

# STORRINGTON & SULLINGTON PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held in The Chanctonbury Room, the Parish Hall, Thakeham Road, Storrington on Thursday, 9<sup>th</sup> December, 2010, commencing at 7.00 p.m.

**Present:** Mr. R. Jerman in the Chair, Mrs. G. King, Mr. D. Roper and Mrs. L. Wheatley.

**In Attendance:** 1 member of the public.

63. **Apologies for Absence** had been received from Mrs. A. Worthington-Leese (ill), Mr. J. Macey (ill) and Mr. A. Mullard (previous engagement). The reasons for absence were duly **ACCEPTED**.
64. **To Receive Declarations of Interest from Members**. Mr. Jerman declared a personal interest in DC/10/2446 and Mrs. Wheatley declared a personal interest in DC/10/2147 and DC/10/2337.
65. **To Approve and Sign and Minutes of the Meeting held on the 11<sup>th</sup> November, 2010**. It was noted that Mrs. G. King was in attendance at the meeting of 9<sup>th</sup> November; with this addition the minutes were duly **APPROVED** as being a correct record of the proceedings thereat and were duly signed by the Chairman.

## **Matters Arising :-**

There were no outstanding matters arising.

66. **Budget Review**. It was noted that there had been no further expenditure since our meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> November and as such the total expenditure to date remained at £745.

**With the agreement of the Committee agenda item 6(d) was brought forward. Due to Mr. Jerman declaring a personal interest in this item, Mrs. Wheatley took over the chair.**

## 67. **Planning Applications Awaiting Comment – Appendix I :-**

- (a) **DC/10/2446 : Lady Place, Monastery Lane**. All members (apart from Mr. Jerman) viewed the application and a number had undertaken a site visit. Mrs. Wheatley read out members comments, the major ones being that the proposed property was not sympathetic to Lady Place or the area of Monastery Lane, there were issues regarding access and that the Parish Council's previous comments remained. It was also noted that there had been one letter of objection from the owner of 1, Spring Cottages.

Mr Sherlock (the owner) was asked if he would like to comment on the plans to which he responded that the proposed property would not be seen from Lady Place except from one upstairs window. He had lived in Storrington since the early 70's, liked the village and the Lane and wanted to downsize from Lady Place (6-bed property). Mr Sherlock went on to say that he did not consider the piece of land to be part of his garden as it was currently occupied by a stable and a few "mothy apple trees". He agreed that he would have preferred to build a more desirable property, along the lines of the previous application, but said this second proposal, with the reduced wall height, now met with planning requirements and would be more acceptable to H.D.C.

Mrs. Wheatley stated that the proposed access would result in the loss of a mature hedge and would emerge on a bend with restricted visibility. Monastery Lane itself was a very narrow road with a considerable amount of traffic passing through it, with the added hazard of cars parking on both sides of the Lane.

Mr. Sherlock responded by saying that the hedge was “extremely mothly and full of rubbish” and that the bend in the road was very gradual, the proposal of opening the entrance would, he believed, make it safer as the lane would then be slightly wider. Mr Sherlock said that he did not feel the proposed dwelling would spoil the area but that it would enhance Monastery Lane.

That said, Mr. Sherlock did agree with the Committee’s comments that the design was not in keeping with Lady Place and that he would like to build something nicer than that proposed.

Mrs. King asked if it would not be possible to apply for a smaller version of the previously refused application (DC/10/1206) to which Mr Sherlock said that if permission were granted, he would very much like to change the design.

Councillors stated that what Mr Sherlock was looking for was in fact outline planning permission to which he agreed. Mrs. Wheatley stated that members could only comment on the details of the current application and asked members to vote. With 1 abstention, 3 members voted to object to this application on the grounds of access and the proposed design. It was therefore **AGREED** to:

***OBJECT** to this application on the above grounds stating that any future applications should address the access issue and should be more in-keeping with the surrounding area/properties.*

**Mr. Jerman thanked Mrs. Wheatley for covering this item and took over the Chair.**

- (b) **DC/10/1457 – Former RMC Engineering Works, Hampers Lane.** Members viewed the amended plans, however did not believe that the reduction from 100 houses to 89 made much of a difference. Mr. Jerman went through some of the findings of the Sandgate Park Refresher Study, August 2010, carried out for HDC by Land Use Consultants and Mr. Roper took this document away to read. Mrs. King stated that heath land was a rare habitat and should be looked after. After lengthy discussions it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED TO:**

***STRONGLY OBJECT** to this application on the grounds of air quality and to reiterate our previous objections (as these had not changed). It was also noted with interest that W.S.C.C. still had concerns regarding highway access and sustainability and that a number of their previous concerns had still not been addressed.*

- (c) **DC/10/2337 – Pulborough Rugby Club, Pulborough Road.** Members viewed this application and **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED TO:**

*Send a comment of **NO OBJECTION** to H.D.C. as this application only appeared to be for one extra hour.*

- (d) **DC/10/2338 – 1, Crown Cottage, Pulborough Road.** Members viewed this application and it was **UNANIMOUSLY AGREED** to:

*SUPPORT this application. The proposals were in keeping with the style of the building and would complement it. That said, the proposals would leave a very small amenity space.*

- (e) **DC/10/2451 – 19, Pulborough Road.** This application was **STRONGLY OBJECTED** to.

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

69. **Planning Applications, Comment Summary – since the meeting on the 11th November, 2010 – Appendix III.** These were duly **NOTED**.

70. **Appeals.**

- (a) **Lion Heart, Fryern Road – Retention of Close Board Fence.** Members were pleased to note that the Planning Inspectorate had **DISMISSED** this Appeal on the grounds that the fence was harmful to the character and appearance of the street scene and countryside.

- (b) **The Norbertine Order, Former Catholic Sanctuary, Fern Road.** It was noted that the Planning Inspectorate had **DISMISSED** this Appeal.

71. **Arun District Council – Local Development Framework – Consultation on Local Housing and Employment Growth.** Mr. Jerman read out the letter to members and it was agreed that no response was required.

72. **Chairman’s Announcements:-**

(a) **Enforcement – Outstanding Issues**

- **EN/10/0427 - Willow Tree Cottage – Untidy Site.** Mr. Jerman was delighted to report that the pile of debris had been removed on Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> November. H.D.C. Compliance had now closed their file.
- **EN/10/0436 - Lionheart, Fryern Road – Erection of Outbuilding and Large Poles.** It had been reported to the office that the owner had submitted an application on 3<sup>rd</sup> December to retain the structure, however this was invalid as additional information was required. H.D.C. were currently awaiting the additional information
- **EN/10/0098 – 36, High Street.** Joanna Searle had undertaken a site visit and reported to the office on 16<sup>th</sup> November that the advertisements, in her opinion, were compliant with the Advertisement Regulations 2007. As such, the case was now closed.
- **EN/10/0549 – 1, Crown Cottages, Pulborough Road.** H.D.C. Compliance had informed the office that an application to retain the fence should be received shortly.

- **EN/10/0539 - 17, Church Street.** An application to replace the windows that overlook Church Street with more suitable ones had been received on 23<sup>rd</sup> November. A comment of no objection had been forwarded to H.D.C. on 25<sup>th</sup> November.
  - **EN/10/0653 – St Joseph’s, Monastery Lane.** It had been reported to the office that the owner had been undertaking some fairly extensive ground works and had spray painted parts of the external wall. H.D.C. Compliance had reported that they’d spoken to the owner and that as of 7<sup>th</sup> December, they could not identify any breach of planning control.
- (b) **E-mail from National Association of Local Councils regarding Cluster Working.** It was unanimously agreed that this e-mail should be put to the next Full Council Meeting for their discussion and decision.
- (c) **DC/10/2279 – 4, Nightingale Park.** Mr Jerman read out a letter of complaint (from a resident of Nightingale Close) regarding this application, within the letter it stated that it was believed a number of TPO’d trees had been removed. Mr Will Jones (H.D.C.’s Arboriculturalist) was looking into this.

**73. Documents for Councillors to Read.**

- (a) C.P.R.E. Fieldwork – December 2010 Issue. Mr. Jerman took this document away to read. A copy would be put in Mr. Mullard’s pigeonhole for collection.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.05 p.m.