be some 21.5 metres from the flank wall of the property, and there is a good level of planting on the boundary. Your officers are however concerned at the size of the proposed roof terrace which would be within some 4 metres of the boundary of the property and it is considered that the use of this terrace for entertaining could result in a noise and disturbance to the adjoining property which would be different to that usually encountered by terraced areas at ground level. It is therefore your officers view that if the door to the terrace was removed any opportunity for the use of the flat roof as a roof terrace would be removed and any issues with regards to any perception of overlooking, noise or loss of privacy would be reduced.
- 6.4 The application also seeks consent to demolish an existing outbuilding and rebuild a detached office in a similar style to the proposed dwelling. It is considered that the proposed office would be in keeping with the style of the extended dwelling and would due to its position of the western side of the property not have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties.

- 6.5 In conclusion it is therefore considered that the proposed alterations and extension to the existing property is acceptable in this instance. It is considered that the proposed extensions would not have an adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining properties and would not appear prominent in this location. Whilst the design of a building is always subjective, the flat roofed modern design proposed in this application keeps the height of the building low and would allow a more distinctive building to be created from the existing nondescript dwelling.

7. RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions and the removal of the doors allowing access to the terrace area;

1. A2 – Full Permission
2. J13 – Removal of Permitted Development Windows
3. F3 – Site Lighting
4. J3 – Ancillary Residential Accommodation “office accommodation” “Bartons”
5. L1 – Hard and Soft Landscaping
6. M1 – Materials “for the proposed extension and alterations” to replace “proposed buildings”
7. O1 – Hours of Working
8. O2 – Burning of Materials

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 ICAB1 – The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

ICTN1 – The proposal would not be obtrusive in the landscape or harmful to the visual quality of the area.

Background Papers: DC/11/2382
Contact Officer: Nicola Mason



Horsham
District
Council

serving our towns and villages

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT REPORT

TO: Development Management Committee South

BY: Head of Planning and Environmental Services

DATE: 17th January 2012

DEVELOPMENT: Change of use to racehorse sanctuary with revised access and horse walker together with 6 external timber stables

SITE: Bridge Hill Farm
Thakeham Road
Coolham

WARD: Billingshurst and Shipley

APPLICATION: DC/11/2256

APPLICANT: The Race Horse Sanctuary

REASON FOR INCLUSION ON AGENDA: Category of Development

RECOMMENDATION: To grant planning permission.

1. THE PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

To consider the planning application.

DESCRIPTION OF THE APPLICATION

- 1.1 This application seeks full planning permission for the change of use of land from agriculture to a Racehorse Sanctuary, with the subdivision of the existing building to form 15 stables, a feed room, rug room, office/storeroom and fodder and bedding storage. The application also seeks permission for 6 external stables, a sand school and horse walker. A new access is also proposed for the site with an extended hardstanding for parking and turning.
- 1.2 The existing buildings on the site are a mixture of modern portal framed buildings and a traditional barn, cartshed and courtyard. The largest building on the site would be converted into stables, with the smaller buildings some of which are in a state of disrepair used for storage purposes associated with the equestrian uses of the site. The proposed external stables would be located to the south of the existing buildings and would be placed on a concrete hardstanding. Each block containing 3 stables would be 3.75 metres wide, and 11.35 metres long. The proposed stables would be 2.4 metres high. The proposed sand school would be

enclosed by post and rail fencing and would be 60 metres long and 20 metres wide. The proposed horse walker would have a diameter of 13.7 metres and would have a clear polycarbonate roof. The structure would be 3.4 metres high. Both facilities would be located to the south west of the main buildings.

- 1.3 The proposed new access would be located some 15 metres to the north of the existing access. The original access would be removed as part of the application and a hedgerow planted to reflect the existing boundary treatment.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

- 1.4 The application site is situated on the western side of the B1239 Coolham Road, to the north of the settlement of Coolham. The application site is set back from the road with hedging along its eastern boundary. To the east of the agricultural buildings is a detached two storey dwelling which is also in the ownership of the applicants.
- 1.5 The agricultural buildings on the site are a mixture of traditional and more modern structures and are closely spaced on the site. Surrounding the buildings are fenced paddocks. A public footpath runs along the southern extremity of the site.

PLANNING HISTORY

- 1.6 There is no recent history relating to the site.

2. INTRODUCTION

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Town & Country Planning Act 1990

RELEVANT GOVERNMENT POLICY

- 2.2 PPS1, PPS7 and PPG13

RELEVANT COUNCIL POLICY

- 2.3 Local Development Framework Core Strategy Policy CP1 (Landscape and Townscape Character), CP2 (Environmental Quality) CP3 (Improving the Quality of New Development), CP15 (Rural Strategy) and CP19 (Managing travel Demand and Widening Choice of Transport) are considered relevant to this application.
- 2.4 General Development Control Policies DC1 (Countryside Protection and Enhancement), DC2 (Landscape Character), DC9 (Development Principles), DC23 (Sustainable Farm Diversification), DC29 (Equestrian Development) and DC40 (Transport and Access) are also considered relevant to this application.

3. OUTCOME OF CONSULTATIONS

INTERNAL CONSULTATIONS

- 3.1 The Councils Public Health and Licensing Team have raised no objection to the application although they have suggested conditions if the application were to be approved.

OUTSIDE AGENCIES

- 3.2 West Sussex County Council Highways have made the following comments;

"The traffic generation of the proposed development is relatively low and below the threshold that would be required for further analysis. We are satisfied that the development would not have a material impact on Highway capacity.

The site accesses onto the B2139 at a point where a 40mph speed limit is in place. It would be appropriate for the access to be designed in accordance to Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). As such, visibility splays of 2.4m x 90m would be required in both directions and the proposed access arrangements satisfy this. Forward visibility along B2139 is good and provides a clear view of vehicles turning into the site for drivers along this road.

The width of the access and road leading to the site is sufficient for two cars to pass and the gate is set back at an appropriate distance to prevent vehicles standing on the Highway whilst opening.

Given the narrow carriageway along the B2139 we would seek clarification, by way of a swept path diagram, that the largest vehicle to use the access would not cross the centre point of the carriageway when entering/exiting the site."

Further information was then submitted by the applicant with regards to large vehicle movements and the County Surveyor made further comments;

The applicant has confirmed that large vehicle movements will occur at the site as a result of the development and that these will cross the centre point of the adjoining carriageway when emerging. However, the applicant has informed that these will be infrequent with very few accessing the site over the course of a year. Typically, smaller vehicles will be used as carriage and that these will not cross the centre point.

Given the infrequent nature, good visibility, good accident record and that it is likely the site would have experienced large vehicle movements previously we do not wish to raise an objection to the proposed development.

PUBLIC CONSULTATIONS

- 3.3 Shipley Parish Council have raised no objection to the application provided that the external stables are of traditional construction, that County Highways are happy with the revised access and that the existing access onto the B2139 is removed.

3.4 No comments have been received from neighbouring properties.

4. **HOW THE PROPOSED COURSE OF ACTION WILL PROMOTE HUMAN RIGHTS**

Article 8 (right to respect of a private and family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property) of the Human Rights Act 1998 are relevant to the application. Consideration of Human Rights forms part of the planning assessment below.

5. **HOW THE PROPOSAL WILL HELP TO REDUCE CRIME AND DISORDER**

It is not considered that the proposal will have any material impact on crime and disorder issues.

6. **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

6.1 This application for the change of use of agricultural land and buildings to equestrian uses and the sub division of the barn to form 15 stables, the construction of 6 further stables, a sand school, horse walker and new access and parking would be judged against the rural policies of the development plan. The application site is situated outside of the defined built up area boundary as defined in the Horsham Local Development Framework Proposals Map. Policy DC1 of the General Development Control Policies requires that development outside of the defined built up area boundary is tightly controlled and development will not be permitted unless it is considered essential to its countryside location and in addition meets one of the following criteria;

- a) Supports the needs of agriculture or forestry;
- b) Enables the extraction of minerals or the disposal of waste
- c) Provides for quiet informal recreational use; or
- d) Ensures the sustainable development of rural areas.

Any development permitted must be of a scale appropriate to its countryside location and must not lead, either individually or cumulatively, to a significant increase in the overall level of activity in the countryside.

6.2 Policy CP15 relates to Rural Strategy and states that sustainable rural economic development within the District will be encouraged to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits for local communities. In the countryside, development which maintains the quality and character of the area whilst sustaining its varied and productive social and economic activity will be supported in principle. Any development should be appropriate to its countryside location and should: contribute to the diverse and sustainable farming enterprises within the District or, in the case of other countryside-based enterprises and activities, contribute to the wider rural economy and/or promote recreation in, and the enjoyment of, the countryside; and either be contained wherever possible within suitably located buildings which are appropriate for conversion or, in the case of an established rural industrial estate, within the existing boundaries of the estate; or

result in substantial environmental improvement and reduce the impact on the countryside particularly where, exceptionally, new or replacement buildings are involved. Any development in accordance with this strategy should not harm the rural character of the area by virtue of the nature and level of activity involved and the type and amount of traffic generated (or by other effects such as noise and pollution).

- 6.3 PPS7 notes that horse riding and equestrian activities are popular forms of recreation in the countryside that can fit well with farming activities and can help to diversify rural economies. Within the Local Development Framework, General Development Control Policy DC29 notes that permission will be granted for equestrian related development if;
- a) it can be demonstrated that the re-use of existing buildings on site for any related equestrian use is not appropriate before new or replacement buildings are considered;
 - b) the proposal is appropriate in scale and level of activity, and in keeping with its location and surroundings; and
 - c) does not result in sporadic development leading to an intensification of buildings in the countryside, particularly in an urban fringe location.
- 6.4 The application proposes to make use of the existing buildings on the site and convert them into stabling, as well as creating a further 6 external stables. It is considered therefore that the application meets the requirements of part a) of DC29 in that buildings on the site are being reused and, that only limited new development is taking place as the remaining buildings on the site are not suitable for the housing of horses.
- 6.5 It is considered that as the majority of the stables would be located within the existing buildings on the site that the proposal would not result in a significant change in the overall appearance of Bridge Hill Farm. The proposed external stables would be located to the rear of the existing buildings and would be traditional timber buildings, of low height, which would be screened due to the existing buildings and the boundary treatment from public view. The stables would also be in close proximity to the retained buildings on the site and therefore it is not considered that the stables would result in the consolidation of sporadic development in the countryside. The proposed sand school and horse walker would be located close to the proposed stables and again it is considered due to their position and the character of the surrounding area that the facilities proposed would not be out of keeping with or detract from the rural character of the area.
- 6.6 The site would be run by a charity whose aim is to home and retrain retired race horses. The horses are retrained to enable them to be rehomed or if this proves unsuccessful the horses remain at the site in retirement. Due to the sometimes highly strung nature of the horses that occupy the site, and the difficulties in reschooling the horses sensitively, the stables although housing a relatively large number of horses would not be used as part of a riding establishment. The levels of activity and traffic movements on the site are kept to a minimum so as to retain a calm and secure environment for the benefit of the horses. The applicant has raised no objection to a condition restricting the occupation of the stables to the charity and to prevent the establishment of a riding school.

- 6.7 As part of the application the applicant has stated that there would be two full time members of staff working at the site (who live on site at Bridge Hill Farm) and 3 part time members of staff. The applicant has had stables for the last 10 years at Belmoredean, Cowfold from which they are hoping to vacate. Traffic movements from the previous site show some 3 horsebox movements per week and 12 car movement per day. The County Surveyor has considered these figures and has raised no objection to the level of vehicular activity from the proposed use, and following consideration of the size of horse box that would generally use the site it is not considered that a wider access would be required. It is considered that the proposed access would allow better visibility from the site and provided that the hedgerow is reinstated the new access would not harm the overall rural character of the locality.
- 6.8 In conclusion it is therefore considered that the application would not have an adverse impact on the character of the area or the amenities of adjoining properties and is therefore acceptable in this instance.

7. RECOMMENDATION

- 7.1 It is recommended that planning permission be granted subject to the following conditions;
1. A2 – Full Permission
 2. D10 – Floodlighting
 3. D11 – Sand Schools
 4. S4 – Surface Water (option A)
 5. The stables, horse walker and ménage hereby permitted shall only be used in association with The Race Horse Sanctuary as a charity and shall not be used for commercial purposes or in connection with any form of commercial riding establishment. Reason as per J7a
 6. J7 (b) Stables
 7. L1 – Hard and Soft Landscaping
 8. M1 – Approval of Materials
 9. O1 – Hours of Working
 10. O2 – Burning of Materials
 11. The buildings shall not be brought into use until details of the waste management scheme including frequency of stable cleaning, storage, and collection/disposal methods has been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Waste should then be dealt with in strict accordance with the approved scheme.
Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the disposal of waste in accordance with Policy DC29 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework: General Development Control Policies (2007).
 12. Stable waste/manure is to be stored at least 30metres from the site boundary and there shall be no burning of stable waste on site. *Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the disposal of waste in accordance with Policy DC29 of the Horsham District Local Development Framework: General Development Control Policies (2007).*
 13. F3 – Site Lighting

- 14. G1 – Parking Provision – submitted plans
- 15. G5 – Recycling
- 16. H1 – Access
- 17. H3 – Existing Access Closed

Note to applicant; The applicant is reminded that a licensed waste removal contractor would be required to remove all clearance debris and construction waste from the site.

8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 ICAB1 – The proposal does not materially affect the amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

ICTN1 – The proposal would not be obtrusive in the landscape or harmful to the visual quality of the area.

Background Papers: DC/11/2256
Contact Officer: Nicola Mason