

# NUTHURST PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the Parish Council Planning Meeting,  
held on Thursday 26th April 2018 at 7.30pm  
St Andrews CofE School, Nuturst

**Present:** Mrs V Court (Chairman) Mr O Hydes (OBE)  
Mrs J Assassi Mr J Mercer  
Mrs F Boulter  
Mrs J Chaytor  
Mrs A Gaffney

District Councillor Toni Bradnum and 45 members of the public attended the meeting.

**3004/18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** were received from Councillor G Dixon, Councillor J McClean, Councillor T Nelson and Councillor S Turner.

**3104/18 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** none.

## **3204/18 PRESENTATION BY GREENPLAN - AMENDED PLANS FOR MICKLEPAGE**

Mr Rob Burnham, Director of Greenplan, made a presentation to the Parish Council with a proposal for changes to the three dwellings at Micklepage (DC/17/2524). The presentation addressed the issues of the height of the garage roof and the dormer window in house 'one'.

## **3304/18 PUBLIC FORUM**

A member of the public commented that out of 25 issues with the development only 18 had been addressed in the presentation and how could a dwelling, costing in excess of £800,000.00, be classified as a 'downsizing' property?

The number of dormer windows, the fact that they overlooked neighbouring properties and the proposal for the dormer to be 'bricked up' from inside the property were further issues mentioned by the public.

There were also serious concerns from the Members and the public that the room above the garage could still be classified as a 'habitable' room.

## **30404/18 PLANING APPLICATIONS**

<b>DC/18/0793</b> 18/04/2018	<b>Change of use of existing detached garage building to a 3 bed dwelling with the creation of a new highway access onto Winterpit Lane and associated parking.</b> Forest House Cottage, Winterpit Lane, Mannings Heath, Horsham
<b>RESOLVED</b>	<b>The Parish Council strongly opposes this Planning Application for the following reasons:</b>  <b>General</b> 1) The title of the application is erroneous and deceptive as the building has been described by the agent as a "garage". In fact, it has been used for some years as business premises by West Sussex Clocks and is currently operational. 2) The application is lacking much important information for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is no ecology report</li><li>• No tree plan or tree report</li><li>• No plan for the roof fenestration</li><li>• No identification of external materials</li><li>• No assessment of traffic along Winterpit Lane (which is a "rat run", much used by heavy goods vehicles, up to 30 horses from nearby racing and</li></ul>

riding stables, horse boxes as well as cars). It is not a “quiet lane” as claimed by the Agent.

#### **The Location**

3) This proposal relates to land well outside the Built Up Area Boundary for Mannings Heath. It is in the countryside and therefore not acceptable for residential development.

4) The proposed dwelling would be directly adjacent to the riding stables/school. The concomitant noise and smell from the stables makes the conversion of this business premises to a residential dwelling inappropriate and unacceptable.

5) The proposed dwelling is in effect in the side garden of Forest House Cottage. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) does not support development in residential gardens:

- a. Paragraph 48 of the NPPF states “*Local planning authorities may make allowance for windfall sites .... and (these) should not include residential gardens*”.
- b. Paragraph 53 of the NPPF states “*Local planning authorities should .... resist inappropriate development of residential gardens .....*”

#### **Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan**

6) The Agent has failed to recognise Nuthurst’s Neighbourhood Plan, which provides for about 50 houses to meet the housing needs in the Parish, including some small and more affordable housing. Horsham District Council has an adequate 5 year supply of housing. This site is not allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan. This proposed dwelling is therefore not needed in the Parish.

7) The Agent states there are several examples of recently approved planning applications for new dwellings in and around Mannings Heath. But he fails to recognise that all these applications were for sites allocated for development in the Neighbourhood Plan and all of them are within the Built Up Area Boundary (BUAB). There have been no new houses approved in Mannings Heath for sites not in the Neighbourhood Plan or outside the BUAB.

8) By the Agent’s admission, the proposal makes no significant alterations to the external appearance of the existing building, therefore the proposal cannot improve the look of the building, as claimed. In fact, the proposed residential building would not reflect the more substantial and traditional appearance of neighbouring residential dwellings in contravention of Policy 10 of the Nuthurst Neighbourhood Plan.

#### **Parish Design Statement**

9) As a residential building, this proposal does not meet a number of requirements of the Parish Design Statement, accepted by HDC as a Supplementary Planning Document, for example:

- It does not meet the principal aims to make sure that new residential developments fit in well with the rural nature of the Parish (section 1) and that new houses fit in well existing houses (section 2). This is because it has a predominantly stained wood exterior suitable for a garage/workshop, but not a residential dwelling.
- It does not meet the recommendation that houses should have a least one garage (sections 1.1, 1(a) and 2.6).
- It does not meet the recommendation that houses should have gardens front and back (sections 1.1 and 1(a)). The proposed dwelling has no garden at the back because the rear of the building is only 1 metre from the site boundary. Note the agent erroneously claims in the conclusion to his Planning Statement that the proposed dwelling would have “rear garden with a sufficient amount of amenity space”.

#### **The NPPF**

10) In Section 5 of the Planning Statement, the Agent lists 8 policies from the NPPF that he claims are “important in the assessment of his proposal”, yet he has provided no assessment or evidence on how his proposals meet these policies. For

	<p>example, the proposal would not lead to “achieving net gains for nature”, given that the new access and driveway/hardstanding for parking would remove what is currently garden. The agent has not provided an ecology report to support his claim. Indeed most of these policies in the NPPF are completely irrelevant to his proposal.</p> <p><b>The HDPF</b>  11) The Agent claims that the proposal complies with policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF. But, in fact, the proposal does not enhance the appearance of the building and it is completely out of character with the surrounding buildings. The building already exists and there is minimal change to the exterior and therefore as a dwelling the proposal does not meet the requirements of policies 32 and 33 of the HDPF.</p> <p><b>Fenestration</b>  12) The lack of natural lighting in this proposed dwelling is a severe problem. Bedrooms 1 and 2 (including the en-suite) have no windows in the external walls and this paucity of natural lighting is unacceptable. The ground floor is similarly short of windows as there are only windows in two of the four exterior walls. The windows provide “borrowed light” to the whole of the ground floor, a large open plan area.</p> <p><b>Trees</b>  13) The Agent also claims there will “not be any future detrimental impact on the life of the trees”, yet he has not provided a map showing the location of the trees, including those subject to TPOs, nor a report on how these trees might be affected by the ground works.</p> <p><b>The Void</b>  14) It is unclear why a void should be left on the first floor above the entrance hall. The agent provides no explanation for this.</p>
--	---

### **3404/18 PLANNING UPDATES**

#### **EN/18/0192 - Tilley House, Broadwater Lane**

An Enforcement notice has been issued for alleged building work, being carried out on the property over and above what has been approved under DC/17/1356 & DC/17/1954.

#### **National Planning Framework Policy revision**

The consultation closes on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2018, Neighbourhood Plans could be weakened with the possible review every 2 years. A draft reply has been prepared and will be discussed further at the Annual Meeting of the Parish Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2018.

### **3504/18 MINOR MATTERS RAISED BY COUNCILLORS TO BE REFERRED TO ON THE NEXT AGENDA** none.

**The meeting closed at 8.50pm**