

154 PLANNING DECISIONS FROM MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL

Reference	Address	WPC	MDSC
DM/15/3458	Chandlers, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down	Object	Approved
DM/15/4404	52 Newtown, Copthorne	Support	Lawful Use
DM/15/4802	20 Westway, Copthorne	Noted	Lawful Use
DM/15/4831	52 Bridgelands, Copthorne	Refer to Tree Officer	Approved
DM/15/4891	1 Birch Close, Crawley Down	Support	Approved
DM/15/4896	Barns Court, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down	Support	Approved
DM/15/4904	Southmead, Borers Arms Road, Copthorne	Object	Approved
DM/15/4959	3 Knowle Drive, Copthorne	Object	Refused
DM/15/5095	52 Newtown, Copthorne	Prior approval not required.	
AP/15/0054	Little Frenches Farm, Snow Hill, Crawley Down, RH10 3EG	Dismissed	
AP/15/0060	Land Adj Poplars Place, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down	Dismissed	
AP/16/0003	1 Haven Gardens adjacent to Fernhill Close, Crawley Down	Appeal Lodged	
AP/16/0006	Land Adj Shepherds Oak, Turners Hill Rd, Crawley Down	Appeal Lodged	

We have 2 planning decisions from the above this where MSDC conflicted with our comments :-

DM/15/3458 – effectively the creation of a new property along the THR

DM/15/4904 – carport adjacent to Borers Arms Rd – affects street scene.

We will continue to monitor the planning decisions - This was noted.

155. HIGHWAY ISSUES.

It was **AGREED** that Cllr Gibson will write to the Cabinet Minister John O’Brien WSCC regarding the poor state of the road surfaces in both wards.

A Highways working groups report was circulated with the agenda. It was **AGREED** that we will need to contact Richard Speller to see how far he has got with the following actions:-

- When will Worth PC have the speed indicator devise (SID) in both of the wards
- Who is responsible for Grange Rd Footpath & Burleigh Wood Street Lights?
- When will the consultation finish on the integrated works programme?

A Cllr referred to the request on the report for pinch points and asked that it is noted:-

- Vicarage Rd is not a pinch point but a raised road marking on existing marking at this junction.

It was **AGREED** that another Highways working group will be arranged by the Clerk.

156. TO CONSIDER THE PLANNING APPLICATIONS LISTED ON THE SCHEDULE BELOW

RESOLVED: that the observations contained in the attached schedule dated 15th February 2016, to be conveyed to the District Council.

Meeting closed 8. 25 pm

Chairman.....

Signed.....

<p>DM/15/4187 55 Burleigh Way, Crawley Down, RH10 4UG Retrospective application to remove hedge and put up a 1.9 metre wooden fence.</p>	<p>Object – will have a negative impact on the character of the street contrary to CDNHP 04b) and 5a)). The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDNHP) Area. THE CDNHP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date, then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise, demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. WPC are the authors of the CDNHP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. LPA Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above, without discussion with WPC.</p>
<p>DM/15/5105 Land At South Place, Beauport House, Carrsfarm Cottage And Hurst House, Copthorne Common Road, Copthorne, RH10 3LG Outline application and consideration of access details for the demolition of existing buildings and the construction of up to 50 dwellings with associated access.</p>	<p>Strongly Object; The site is in Copthorne Neighbourhood Plan Area. This is not a sustainable development as it is a greenfield site¹, outside the built-up area boundary, ribbon development, over-development and all local journeys will need to be made by motorised transport. The development is contrary to policies C1 and C2 of the Local Plan. Walking and cycling from the site to local services are impractical and dangerous. As such it is contrary to the requirement in NPPF para 17 to “take account of the different roles and character of different areas” and “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable”. The proposed development is also contrary to the requirement in NPPF paras 53 and 58 to ensure that development “will function well and add to the overall quality of the area, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development” & “create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine quality of life or Community cohesion” and “respond to local character and history”. The adverse impact on the area outweighs the benefits of the additional housing. Local shops are limited to a convenience store selling a limited range of goods at prices which are higher than would be found in the village centres. All traffic exiting the site will need to use the Dukes Head roundabout and will contribute to the congestion experience there at peak times resulting in long traffic queues towards Crawley Down and West Park Road in particular. Vehicles turning right into the site will add to congestion on Copthorne Common Road and are likely to increase the difficulty experience by vehicles entering and leaving the petrol station at peak times.</p>
<p>DM/16/0172 The Coach House, Down Park, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, RH10 4HQ Change of use of garage to form part of existing business use.</p>	<p>Support – Site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p>
<p>DM/15/5048 Land Parcel At Gibbshaven Farm, Furnace Farm Road Outline application for residential development of up to 30 dwellings, public open space and ancillary</p>	<p>Strongly Object – 22 Objections - Paras 55 of the NPPF is operative as this is a greenfield site in the countryside. Note that the number of new dwellings is not a determining factor whether para 55 of the NPPF is operative. The LPA needs to insist on a full application in order to assess whether the proposed design displays the quality and innovation required by para 55. The proposed site is in the Crawley Down Neighbourhood Plan (CDNHP) Area. The CDNHP is now part of the local development plan and its policies carry full weight. If its policies cannot be considered to be up-to-date, then Planning Officers and Councillors should still consider all of its policies when conducting the balancing exercise, demanded by para 14 of the NPPF and give them full or very significant weight. The application conflicts with the following policies of the CDNHP: CNDP01 CNDP05 a), c), d), e), f.), g), i), j), k), l), m), o) & p). CNDP06 CNDP08 a., b. & c. CNDP09 a., b., c., d. & e. CNDP10 a), b), c), d), e) & f) CNDP11 In particular, it is noted that the Supporting Statement provided with the application, completely ignores policy CNDP01 which addresses the timely provision of the appropriate infrastructure. The policy is a key pillar of the overall vision of the CDNP and cannot be addressed through the use of ‘Grampian Conditions’. The proposed development represents a significant infringement on the strategic gap between Crawley Down and Felbridge, and would have a detrimental impact on the character of the countryside in that location. In respect of the latter, it is noted that Gibbshaven traces its origins back to the 14th century. WPC are the authors of the CDNHP and as such are best placed to judge whether a planning application is in accordance with its vision, policies and definitions. LPA Planning Officers should not contradict the assessment set out above, without discussion with WPC.</p>