 Washington Parish Council Planning and Transport Committee Meeting

**MINUTES of the Committee Meeting held on Monday, 20th April 2015 at Washington Village Hall**

**PRESENT:** Cllrs Beglan, Britt, Cook, Heeley (chairman), Jolly and Turley

**ALSO:** Clerk to the Council Petrina Kingham

**MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC**: 6

**ABSENT**: 0

The Chairman opened the meeting at 19:47

**1. Apologies for absence**

There were no Councillors absent

**2.** **Declarations of Interest from members in any item to be discussed and agree Dispensations**

Cllr Cook declared a personal prejudicial interest in Lupin Cottage (Item xxx) and did not participate in the discussion or voting.

**3. To approve the Minutes of the last Planning & Transport Committee meeting**

The minutes of the Meeting of 16th March 2015 were **AGREED** as being a correct record and duly signed by the Chairman.

**4. Public question time**

Mr Keith Rushton spoke on the matter of Rock Road/Newhouse Lane/Merrywood Lane junction (Item 9.5 on the Agenda). He confirmed that Cllr Circus now supported a 30mph limit. He had submitted a FOI request on 13th April to WSCC requesting details of the number of accidents in the location over the last 15 years, copies of all risk assessment on the junction and a list of possible risk reduction measures that have been considered by WSCC over the same period. Cllr Heeley confirmed that the item would be brought forward for discussion as the first item on the Agenda after public question time.

Mr Mike Gould spoke on the matter of Lupin Cottage - DC/15/0698. Mr Gould stated that the views of the HCRA were well known on this matter. However personally as the father of a child with a disability he felt that using the Equality Act to support flouting the Planning system was insulting to the disabled and not a justification for granting permission. The material problems which had caused the refusal in the first place had not changed. He stated that nothing in planning should be assumed, advice and permission should be sought first. He knew of nothing on planning law which made disability a material planning consideration.

Mr Roger Wilmshurst spoke on the matter of Sandhill Lodge (Item 9.2). He wished to give an overview of the reasons behind the cabin and the haste in which it had been erected (due to the fact it was purchased and had to be removed from the original site and re-erected quickly to prevent damage/warping). He was disappointed that the Parish Council had taken such a hard line. Cllr Heeley asked if any Councillors wished to respond to that. Cllr Britt said that the Council had actually supported the mobile home application due to the special circumstances of the applicant at that time however the development had increased in size and was encroaching significantly into the countryside and the curtilage of a listed building. It was unclear where the applicant was going with the plot as a whole.

**Item 9.5 (this item was brought forward on the Agenda by agreement)**

Cllr Heeley read through the chronology of the tree removal and signage. Cllr Turley added that an improvement in road safety on a junction could lead to increased traffic speed. There was evidence to confirm that three accidents which involved injury had occurred over a relatively recent period at the location. Increasing traffic volume in this area as a whole was an issue. After discussion the Committee **AGREED** that the Clerk should write to Councillor Circus and express their concern over the lack of priority given to the matter by WSCC when there had been accidents resulting in injury.

 **5. Planning applications and consultations:**

**DC/15/0682** *Longbury End Hampers Lane Heath Common - Erection of front wall and wooden gates*

Councillors discussed the application at some length and **AGREED** to **OBJECT** to the design of the gates on the basis of the height, the brick pillars, materials and design. The gate is solid in construction and not considered ‘rural or rustic’, in style, the pillars are made of brick and both pillars and gate stand over 2m in height. This proposal is contrary to Guidance 11 of the Heath common village Design statement as adopted by HDC and incorporated into the emerging Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan which states:

*All planning must encourage boundary enclosures which are compatible with the rural character of the area, by providing varieties of rustic fencing supplemented by hedge planting thus avoiding the suburban feel given by brick walls etc.* This is therefore a material consideration.

**DC/15/0739** Longbury Rock Road, Storrington - amendments to planning permission DC/14/1413 - demolition of existing 3 bedroom chalet bungalow, construction of a new 4 bedroom 2 storey dwelling, with basement, new driveway and store to driveway, planting of trees to site boundary Councillors felt that the amended application had no material effect on the external view of the property and therefore had **NO OBJECTIONS** but **AGREED** that any alternations should not compromise the level of screening already approved.

**DC/15/0710** *Honeysuckle Lodge Badgers Holt Heath Common - Single storey rear and side extensions and construction of brick pillars adjacent to driveway entrance*

Councillors had **NO OBJECTIONS** to the single storey rear and side extensions but **OBJECTED STRONGLY** to the proposed gates and brick pillars. The gate is solid in construction and not considered ‘rural or rustic’, in style, the pillars are made of brick and both pillars and gate stand over 2m in height. This proposal is contrary to Guidance 11 of the Heath Common village Design statement as adopted by HDC and incorporated into the emerging Storrington Sullington and Washington Neighbourhood Plan which states:

*All planning must encourage boundary enclosures which are compatible with the rural character of the area, by providing varieties of rustic fencing supplemented by hedge planting thus avoiding the suburban feel given by brick walls etc.* This is therefore a material consideration.

**DC/15/0698** *Lupin Cottage Hampers Lane Heath Common - retrospective application for the raising of the existing roof and creation of first floor living accommodation*

Councillors discussed the application at some length. They **AGREED to STRONGLY OBJECT t**o the proposals on the following grounds:

1. The proposed addition by reason of its size, scale, character and design and prominent position would result in an unsympathetic addition to the character of the applicant dwelling. The proposal would therefore cause visual harm to the visual amenities and character of the area contrary to policies CP1 and CP3 of the Core Strategy (2007), Policy DC9 of the GDCPD (2007) and para.64 of the NPPF.
2. There was a particular and significant detriment to the visual amenity, loss of light and quality of outdoor life to the residents of Walscombe who are very elderly and potentially vulnerable in characteristic.
3. The proposal does not address or change the reasons for the original rejection of the application.
4. Whilst much weight is attached to the characteristics of the applicant and her requirement for a particular type of accommodation (to which the Committee was sympathetic) it was felt that this cannot be a reason to override the normal principles of planning or the refusal/lack of engagement for such a large scale development to take advice from an Officer of HDC in the early stages of planning.
5. Whilst significant weight had been attached to the provisions of the Equality Act the Committee did not agree that this Act was material nor did it override the Rights of the occupants of Waslcombe

**6. Enforcement issues update**

There was no update

**7. To receive planning department decisions**

Councillors **NOTED** the following decisions:

Application Number: DC/15/0231 Decision: Application Permitted

Site: Little Yew Georges Lane Storrington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3JH

Description: Increase the length of an existing extension by 3.5m to 7.5m

Date of Decision: 30/03/2015

WPC had no objections to this application

Application Number: DC/15/0252 Decision: Application Permitted

Site: Wee Burns Bracken Lane Storrington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3HS

Description:

Demolition of existing garage. New single storey side/front extension

Date of Decision: 30/03/2015

WPC had no objections to this application

Application Number: DC/15/0288 Decision: Application Permitted

Site: Small Croft Georges Lane Storrington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3JH

Description: Rear extensions and pitched roof and replacement garage

Date of Decision: 30/03/2015

WPC had no objections to this application

Application Number: DC/15/0311 Decision: Application Refused

Site: Woodsmoke Bracken Close Storrington Pulborough West Sussex RH20 3HT

Description: New blind box dormer to North East elevation and 2 rooflights to North West

Date of Decision: 27/03/2015

**WPC objected to this application**

**8. Appeals**

There were no appeals

**9. Planning and Transport issues**

**9.1** *To Review Discuss and Respond to the Proposed Main Modifications to the Horsham District Planning Framework (web site link* <http://www.horsham.gov.uk/planningpolicy/planning-policy/horsham-district-planning-framework-examination/hdpf-main-modifications> ).

Councillors had no comments to make.

**9.2 *DC/14/2736*** *Sandhill Lodge, Sandhill Lane, Washington - retention of a timber cabin for use as an ancillary domestic building to the existing mobile home*

To receive an update on the status of the application. The Clerk advised that Dr Chris Lyons (Director of Planning HDC) had confirmed that a decision would be made on this over the next two weeks. There was no response to the matter of why representations were still being accepted.

**9.3 *RMC Site and Storrington and Sullington Bus Shelter -*** *to Review discuss and respond to the Interim Safety Audit (if received)* The Clerk advised that she had spoken to Malcolm Westcott and had been told that the audit had been completed but was being reviewed by WSCC prior to disclosure. The matter would be added to the next Planning and Transport Agenda for discussion.

**9.4 *To review*** *and respond to a member of the public’s complaint about vehicles obstructing the Frankland Arms Post Box - Irene Thomson has complained on behalf of herself, another resident and the postman that vehicles parked in front of this post box make it inaccessible, especially to the less mobile. The clerk has asked for details of the postman and the other complainant but these have not yet been provided.*

Councillors discussed the matter and felt that on the whole it was residents that were parking in that area. It was not considered appropriate to line the junction as this might cause problems elsewhere. However Councillors felt that because the problem was local in nature an item in the June/July newsletter would remind people to park considerately in this area.

**9.6** *To Note the change in the Planning Process in respect of non-contentious applications submitted within the SDNP*

Councillors **NOTED** the following update - The Director of Planning via his officers making delegated decisions on non-contentious planning application has advised that this will free up the Committee to deal with the more complex applications within the park. The officers will liaise directly with the Parish Council where there are concerns. An explanatory email was circulated to Councillors on 14th March 2015.

**10. Items for the next Agenda**

Date of next meeting 18th May 2015 (cancelled)

The meeting closed at 20:47

Signed………………………………….. Dated………………………………..