

NUTHURST PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Planning Meeting
held on Wednesday 21st June 2017 at
Mannings Heath Village Hall, Commencing at 7.30pm

Present: Mrs V Court (Chairman) Mr O Hydes (OBE)
Mrs F Boulter Mr T Nelson
Mrs J Chaytor
Mrs G Dixon
Mrs A Gaffney

Six members of the public attended the meeting.

2806/17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE were received from Councillor J Mercer, Councillor J McClean and Councillor S Turner.

2906/17 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST none.

3006/17 PUBLIC FORUM

A member of the public spoke of resident's concerns about the possible closure of footpath 1711. The footpath provides the only access to the public rights of way behind Chumleigh. Surveyors have today been assessing the site and a manhole cover has been removed and not replaced.

Residents were also concerned about the boundaries of the site, and the statutory width and ownership of the footpath. When examined, maps were not clear on the exact location of the boundaries or the footpath.

The Chairman advised that the Clerk would report the removal of the man hole cover and suggested that a Land Registry search could be undertaken to ascertain the exact location of the boundaries.

3106/17 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/17/0301 31/05/2017	Retention, refurbishment, part demolition and single storey rear extension of existing public house (A4 use) at ground floor, change of use and alterations to upper floors for residential flats (C3 use) and redevelopment of land adjacent to provide a residential dwelling (C3 use): amended April 2017. Former Dun Horse Inn, Brighton Road, Mannings Heath
RESOLVED	The Parish Council strongly objects to this amended planning application for the following reasons: The refurbished public house (1) This scheme will <u>not</u> enable the pub to be viable beyond the short term. Whilst the one-off sale of the house could pay for the refurbishment of the pub and the two flats, thereafter, the pub will have to rely on its own takings. Its viability might be exceedingly difficult to achieve given the very small size of the proposed kitchen (approximately 5 by 5 metres including 4 doorways), a very cramped dining area, lack of parking and obvious lack of a decent sized sunny pub garden. Even if the flats were rented out by the pub this would not according to the developers make the pub viable (quote " <i>a refurbished pub with two residential flats above is still not viable</i> "). The new house therefore has absolutely no role to play in the retention of the pub beyond the short term. (2) Indeed, the new house could jeopardise the pub's viability even more by giving the pub a less attractive setting and reducing its ambience. (3) The proposed business, should it be successful, would create a considerable demand for parking, but the amended plans are worse because they make no specific proposals for parking by pub customers and its employees. WSCC Highways has consistently said that the "triangle" cannot be counted as parking but plans flagrantly continue to show it as such. Customers of the pub and employees

	<p>should not be forced to park on Pound Lane because it is narrow and its bend results in limited visibility. The parking issues caused by the applicant's plans continue to create an unacceptable safety hazard to the pub's clients and the community due to the site's dangerous location at the junction of Pound Lane and the A281 and street parking would spoil the street scene at the entrance to the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council is also very concerned about safety during the construction of the house and alterations to the pub as there would be nowhere for lorries and vans to park and unload materials, except in Pound Lane.</p> <p>The proposed new 4-bedroomed house</p> <p>(4) The site is not allocated in the Parish's "made" Neighbourhood Plan which provides for about 50 new houses. Horsham District Council has an adequate 5 year supply of new houses. So this additional house is not needed.</p> <p>(5) The site is very small and the massing effect of a large detached house only 1 metre from the proposed extended Dun Horse Inn represents severe over-intensive development of the site. This is contrary to Policy 10 of the Neighbourhood Plan and Policy 33 of Horsham District Planning Framework 2015.</p> <p>(6) The new house being tall and too close to the pub creates an unwanted urban street scene and it means that the new house is not subservient to the pub as the developer claims.</p> <p>(7) The massing has an adverse effect on the setting of Chulmleigh on the A281, which is a grade II listed building and directly opposite the proposed development and in open view just some 16 metres from the site. It is not acceptable for the applicant to cite planning permission for eight houses on "land opposite the Dun Horse" as a rationale for the proposed development having no impact on Chulmleigh. These eight houses are some distance along the same side of the A281 as Chulmleigh and are well screened from Chulmleigh by banks of trees and a public footpath.</p> <p>(8) The proposed 4 bed-roomed dwelling is contrary to policies in the "made" Nuthurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan (NPNP) and to the guidance in the Nuthurst Parish Design Statement (NPDS) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) The rear garden measures approximately 8 by 12 metres and is far too small for a 4 bed-roomed house. This is out of character with similar sized houses in the immediate area. It has no usable front garden as its entirety is occupied by about 100 square metres of driveway in an attempt to address road safety issues. It is contrary to Policy 10(ii) of the NPNP which requires developments to "<i>include adequate functional private garden space appropriate to the dwelling size and type</i>". It is also contrary to section 1.1 of the NPDS, "<i>The drive should not occupy the whole of the frontage of the house so there is garden left in which to plant flowers, bushes and trees to enhance the street scene.</i>" Indeed, the new house and drive involve the removal of existing trees, bushes and other greenery. Furthermore, the hard surface for the drive removes about 100 square metres of permeable garden for absorbing rain water. ii) The house is only 1 metre from the public house. This is contrary to section 1.1, 'The Layout of Sites and Size of Plots' of the NPDS, "<i>Houses should not be overly close to one another and should have spaces between them that can be planted with green living hedges, bushes and trees.</i>" iii) The house does not have a garage. This is contrary to section 1.1 and section 2.6 'Garages' of the NPDS, "<i>All houses should preferably have at least one garage which should either be attached to the house or alongside the house.</i>" This is to avoid dangerous and unsightly street parking. vi) The proposed house has accommodation on three floors. This is contrary to the development policies in the NPNP and section 1.1 of the NPDS, which require that new developments should "<i>not have houses higher than two storeys.</i>" Please note the Oxford English Dictionary's definition of the word "storey" as "A part of a building comprising all the rooms that are on the same level." Therefore the proposed house is on three storeys and the word "storey" should not be misused to serve the applicant's purpose. <p>(9) The dormer windows in the third floor of the proposed house constitute an</p>
--	--

	<p>unacceptable overlooking and overbearing on two properties in The Whytings.</p> <p>(10) The applicant has produced a series of four carefully selected diagrams (scenarios) that seek to minimise and avoid stating the difficulties and safety issues associated with car accessing and exiting the proposed house.</p> <p>The proposed in/out access point for the new house remains unsatisfactory for the following reasons which are illustrated in the attached diagrams: (appendix A)</p> <p>(i) The in/out access is on a bend in the highway with insufficient visibility in the northerly direction. The visibility must fully meet the required standards at this particularly dangerous point.</p> <p>(ii) The drive shown for the house is so tight that a large car entering from the north would need to use all of the opposite carriage way of Pound Lane.</p> <p>(iii) A car exiting the drive cannot turn right towards Mannings Heath Village because there is insufficient room to manoeuvre to get the correct angle, especially when there is already a car parked in the drive. It can only turn left towards the A281. A car should be able to exit a drive in both directions, but this is not possible.</p> <p>(iv) Several multipoint manoeuvres of a car would be needed to exit the drive in a forward direction if one other car was parked in the drive. It would be impossible with two parked cars in the drive. In practice, this raises the likelihood of cars reversing out into Pound Lane.</p> <p>The above deficiencies collectively mean that the drive and its in/out access point is currently unsatisfactory and would add to the hazards for users of the drive and all other highway users.</p> <p>(11) The National Planning Policy Framework does not support development in gardens. The proposed house would be in the side garden of the Dun Horse. At present, the garden provides a green space at the entrance to Mannings Heath. The massing effect of the proposed house alongside the Dun Horse and the removal of several trees and a hedgerow would unacceptably urbanise the entrance to the village.</p> <p>(12) In view of objections (8), (9), (10) and (11), the Parish Council considers that no dwelling is acceptable in the very small side garden of the pub.</p> <p>The proposed flats</p> <p>(13) The proposed flats have accommodation on the third floor. This is contrary to the development policies in the NPNP and section 1.1 of the NPDS which require that new developments should “<i>not have houses [flats] higher than two storeys.</i>” Note again the definition of the word “storey” as “A part of a building comprising all the rooms that are on the same level.”</p> <p>(14) The dormer windows in the third floor of the proposed flats constitute an unacceptable overlooking and overbearing on two properties in The Whytings.</p> <p>(15) Although the proposal provides two parking spaces for the residents of the two flats (parking on the “triangle” cannot be counted as this is part of the public highway), these spaces are unacceptable because:</p> <p>(i) a car parked in the northern space would have to reverse onto Pound Lane close to a bend</p> <p>(ii) a car parked in the southern space would have to reverse onto the fast moving A281 (see attached photo - <u>appendix B</u>).</p> <p>(iii) parking in the southern space blocks the delivery/removal of beer kegs to/from the store on the eastern side of the pub and the removal (and return) of the pub rubbish bins to the front of the pub for collection.</p> <p>It is hard to comprehend why the applicant has thus placed the parking bays in these positions given the reversing issues and the blockage of the route for beer kegs and the pub’s rubbish bins.</p> <p>(16) The gap of just over 0.5 metres between the wall of the entrance to the flats and the boundary wall between the pub and the proposed house will NOT allow the 0.6 metre wide blue or green rubbish bins for the flats to pass through.</p> <p>There remain many significant and important issues that need a satisfactory resolution. The application as amended does not properly address them. Indeed, with no proper provision for pub parking by customers and employees and owners of the flats having to reverse onto Pound Lane and the A281, it is actually a far worse application. Therefore, the Parish Council strongly urges</p>
--	---

	HDC to refuse this planning application as amended.
DC/17/1158 09/06/2017	Outline application for proposed residential development of 4 dwellings and associated works all matters reserved except access. Former Swallowfield Nursery, Church Road, Mannings Heath
RESOLVED	To object to this application, copy of the letter sent to Horsham District Council attached (appendix C).

3206/17 PLANNING UPDATES

DC/17/0815 Church Road

District Councillor Toni Bradnum previously advised that the planning officer was 'minded' to recommend the application for approval, before the end of the consultation period and before Will Jones, HDC Arboricultural Officer, had prepared his report.

The Chairman, Councillor O Hydes and District Councillor Toni Bradnum will be attending a meeting with Chris Lyons and Barbara Childs on 22nd June 2017. Planning Officers need to recognise the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan and Parish Design Statement and will be asked to change the recommendation for approval.

The BUAB has also been mentioned, however, this is a mapping error which HDC are aware of and will be updated later this year.

3306/17 FOOTPATH 1711

The planning conditions for DC/16/1753 (land opposite the Dun Horse) provides the following note to the applicant:

'With reference to the public footpath adjacent to the site, the Applicant is advised that should any building works, demolition or construction encroach upon the PROW then a Temporary Path Closure Order may be required, for which an application must be made to WSCC's RoW Team. The grant of planning permission for the proposed development not confer consent for such a closure, which would require a separate application to WSCC's RoW Team'

Local residents are extremely concerned about the possible closure of the footpath and the Clerk has advised WSCC of the matter, the RoW Team were not aware of the note to the applicant.

The Parish Council are advised by WSCC of any applications to amend/close public footpaths.

3406/17 MINOR MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS TO BE REFERRED TO ON THE NEXT AGENDA none.

The meeting closed at 20.00