

**NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING, ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE
THURSDAY 23RD AUGUST 2018 at 7.30pm
AT ROFFEY MILLENNIUM HALL**

CLERK'S REPORT TO BE READ IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE AGENDA

1. Public Forum

The Public Forum will last for a period of up to 15 minutes during which members of the public may put questions to the Council or draw attention to relevant matters relating to the business on the agenda. Each speaker is limited to 3 minutes. Business of the meeting will start immediately following the public forum or at 7.45pm whichever is the earlier.

3. Declaration of Interests

Members are advised to consider the agenda for the meeting and determine in advance if they may have a Personal, Prejudicial or a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in any of the agenda items. If a Member decides they do have a declarable interest, they are reminded that the interest and the nature of the interest must be declared at the commencement of the consideration of the agenda item; or when the interest becomes apparent to them. Details of the interest will be included in the Minutes.

Where a Member has a Prejudicial Interest (which is not a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest), Members are reminded that they must now withdraw from the meeting chamber after making representations or asking questions.

If the interest is a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest, Members are reminded that they must take no part in the discussions of the item at all; or participate in any voting; and must withdraw from the meeting chamber; unless they have received a dispensation.

5. Chairman's Announcements

- (a) Residents of Lambs Farm Road have reported their concern that 42 tonne lorries are delivering on a daily basis to the One Stop shop and from 6am to late at night. This could currently be exacerbated by the closure of Crawley Road. The West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) Area Highways Engineer for Horsham advised that 'whilst a Traffic Regulation Order to control HGV traffic is permissible, its purpose is to tackle through traffic where such use is inappropriate and having a detrimental effect on safety, the highway or environment (this would need to be evidenced). Any HGV related Traffic Regulation Order must contain an exemption allowing legitimate deliveries to premises within the controlled area. The larger an area covered by an HGV TRO, the more difficult it will be to enforce and the less effect it has.

If a TRO application met WSCC's policy for introduction it would permit any legitimate access within the controlled area by any size of vehicle, e.g a 42 tonne truck could still enter a 7.5 tonne restricted area and would be legally permitted to do so provided that it needs to gain access.

Whilst it is generally unreasonable for hauliers to use large vehicles in residential areas, they likely do so for financial and logistical reasons. When considering a TRO controlling HGV traffic WSCC must consult with haulage representation (such as the Freight Transport Association) and if there are objections it may have to go to public inquiry, a very costly process. Therefore, any proposal must have a clearly evidenced and sound reason for it to be successful.

- (b) The North Horsham Parish Council Tree Wardens are monitoring ash-die back on two trees in the Parish as part of the UK Ash Survey . One is seemingly healthy and the other is showing signs of distress. This has been reported to the Property Committee previously and it is being monitored. The Tree Wardens intend to give a periodic report at the next Planning, Environment and Transport Meeting.
- (c) Five Parish Councillors and two Parish Councillors representing the District Council were among the 25 people who attended the briefing on the former Novartis site off Parsonage Road on Wednesday 25th July 2018 at the Holbrook Club. The site is owned by WSCC. They bought the site with a grant from the Local Enterprise Partnership. The Council has to generate a return on the investment. The target for submitting the Planning Application is early December 2018. A representative from Communications Potential explained the programme of community engagement that would take place in the run up to the application being submitted. Savills UK were involved in the masterplan.

The proposals are for two thirds of the site to be business use and one third housing. The original art deco building will be converted to residential units on the first floor, with retail units on the ground floor to support the surrounding community. WSCC Councillor Louise Goldsmith explained that the original vision of a science park in collaboration with the University of Brighton had gone as businesses of that type had been attracted to cluster in the Oxford/ Cambridge area. The vision for the business site is to attract enterprises that are a little bit different and those specialising in the high tech industry to develop a creative digital hub. There is evidence of a chronic shortage of Grade A office space in Horsham that threatens some existing companies that want to expand and stay in Horsham as there is no suitable accommodation to offer. It is hoped that by providing homes on the site, people will be able to live and work in Horsham.

The business element on the site is likely to generate 1,200 jobs on a site of 175,000 sq ft. Those in attendance raised concerns as follows:-

- Connectivity – a footbridge to link with Collyers and on to the train station would be imperative, not only for those working on the site, but for those who would visit. (The government are encouraging development near to a rail hub).
- Safe cycling to and from the station would also be a good way of encouraging connectivity, this could include some changes to bike storage at Horsham station.
- Wimblehurst Road is a key route to services in Horsham and it is already busy with traffic, along with surrounding roads, which will only get worse as more homes are built. Measures should be taken to minimise intrusion to existing residents.
- It was hoped that access would be in and out of the relatively quieter Parsonage Road.
- Parking will be considered as part of a transport viability study, but there may be undercroft or stacked parking to provide sufficient parking. Existing business areas have insufficient parking, for example Foundry Lane, this impacts on residents and on access for HGV's ambulances etc.
- The recreational space in North Horsham is being built on, but it is important that people can access green spaces, so a request was made for recreational space to be included in the plan.
- WSCC suggests that it will act as landlord and collect a revenue from the site. It is hoped that the rents will be kept competitive.
- A contamination survey is being done.

WSCC were looking to give the site a name and suggested Wimblehurst Business Park; Wimblehurst Triangle; Wimblehurst Commerce Centre and Horsham Commerce Centre. WSCC were open to alternative ideas.

- (d) Cllr Alan Britten and Cllr Ray Turner attended the Horsham Association of Local Councils Meeting on 26th July 2018 and raised the matter of noise from motorcycles due to anti-social behaviour (Wheelies, donuts, riding at speed) with Sussex Police who were in attendance. Other parishes reported similar issues. The Police highlighted a campaign targeted at motorcycle riders "Operation Ride". The Chief Inspector for Horsham has been made aware of the issue and reported it to the local roads policing sergeant. Anyone witnessing anti social behaviour is advised to report it through the Operation Crackdown portal. The Times (August 16th 2018) reports that the Department of Transport is considering new powers to "combat excessive noise" from motorbikes as over the past 4 years over 32, 000 vehicles failed their MoT because of "excessive noise" and more than one fifth of those related to motorbikes.
- (e) West Sussex Association of Local Councils lent their support to North Horsham Parish Council's concerns about the poor train service to smaller stations such as Littlehaven and would take it up at their next board meeting. A response from Cllr

Bob Lanzer, WSCC Cabinet Member for Highways and Infrastructure to a letter sent on 28th July 2018 from the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee was circulated to the full Council. Cllr Lanzer was forwarding the Committee's letter to Govia Thameslink Railway (GTR) so that they could address the concerns direct. Jeremy Quin MP responded to a letter sent on 23rd July 2018 and enclosed a spreadsheet from GTR comparing the weekday peak service to and from Littlehaven for the pre- and post- May timetables. Mr Quin MP had raised the issue of trains 'skipping' Littlehaven and GTR immediately acknowledged that 'skipping' Littlehaven is not only wrong in principle, but it makes no difference to their efforts to 'regulate' the service. Mr Quin MP has monitored an improvement.

- (f) The TRO applications for Lambs Farm Road and Hawkesbourne Road were amalgamated on the advice of the WSCC Traffic Officer as joining the two was more likely to give higher community support and casualty figures and therefore, success. The application has passed the initial assessment stage and speed data is now being gathered.
- (g) The free South East Community Led Conference to be held in Billingshurst on 19th October 2018 between 9.45am and 4pm includes a presentation on Community Land Trusts from a representative of the National CLT Network.
- (h) Cllr Joy Gough has been booked on SALC Planning Training on 22nd November 2018 in Billingshurst.
- (i) The WSCC and South Downs National Park Authority have adopted the West Sussex Joint Minerals Local Plan which is now part of the statutory 'Development Plan' for West Sussex and will be the basis for all planning decisions relating to mineral development in the County.
- (j) The Council were notified that a food van is trading in the layby on the A264 near to the Rusper Road roundabout. This has been reported to WSCC Highways as there is damage to the road sign and evidence of anti social behaviour.
- (k) The Parish Council were notified that land adjacent to 15 Durfold Road owned by Horsham District Council has been sold subject to the new owner having responsibility for the trees on the plot.
- (l) At the Planning, Environment and Transport Meeting held on 20th July 2017 the Parish Council nominated the Art Deco building on the former Novartis site for an information plaque and to be included, along with other nominated buildings, as part of a town trail. The partnership group formed by Horsham Museum and Horsham District Council that are working on this project submitted an outline application to the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) in January 2018 and received a positive response, but further investigation revealed that the cost of manufacturing

the plaques and the time involved in getting the permission to install the plaques at the various sites from WSCC was prohibitive to continuing. The group has, therefore, changed the scope of the project and intend to continue with the development of heritage trails without the plaques. A submission to the HLF was made in July 2018 and if successful, the working group will look for volunteers to be trained in developing trails and develop guides to be published.

6. Planning Protocol

Sussex and Surrey Associations of Local Councils Planning Protocol 5th April 2018 attached.

8. Crawley Road closure – bus services

Diversion of bus routes 98, 200 and 23 during gas main work along Crawley Road could make it difficult for some residents to get to travel to medical appointments, the shops etc. Buses travel down Crawley Road from the north then turn along Manor Fields. The bus then travels along Harwood Road, Redkiln Way and picks up its original route along Kinds Road. In effect the section of Crawley Road from Manor Fields to the roundabout at the junctions of Rusper Road, Kings Road, Redkiln Way and Parsonage Road doesn't have an active bus stop whilst the gas main work is carried out.

10. Planning Appeals

None notified.

The protocol will be reviewed in due course to reflect any changes in planning legislation and feedback on the use of the protocol from users in Sussex and Surrey.

2. Background

Relevant planning legislation

The planning system in England is based upon a large body of legislation which is subject to regular review and amendment by Parliament. The system is continually evolving. The main items of legislation currently governing the system are:

- The Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)
- The Town & Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended)
- The Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended)
- The Town & Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)
- Town & Country Planning (Control of Advertisement) Regulations 2007
- Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
- The Localism Act 2011 (as amended)
- The Neighbourhood Planning (General)Regulations 2012 (as amended)
- The Town & Country Planning (Development Management Procedure)(England) Order 2015 (as amended)

This is not an exhaustive list. There are many other items of UK and European legislation which bear upon planning decisions. Please note that the legislation is subject to regular amendment.

Government planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, accompanied by the National Planning Practice Guidance, is a material consideration in planning decisions, alongside the legislation indicated above.

Other relevant legislation

Operation of the planning system is also affected by wider UK legislation such as the Human Rights Act 1998; Data Protection Act 1998 and the General Data Protection Regulation; the Freedom of Information Act 2000 and the Environmental Information Regulations 2004; and the Equality Act 2010. This legislation will also bear on how town and parish councils conduct their business on planning (and other) matters. Town and parish councils should already be aware of their duties and obligations under these items of legislation.

Conduct in public office

The Nolan Committee (1995) on standards in public life established the following seven principles to govern the conduct of anyone who is in public office, whether elected, appointed or employed. These principles should guide behaviour on planning matters.

- **Selflessness:** Holders of public office should act solely in terms of the public interest.
- **Integrity:** Holders of public office must avoid placing themselves under any obligation to people or organisations that might try inappropriately to influence them in their work. They should not act or take decisions in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends. They must declare and resolve any interests and relationships.
- **Objectivity:** Holders of public office must act and take decisions impartially, fairly and on merit, using the best evidence and without discrimination or bias.
- **Accountability:** Holders of public office are accountable to the public for their decisions and actions and must submit themselves to the scrutiny necessary to ensure this.
- **Openness:** Holders of public office should act and take decisions in an open and transparent manner. Information should not be withheld from the public unless there are clear and lawful reasons for doing so
- **Honesty:** Holders of public office should be truthful.
- **Leadership:** Holders of public office should exhibit these principles in their own behaviour. They should actively promote and robustly support the principles and be willing to challenge poor behaviour wherever it occurs.

Town and parish councils must have an adopted Code of Conduct under the Localism Act 2011. Such codes are based on the Nolan principles and govern the standards of behaviour expected of their councillors. The rules on behaviour will always apply to you when acting as a councillor. You cannot choose not to be covered by the code of Conduct, for example acting as a private individual.

Declarations of interest

All councils maintain a register of interests for councillors where, at least, disclosable pecuniary interests are recorded, following election or appointment. Where a planning matter occurs, which is related to a previously registered, or other personal, prejudicial, or disclosable pecuniary interest, it should be declared by the councillor at the meeting.

Following such declaration, the councillor should either leave the meeting whilst that matter is discussed and voted upon (this is preferable) or, if the Code of Conduct permits, remain in the room, but should play no part in the discussion, debate and voting.

Sometimes such an interest may be minor or have only a tenuous link to the matter under discussion. In such cases, the councillor should raise the matter with the Clerk and seek guidance on whether it is sufficient to be declared and affect participation.

Dual membership

Sometimes councillors sit on both town/parish councils and local planning authorities (districts/boroughs, counties, unitaries and national park authorities). This can raise concerns and complications where a planning matter is discussed at both levels.

At the town/parish council level, the “two-hatted” councillor should consider planning issues from that viewpoint. If the same matter - such as a planning application- goes onto a local planning authority for decision, the councillor should not be confined by the town/parish view. They are not “delegates” to the higher level authority or “mandated” to follow the town/parish view. They should consider the matter afresh from a local planning authority viewpoint, having regard to the development plan and all material planning considerations. This will often include information, consultee responses and professional officer assessment which were not available to the town/parish council at an earlier stage in consideration of the application. Thus, the two roles are different, but complementary.

Applications made by a town or parish council will engage the interest provisions of the Code of Conduct, when they are considered by the local planning authority.

The role of clerks and their relationship to elected members

The role of town or parish council clerk is to ensure that the Council as a whole conducts its business properly and to provide independent, objective and professional advice and support. The clerk is there to serve the council as a whole and not to advance or hold back the views of any individual councillor. Where planning matters are complex and divisive in the local community, this role can be difficult and demanding. Councillors should treat the clerk with respect and consideration in carrying out their duties.

3. Planning applications

Pre-application discussions and other meetings with developers

Discussions between the landowners and developers promoting development, and local planning authorities, town and parish councils, and local communities, prior to the formal submission of a planning application can be useful for all concerned. In particular, they can result in better quality applications which take into account local views. As such, they are strongly encouraged by the Government. However, if held in secret, they can cause concern, controversy and speculation, getting development proposals “off on the wrong foot”.

Wherever possible, pre-application discussions at the local level should be held in public. The best way to do this is some form of public meeting or exhibition where people can see and comment upon initial development ideas, and local councillors can also attend. If the developer/landowner wants to talk direct to the town/parish council, this should be in a meeting which is also open to the public, with discussion and debate recorded in the normal way through published minutes. The guidance below on “pre-disposition” and “pre-determination” is also relevant here.

Where, exceptionally, the developer /landowner insists upon a private meeting with the town/parish council (for example if matters of commercial confidentiality are unavoidably to

be discussed), the town/parish needs to decide whether the benefits of such a meeting are likely to exceed the risks arising from lack of openness. It is often useful to discuss such requests with your local planning authority, so that any actions are co-ordinated. The town/parish council may decide to decline a private meeting in favour of an open meeting. However, if a private meeting does go ahead, it is wise to seek agreement in advance to publication of a jointly agreed post-meeting statement: this may allay some of the concerns in the local community over a “secret meeting” and avoid a vacuum which the local rumour mill will be only too eager to fill. You will also need to consider whether to open up such a meeting to all town and parish councillors, rather than a selected few such as members of a planning committee.

Planning applications submitted by councillors, officers or town/parish councils

Proposals submitted by serving and former councillors, officers and their close associates and relatives can easily give rise to suspicions of impropriety. Such proposals could be planning applications or local plan proposals. They must be handled in a way that gives no grounds for accusations of favouritism. Accordingly, national guidance on “Probity in Planning” advises :

- if a councillor submits his or her own proposal to the local planning authority, he or she should play no part in its consideration by the town or parish council
- a system should be devised to identify and manage such proposals
- such proposals should be reported to a public meeting of the town or parish council rather than any other channel

Applicants in such cases have the same rights as any other applicant, but the councillor, as applicant, should also not seek to influence improperly the decision. Proposals for a council’s own development should be treated with the same transparency and impartiality as those of private developers.

Consultation on planning applications

In the great majority of cases, consultation and public engagement on planning applications will be undertaken solely by the local planning authority. It will approach neighbouring residents and businesses , and statutory and other consultees, to seek views.

Exceptionally, the town or parish council may wish to supplement local planning authority consultations by arranging its own events at the local level, such as public meetings or exhibitions on planning applications which are particularly important or controversial. In such cases, the town or parish council should avoid setting up separate and parallel consultation arrangements which will cause confusion to the public. It is usually best to advise people to submit their comments on the application direct to the local planning authority via the channels, and within the timescale, the latter body has set. If required, the town or parish council can be copied in to such comments.

Site visits

As a matter of course, the local planning authority's case officer will visit application sites at least once prior to a decision. If individual town or parish councillors wish to make a site visit, they can do so, but only using public vantage points (land with public access, public highways or rights of way). Members of town and parish councils have no special rights of entry to private land without the owner's consent.

If individual members do arrange to visit application sites with the owner's consent, then they should inform the clerk. The guidance below on "pre-disposition" and "pre-determination" is relevant in such circumstances.

If the town/parish council consider that a group site visit to a planning application site should be held, this should be arranged by the clerk, who may wish to seek agreement with landowners to enter private land, if that is necessary. Such arranged site visits should be for the sole purpose of understanding of the application proposals and their relationship to the wider environment. They are not an opportunity for lobbying by either the promoters of, or objectors to, the development.

Pre-disposition and pre-determination

As indicated below on lobbying, councillors should be open-minded and generally avoid "pre-determination": this is taking a conclusive view on planning applications before a councillor has seen all the information or heard all the arguments at a committee meeting. This is not the same as "pre-disposition", which is being inclined to a particular viewpoint, either for or against a planning application, but still open to changing his/her mind if new information or arguments come to light. It is entirely proper for a councillor to be predisposed to a particular viewpoint (for example, "I am worried about the access arrangements and the impact on the landscape" or "I welcome the new jobs provided by this development") whilst still being open to opposing arguments about the application.

As a councillor, you must demonstrably keep an open mind.

Lobbying of councillors

Lobbying is a normal part of the planning process. Those who may be affected by a planning decision will often seek to influence it through an approach to their local councillor. This is local democracy in action.

Lobbying, however, can lead to the impartiality and integrity of a councillor being called into question, unless care and common sense is exercised by all the parties involved.

It remains good practice that, when being lobbied, and listening carefully to what people say, councillors (members of the planning committees in particular) should try to take care about expressing an opinion that may be taken as indicating that they have already conclusively made up their mind on the issue before they have been exposed to all the evidence and arguments.

Councillors should never accept any hospitality or other inducements from lobbyists which would put them in a position where they owe an obligation, or might reasonably be considered to have done so. Individual councils' Codes of Conduct will provide more detailed guidance on this matter.

Lobbying by councillors

Naturally, town and parish councillors talk amongst themselves about planning applications in their area. However, the following guidelines should be observed to maintain probity:

- Planning decisions cannot be made on a party political basis in response to lobbying; the use of political whips to seek to influence the outcome of a planning application is likely to be seen as maladministration.
- Councillors should in general avoid organising support for or against a planning application, and avoid lobbying other councillors.
- Councillors should not put pressure on officers for a particular recommendation or decision, and should not do anything which compromises, or is likely to compromise, the officers' impartiality or professional integrity.
- Once the town or parish council has considered a planning application and made its views known to the local planning authority, it may lobby or campaign for a particular outcome

Consideration of applications at town and parish council meetings

This will normally be governed by the individual town or parish council's standing orders. These will usually cover matters such as presentations by officers, debate by councillors, proposing and seconding motions, voting, and recording decisions and recommendations.

In framing their comments on planning applications to the local planning authority, town and parish councils should focus on relevant planning policies and other material planning considerations, backed as far as possible by evidence. It is not simply about following the views of those who are shouting loudest.

As a councillor, you should always act fairly between applicants and objectors.

Format of responses on planning applications to local planning authorities

When responding to local planning authority consultations on planning applications, it is helpful if the town or parish council responses are recorded and submitted in one of the following formats:

- **No objection** or **no comments** (neutral)
- **Support** with reasons set out as clearly as possible (positive)
- **Object** with reasons set out as clearly as possible (negative)

The Council is under an obligation to give reasons for its decisions.

Representation at local planning authority planning committees

Local planning authorities normally offer an “opportunity to speak” where interested parties – including town and parish councils- have 2/3 minutes to express their views to the planning committee at the point of decision on the planning application.

A town or parish councillor representing their organisation should normally be an ex-officio appointee (such as chair of the town/parish council or its planning committee) or another person expressly appointed for the task by the town/parish council.

Other town/parish councillors can use the “opportunity to speak”, but should make it clear that they are speaking in a personal capacity and that their views may not necessarily represent those of the town/parish council.

Discharge of planning conditions

Many planning applications are subject to the discharge of a number of planning conditions, some of which must be resolved prior to the commencement of development on the application site. Often, such conditions are highly technical in nature , and will be resolved between the applicants and local planning and highway authority officers (for example design of road junctions and sequencing of traffic lights to ensure the smooth flow of traffic) with little or no input from the town/parish council .

If there are planning conditions which are of particular significance to the town/parish council in achieving a satisfactory development, they should ask the local planning authority for the opportunity for consultation and comment on them prior to discharge.

Town and parish councils may assist in monitoring compliance with planning conditions and should inform the local planning authority if they have reason to believe that conditions are not being complied with. The local planning authority will then investigate and consider whether it is expedient to take further action. The guidance below in section 5 on planning enforcement is relevant here.

Planning agreements/unilateral obligations

Often, as part of the planning application process, there will be a requirement for a planning agreement - under section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990- to be negotiated and entered into between the local planning authority, the landowner and the developer. In some cases, a developer will offer a planning obligation unilaterally (without negotiation), particularly during planning appeals. Such agreements can cover affordable housing; the provision, transfer and subsequent maintenance of community facilities , open space and play areas; phasing of development; highways , education and library contributions.

Town and parish councils have no right to involved in the negotiation and agreement of such agreements (unless they are a landowner), but should seek involvement where they are expected to assume ownership or management and maintenance of property assets. Even if a town or parish council objects in principle to a planning application, it may wish to

consider the community benefits which may accrue from the development on a “without prejudice” basis.

4. Planning appeals

Procedure

Whilst the procedure and timescale for planning appeals is a matter to be determined by the Planning Inspectorate, the appellants, and the local planning authority, town and parish councils have a right to make their views known on the appeal and to take part in any hearing or public inquiry.

There are three types of planning appeal procedure:

- **Written representations** (all parties exchange written comments on the case , which are considered by the Inspector after a site visit)
- **Informal hearing** (all parties submit cases in writing and the Inspector leads a structured discussion on the key planning issues , followed by a site visit)
- **Public Inquiry** (all parties submit written evidence , which is then subject to questioning and debate in a formal inquiry presided over by an inspector, followed by a site visit.

Town/parish council involvement

It is open to the town/parish council to determine its own degree of involvement in any planning appeal in, or affecting, its area. This will depend on the importance of the appeal outcome. Town/parish councils may decide whether to simply re-iterate the comments made to the local planning authority at the application stage or they may decide to amplify and elaborate this in a more detailed submission. In either event, it is good practice to record a decision.

At a planning appeal, the town/parish council normally takes a secondary role, in support of the local planning authority, and there is no need to duplicate the work done by it.

Representation at appeal hearings and inquiries

A town or parish councillor representing their organisation should normally be an ex-officio appointee (such as chair of the town/parish council or its planning committee) or another person expressly appointed for the task by the town/parish council.

Other town/parish councillors can appear at an appeal hearing or public inquiry, but should make it clear that they are speaking in a personal capacity and that their views may not necessarily represent those of the town/parish council.

Town and parish councils should be wary of entering into collaborative arrangements regarding appeals with other persons and organisations, especially private individuals or bodies. The council must consider, and keep under review, what is in the public interest (and not what might benefit the private interests of others), so far as the conduct of any planning

appeal, and subsequent court challenge, is concerned. It must ensure that the expenditure of public funds is proportionate to the public objective pursued.

5. Planning enforcement

Some key principles on planning enforcement

Where development proceeds without the necessary permissions, local planning authorities have a range of statutory powers to remedy breaches of planning control where the development would not, on its individual planning merits, be acceptable. Planning enforcement is essential for the credibility of the whole planning system.

Some key principles on the system of planning enforcement are as follows:

- The first stage in any enforcement case is to establish the facts through careful investigation
- Breach of planning control is not normally a criminal offence (listed buildings and protected trees are an exception)
- Enforcement action is discretionary and local authorities are urged to act proportionately to the impact of any breach on the local environment
- Planning enforcement generally seeks to be restorative (restore things to the previous lawful condition) rather than punish those responsible (although there are fines and even imprisonment if statutory notices are not complied with and the courts are flouted)

The town and parish council role in planning enforcement

Town and parish councils do not have any formal statutory role in planning enforcement. However, the local planning authority will usually welcome the town and parish councils acting as their local “eyes and ears” in reporting possible breaches of planning control or maintaining logs of activity or vehicle movements to assist their work on sites under investigations . In return, it is good practice for local planning authorities to liaise with town and parish councils over the progress of any enforcement cases in their area.

Liaison on enforcement matters is best done through the town/parish clerk and the local planning authority investigating officer. Other “freelance” operations involving individual town or parish councillors can result in tangled lines of communication.

Whilst local planning authorities welcome local town/parish councils and members of the public acting as “eyes and ears” in reporting information, **councillors and local people should never enter a site under investigation or confront persons alleged to be in breach of planning control, or their contractors.** Such situations can be tense, emotional or even dangerous, and are best left to trained and experienced staff at the local planning authority.

6. Development plans

The statutory development plan for an area comprises (a) the local plan prepared by the local planning authority and (b) any neighbourhood plans prepared by the town or parish

council, or constituted neighbourhood forum. Legally, “decisions on planning applications have to be made in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise” (Planning & Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, section 38(6)), so they have primacy in planning decisions.

The role of town and parish councils in local plans

Town and parish councils are important consultees on local plans and will have the opportunity to comment on the emerging local plan at various stages of its preparation, up to and including the public examination of it by an independent inspector.

It is important that town and parish councils make room for proper consideration of local plans as they will have profound effects on their area. This may require special briefings by local planning authority officers and/or discussion of consultation documents at special meetings unencumbered by lengthy agendas on other matters. All responses to consultation should be carefully recorded and submitted within local planning authority timescales

If a town or parish council wishes to pursue a case through to the public examination on the local plan, it should appoint a councillor (or councillors) to attend and speak on its behalf. Any other councillors wishing to attend and speak may do so, but should make it clear that they are speaking in a personal capacity and that their views do not necessarily represent those of the town/parish council. Alternatively, the town/parish council can decide whether to engage professional support to act on its behalf

Neighbourhood plans

Neighbourhood plans give communities the power to develop a shared vision for the future of their area and decide where new development should be located , what it should look like what infrastructure it needs to support it, and what features of the local environment should be conserved and enhanced. These neighbourhood plans are a statutory document, and – along with the local plan - form part of the development plan, used to determine planning applications in the area.

Town and parish councils may apply to the local planning authority for the designation of all, or part of, their area as a neighbourhood plan area. Following designation, the town/parish council needs to set up appropriate governance and working arrangements for the preparation of the neighbourhood plan. Arrangements will differ from place to place, for example from a market town to a small rural parish.

Governance needs to cover oversight, programming, and the resourcing of work on the neighbourhood plan and eventually deciding whether formally to submit the draft neighbourhood plan to the local planning authority for the later statutory stages, including examination and referendum. This is usually done by elected members of the town/parish council, supported by their clerk, with the “submission draft”, and associated documents, formally endorsed by the council. It is important to remember that the decision-maker on

preparation and submission of the neighbourhood plan is the town or parish council and that it cannot delegate its functions or expenditure to non-council bodies or groups.

Working arrangements can be much more flexible and , as well as local councillors, draw in the talents and energy of the local community to identify and work on the planning issues which are of most concern locally in small groups , with regular consultation and feedback as it moves towards drawing up a neighbourhood plan.

When the neighbourhood plan gets to public examination, the town/parish council must decide how best to argue its case in the face of any formal objections .It should appoint a councillor (or councillors), or professional assistance, to attend and speak on its behalf. Any other councillors wishing to attend and speak may do so, but should make it clear that they are speaking in a personal capacity and that their views do not necessarily represent those of the town/parish council. Alternatively, the town/parish council can decide whether to engage professional support to act on its behalf.

FURTHER READING

- **Probity in planning for councillors and officers** Local Government Association and Planning Advisory Service April 2013
<https://www.local.gov.uk/sites/default/files/documents/probity-planning-councill-d92.pdf>
- **National Planning Policy Framework** DCLG 2012 (The Government published proposed amendments for consultation in March 2018)
https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/6077/2116950.pdf
- **National Planning Practice Guidance** DCLG 2014 (The Government published proposed amendments for consultation in March 2018)
<https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/planning-practice-guidance>
- **The Plain English Guide to the planning system** DCLG 2015
<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/plain-english-guide-to-the-planning-system>

Prepared by Lindsay Frost Consulting Ltd for SSALC. April 2018

The author wishes to thank the chairs of the three county associations in East and West Sussex and Surrey, Trevor Leggo (Chief Executive SSALC) and Ian Davison (Surrey Hills Solicitors LLP and Legal Advisor to SSALC) for their helpful comments on earlier working drafts of this protocol. Responsibility for the content of the protocol rests with the author.

Comments or feedback should be sent to lfrost5@aol.com

North Horsham Parish Council

Report to Planning, Environment and Transport Committee August 23rd 2018.
Agenda item 7.

Compilation of a Planning Resource – ‘Culturally significant, historical and heritage assets in North Horsham Parish.’

1. Introduction

1.1 From 1st April 2015, West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) withdrew its advisory service for archaeology (and ecology) to Local Planning Authorities in West Sussex.

1.2. Horsham District Council (HDC) employ contractors to provide archaeological advice, when it is requested. Horsham District Planning Framework November 2015 (Policy 34) recognises that heritage assets are an irreplaceable resource, and as such the Council will sustain and enhance its historic environment through positive management of development affecting heritage areas.’ The policy lists 8 criteria that applications for development must follow.

1.3. In the past sites which may have the potential to have archaeological remains were highlighted based on proximity to heritage assets, geology, location to natural resources etc. As a result, many unknown archaeological sites have been discovered and recorded.

1.4 Horsham Archaeology Society had concerns that the withdrawal of the service by WSSCC combined with the limitations of HDC's policy may result in local heritage being lost and requested that Parish Councils actively consider culturally significant, historical and heritage areas within its Parish when looking at planning applications.

2. North Horsham Parish Council's commitment

2.1 At the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee Meeting in September 2016, it was agreed

“to actively consider culturally significant, historical and heritage areas in North Horsham Parish when considering planning applications using a reference list which will be drawn up by a volunteer as soon as possible.”

Regrettably the volunteer was unable to continue with the project and due to other pressures, the matter was put to one side.

3. Gathering resources

3.1 The Clerk contacted Horsham District Archaeological Group and was advised that the full Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment carried out by Archaeology South East (ASE) for the area north of the A264 would be a good starting point.

3.2 WSCC holds the Historic Environment Record (HER) which is a summary of known historic assets in West Sussex. There could be a charge for this. It was suggested that the HER was the basis of the Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment and that there would be little to gain by accessing this source.

3.3 The Museum and Heritage Officer at Horsham Museum suggested that rather than identifying traditional historical features, a more holistic approach may yield greater benefits to create a sense of place. The Local Government Association, in their publication *People. Culture, Place* (February 2017) state that

“Our councils are founded in our communities, and our communities are founded on their heritage, traditions and industries. At times, this connection with our cultural and historic past may have faltered, but more and more we are realising the need to retain these links as we develop new economies, new relationships with our surroundings, and as our communities evolve”

The Museum and Heritage Officer suggested identifying listed buildings, natural history features, tree preservation orders, landscape features and building heritage. This is a bigger piece of work for which there is no resource currently.

3.4 In addition to the Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment, there are other sources of information for consideration: -

The Horsham Town Local List. February 2011. Horsham District Council.

Review of the Horsham Town Local List – stage 1 – potential additions. November 2016. Horsham Society.

Areas of Special Character. January / February 2003. North Horsham Parish Council.

Horsham Town Design Statement. December 2008. Horsham District Council

4. Culturally significant, historical and heritage areas in North Horsham Parish listed from the Horsham Town Local List, Areas of Special Character and Horsham Town Design Statement

Site	Details	Source
Fields at Earles Meadow	The area supports a wide variety of fauna and flora.	Areas of Special Character. 2003
North side of Crawley Road. Area between Millthorpe Road and Littlehaven Lane is noted as a character area in the Horsham Town Design Statement 2008 as is housing north of Crawley Road.	The properties were built around the 1900s and would appear not to have changed much since they were built. The building materials used have been consistent and many of the properties have retained their front gardens without changing their use to off street parking. The houses between Millthorpe Road and Littlehaven Lane are modest two storey terraced and semi-detached houses of artisans' cottage style. There is a natural gap from opposite Roffey Millennium Hall to Spooners Road where there are a variety of small businesses. Further along, next to the Roffey Institute is the home of the former Parish Nurse. (229 Crawley Road) Crawley Road is the 'heart' of Roffey.	Areas of Special Character 2003. Horsham Town Design Statement.2008.
Rural area north of A264	This is detailed in the Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment.	Areas of Special Character 2003.
Motte and Bailey, Chennells Brook	Scheduled Ancient Monument under the Ancient Monuments and archaeological Areas Act 1979.	Areas of Special Character 2003.
Chennells Brook, Riverside Walk	Protected in the Horsham District Planning Framework.	Areas of Special Character 2003.
Old Moorhead Farm, Crawley Road.		Areas of Special Character 2003.
Cottage on the left of the B2195 (towards the Moorhead Roundabout).		Areas of Special Character 2003.
Cottages on the right of		Areas of Special

the B2195 (just below Kingsmead Nursing Home.		Character 2003.
Older properties in the general area of Roffey Corner traffic lights and along the B2195 towards All Saints Church, Roffey.		Areas of Special Character 2003.
Star Row – Crawley Road	Victorian property.	Horsham Town Design Statement.2008
194 &196 Crawley Road	Two storey semi-detached cottages, possibly originally one house. Painted brick with casement windows, pitched tiled roof. Interesting pointed arched windows to side elevation of 94. Set back from road behind mature gardens. 196 has front bay ground floor window. Part of the original settlement of "Roughy" c1800.	Horsham Town List 2011.
221,223, 225 and 227 Crawley Road	Group of 4 terraced cottages, setback from the road behind mature gardens, behind low brick walls with gate pillars. 2 storeys, brick with clay tile hanging to the first floor. Pitched roof with gables facing the road. Some have replacement windows, but all with original timber front doors and chimney stacks. Group value as a terrace. Possible connection to nurse's cottage at 229 Crawley Road as almshouse style in character. C1920.	Horsham Town List 2011.
Roffey Institute, Crawley Road	Former Village Hall, single storey brick with large clay tiled gable, window and decorative arched porch. Pitched roof, with hall to rear. Interesting vent detail to roof. Timber front door. Set back from the road and surrounded by traditional railings. Now used as a community centre. Limestone	Horsham Town List 2011.

	plaque to right hand side reads "erected by JAMES INNES *1894* for the people of ROFFEY". Built 1894.	
The Old Vicarage, behind All Saints Church, Roffey.		Areas of Special Character 2003.
Properties in Forest Road – Piper Hollow, Highfield, Forest House, Beechlands. Roffey Hurst, Seymours, Thatchers, Vangrays and nos 5 – 15 Forest Road (left hand side).		Areas of Special Character 2003.
Cottages in Littlehaven Lane, towards the former Fountain Public House.		Areas of Special Character 2003.
72 Littlehaven Lane	Two story weather boarded timber framed house with plain clay tiled roof. Timber casement windows, porch. Original part c1700.	Horsham Town List 2011.
Flagstones, North Heath Lane	One and a half storeys, brick with decorative tile hanging and tile roof. Three dormers to the front, timber casement windows, central brick porch. Modern single storey extensions to north and south. Set in mature gardens. Flagstones is on the 1863 OS map; however, its origins may be older.	Horsham Town List 2011.
Wimblehurst Lodge, North Heath Way	Original gate house for Wimblehurst House (now demolished). Built in the Edwardian Tudor revival style. Two story, brick with tile hanging at first floor. Half timber gables, projecting oriel window. Timber sliding sash windows with leaded lights. Set in mature gardens, below a low brick wall c 1880.	Horsham Town List 2011.
20,22,24 & 26 Rusper	A pair of large semi-detached	Horsham Town

Road	Victorian houses of brick and tile hanging with decorative bay windows. Moulded decorative plaster bays, with attached open timber porch. Timber sash windows and front doors. Group value with 28 Rusper Road and 30 – 34 Rusper Road. C1896	List 2011.
28 Rusper Road	Large double fronted detached Victorian house of brick with contrasting brick quoins and tile hung gables. Two storeys with original timber sliding sash windows, half timbered porch and timber front door. Low brick boundary wall to front, set in mature gardens. Group value with 20 – 26 Rusper Road and 30 – 34 Rusper Road. C1896.	Horsham Town List 2011.
30,32 &34 Rusper Road	Group of 3 detached double fronted 2 storey houses set amongst large gardens, with front drives behind low brick walls. Brick with quoins and stringcourse detailing, clay tile roofs, two chimney stacks, toothed timber eaves detailing. Sliding sash windows, central door with porch and skirt roof above ground floor windows. Group value with 20 – 26 Rusper Road and 28 Rusper Road. C110.	Horsham Town List 2011.
Former Novartis building (CIBA Headquarters), Wimblehurst Road	Pale buff brick built in an international style typical of the interwar period. The tall central tower over the doorway forms a focal point to the long drive from the entrance. C1939.	Horsham Town List 2011.
Gate lodges and gates, former Novartis site, Wimblehurst Road	Built just before WWI!, the Gate Lodges and Gates were designed to frame the entrance drive up to the Locally Listed CIBA Headquarters building and are an intrinsic part of the overall setting of the main building.	Review of the Horsham Town Local List – stage 1 – potential additions. November 2016. Horsham

		Society.
Ringley Road and Shepherd Way	Examples of modern (post WW11-1945 – 1970 housing. Major development in North Horsham. Fewer individually designed houses. Low density, low rise private housing estates on greenfield sites, built mainly by local builders using locally sourced materials. Short cul de sac estate roads, tree lined avenues, informal green spaces between houses and large gardens. Unfenced gardens. Built in garages. Brick with tile hanging. Roofs were plain clay tiles and clay and concrete inter-locking tiles.	Horsham Town Design Statement.2008
Southern Holbrook, Lambs Farm Road, Church Road, Beech Road. Beech Road and Sycamore Avenue is noted as a character area in the Horsham Town Design Statement 2008 as us Lambs Farm Road east (School Road to Crawley Road)	Example of modern housing (1970 – 1985) Residential development on greenfield sites. Private and social housing. Medium and smaller dwellings with mix of semi detached and terraced housing interspersed with detached houses and three storey town houses. Road layouts based on crescents. Modest gardens and open plan estates. Brick fascia and concrete inter-locking tiles at a lower pitch.	Horsham Town Design Statement.2008
Modern (post 1985) Oaktree Way Lemington Way is noted in the Horsham Town Design Statement. 2008 as a character area.	Example of modern housing. Open plan estates. New estates included large executive housing built on modest sized plots, most with integral garages.	Horsham Town Design Statement.2008.

5. Providing a resource for the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee.

5.1 The list above in addition to the Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment, produced by Archaeology South East could form the basis of a document that could be available at every meeting as a resource to be used by the Planning, Environment and Transport Committee when proactively considering the

culturally significant, historical and heritage areas in North Horsham Parish when considering planning applications. The document could be refined over time, perhaps with input from a working party from the Committee.

Recommendations: -

- 1. To use the list of assets compiled from the North Horsham Parish Council Areas of Special Character Report 2003, Horsham Town List 2011, Review of the Horsham Town List November 2016 and the Horsham Town Design Statement 2008 and the Desk Based Heritage Impact Assessment produced by Archaeology South East as the basis of a resource when considering planning applications to assess culturally significant, historical and heritage areas in North Horsham Parish.**
- 2. To review the resource on a two-yearly cycle to include any updates.**

Pauline Whitehead BA(Hons) FSLCC 15th August 2018

**NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL
SCHEDULE OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR CONSIDERATION
23rd AUGUST 2018**

DC/18/1215	Holbrook West
Site Address: Fisher Clinical Services Uk Ltd Langhurst Wood Road	
Proposal: Erection of a side extension to existing warehouse	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1403	Holbrook East
Site Address: The Holbrook Club North Heath	
Proposal: Non material amendment to previously approved DC/16/2855 (Residential development of playing fields providing for 58 new dwellings including a new access from Jackdaw Lane) Insertion of entrance walls at the entrance on Jackdaw Lane.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1433	Holbrook East
Site Address: The Holbrook Club North Heath Lane	
Proposal: Creation of a new entrance with canopy to rear and fire escape with associated escape ramp to side. Installation of 3x roof lanterns and 3x wall mounted air conditioning units to rear elevation.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1468	Roffey North
Site Address: 11 Greenfields Way	
Proposal: Erection of a 2m high timber fence to replace existing 2.4m high hedge.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1521	Roffey North
Site Address: 13 Rusper Road Proposal: Erection of a single story rear extension (revised scheme for previously approved DC/17/2382).	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1539	Holbrook East
Site Address: 1 Timms Close Proposal: Erection of a rear conservatory	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1555	Holbrook West
Site Address: 5 Cottingham Avenue Proposal: Non material amendment to previously approved DC/15/2748 (Loft conversion with front and rear dormers, demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey side and rear extension including replacement attached garage). Addition of a roof window to the side elevation.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1575	Roffey North
Site Address: 10 Maple Close Proposal: Surgery 1 x Oak	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1578	Roffey North
Site Address: 175 Farhalls Crescent Proposal: Surgery to 1 x Oak, 1 x Holly , 1 x Hazel	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1579	Roffey North
Site Address: 163 Farhalls Crescent Proposal: Surgery 3 x Oaks.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1588	Roffey North
Site Address: 173 Farhalls Crescent	
Proposal: Surgery to 3 x Oaks	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1620	Holbrook East
Site Address: 17 Avebury Close	
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension and a proposed loft conversion including installation of a front and rear dormer window.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1623	Roffey South
Site Address: Co-op Welcome , 2 – 4 Fitzalan Road	
Proposal: Installation of a new replacement plant and new AC unit to the north elevation.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1625	Holbrook West
Site Address: Holmwood House, Broadlands Business Campus, Langhurstwood Road	
Proposal: Replacement of windows, entrances and installation of louvres.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1630	Roffey North
Site Address: 1 Little Hatch, Rusper Road	
Proposal: Surgery 1 x Ash	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1647	Holbrook East
Site Address: 16 Allcard Close	
Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1667	Holbrook West
Site Address: 15 Broome Close	
Proposal: Surgery 1 x Oak	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1662	Roffey North
Site Address: 57 Amberley Road	
Proposal: Surgery 1 x willow	
Parish Council Comment The work has been requested by North Horsham Parish Council.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1704	Roffey North
Site Address: Cherry Tree Walk	
Proposal: Surgery 1 x Silver Birch; 1 x Contorted Willow.	
Parish Council Comment The work has been requested by North Horsham Parish Council	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1691	Roffey North
Site Address: 16A Littlehaven Lane	
Proposal: Erection of a rear conservatory.	
Parish Council Comment	
HDC Decision	

**NORTH HORSHAM PARISH COUNCIL
SCHEDULE OF PLANNING DECISIONS
19.07.18 to 23.08.18**

DC/18/0055	Roffey North
Site Address: Enterprise House 80 Lambs Farm Road Proposal: Variation of Conditions 4 and 7 to previously approved DC/11/1660.	
Parish Council Comment No objection. However, the Committee reiterated its view regarding concerns of the potential nuisance from cooking smells and would like reassurance that the ventilation system is adequate and working at maximum capacity to reduce unwanted odours.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/0390	Roffey North
Site Address: 2 Manor Road Proposal: Erection of 1no. detached two storey dwelling	
Parish Council Comment Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment. It was noted the application parking layout/provision was not clear. Parish Council Comment – Amended plan Objection on the grounds of overdevelopment. It was noted the application parking layout/provision was still not clear.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/0429	Roffey South
Site Address: Land North of 20 To 42 Roebuck Close Proposal: Surgery to 2 x Oak Trees	
Parish Council Comment Objection – the Parish Council support the view of their Tree Wardens that there was insufficient information given on the application for the request to monolith.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/0840	Roffey North
Site Address: 7 Agate Lane Proposal: Erection of a second storey rear extension over existing two storey element	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	REFUSED

DC/18/0940	Roffey North
Site Address: 3A Buttermere Close	
Proposal: Erection of a timber garage to the west of existing property and installation of a decking area and a pergola to the rear of the property.	
Parish Council Comment No Objection however, noting a brick-built garage would be in keeping with the area.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/0942	Roffey South
Site Address: Tregerrick 2 Forest Oaks	
Proposal: Fell 1 x Oak	
Parish Council Comment Strongly object, unless HDC's Tree Officer states it is necessary. If felled request it be replaced with a suitable native species.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/0948	Holbrook East
Site Address: Land To The Front of The Holbrook Club North Heath Lane	
Proposal: Erection of a non-illuminated freestanding aluminium 'V' sign (Advertisement consent)	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1009	Holbrook West
Site Address: 7 Peary Close	
Proposal: Erection of a first floor side extension over existing ground floor side projection.	
Parish Council Comment Objection due to overdevelopment of the site.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1015	Roffey South
<p>Site Address: 4 Fenby Close</p> <p>Proposal: Application to confirm that partially completed loft conversion and roof additions comply with the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (Certificate of Lawful Development - Existing)</p>	
<p>Parish Council Comment</p> <p>Objection, the parish council feel the applicant must keep to the original plan submitted (DC/17/2606) and the limits stated in class B and C of Part 1, schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.</p> <p>Parish Council Comment – Amended Plan</p> <p>Objection, the parish council feel the applicant must keep to the original plan submitted (DC/17/2606) and the limits stated in class B and C of Part 1, schedule 2 of the Town & Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.</p> <p>This application would be an overdevelopment of the site and would overlook neighbouring properties with no obscured glass.</p>	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1018	Roffey North
<p>Site Address: St Robert Southwell Roman Catholic School Lambs Farm Road</p> <p>Proposal: Erection of a new detached timber-framed chapel building.</p>	
<p>Parish Council Comment</p> <p>No objection subject it to be used solely for school purposes/activities.</p>	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1047	Holbrook West
<p>Site Address: Rockwell 44 Pondtail Road</p> <p>Proposal: Erection of a three storey side extension on south elevation, rear single storey extension on east elevation, first floor extension over existing ground floor on north elevation and front porch on west elevation. Installation of two front dormer windows and two rear dormer windows.</p>	
<p>Parish Council Comment</p> <p>No objection in principle however, it was noted it was very close to the boundary.</p>	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1059	Roffey North
Site Address: First Floor 137 Crawley Road Proposal: Change of use from B1 office use into 4 no. flats including erection of a single storey first floor extension to the rear and erection of a stairway and bollards to West elevation.	
Parish Council Comment The Parish Council objects to the application as there are concerns regarding the associated parking, especially in light of the lack of information about development plans for the ground floor and the site as a whole. It was noted the site isn't currently kept in a safe and satisfactory condition.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1084	Holbrook West
Site Address: 24 Haybarn Drive Proposal: Fell 1 x Yew	
Parish Council Comment No objection to felling subject to the comments of HDC's tree officer and as long as it is to be replaced with a suitable native species.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1101	Roffey North
Site Address: 17 Rowlands Road Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear/side extension.	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1111	Roffey South
Site Address: 176 Crawley Road Proposal: Erection of an attached two storey, two bedroom dwelling	
Parish Council Comment Objection due to overdevelopment of the site.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1117	Holbrook West
Site Address: Scout Hut Peary Close Proposal: Variation of condition 8 to previously approved application DC/18/0017 (Demolition of existing former scout buildings and erection of 5 x 2 bed affordable dwellings and 3 x 1 bed affordable dwellings (including temporary accommodation) with associated car parking and landscaping). Amendments sought to change condition 8 from a pre-commencement to a pre-occupation condition.	
Parish Council Comment No objection	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1134	Holbrook East
Site Address: 68 Gateford Drive Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension over existing garage.	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1158	Holbrook East
Site Address: 11 Bailey Close Proposal: Loft conversion involving installation of front and rear dormers and hip to gable roof extension	
Parish Council Comment Objection due to it causing impact on the street scene.	
HDC Decision	WITHDRAWN

DC/18/1159	Roffey North
Site Address: 30 Ringley Road Proposal: Fell 1 x Oak, 2 x Trees of unknown species.	
Parish Council Comment Objection to felling 1 x Oak and 2 x Trees of unknown species.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1224	Holbrook East
Site Address: 'Morven' Rusper Road Proposal: Erection of a detached two bay open carport	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1227	Roffey South
Site Address: 225 Comptons Lane Proposal: Surgery to 1 x Oak	
Parish Council Comment No objection subject to comments from the HDC Tree Officer.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1231	Roffey North
Site Address: 8 Downsview Road Proposal: Removal of existing garden fence and erection of new boundary fence in line with existing principal elevation	
Parish Council Comment Objection – loss of land intended to be part of the open plan nature of the development.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1277	Roffey South
Site Address: 10 Wellwood Close Proposal: Full application for the change of use of a 6 bedroom house of multiple occupation (HMO) (C4 CLASS) to an 8-bedroom house of multiple occupation (SUI GENERIS).	
Parish Council Comment Objection; the nature of use is situated in an inappropriate location and would increase pressure/cause issues with parking. It was also noted that the original HMO was not notified to North Horsham Parish Council.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1294	Holbrook East
Site Address: 209 Comptons Lane Proposal: Fell 1 x Maple	
Parish Council Comment No objection to felling as long as it is to be replaced with a suitable native species.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1297	Roffey North
Site Address: 63 Rusper Road Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension.	
Parish Council Comment No Objection.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1300	Holbrook East
Site Address: Cedar House 8A Gateford Drive	
Proposal: Surgery 1 x Cedar	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1322	Roffey North
Site Address: 1 Willow Road	
Proposal: Surgery to 3 x Sycamore Trees	
Parish Council Comment No objection subject to comments from the HDC Tree Officer.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

DC/18/1331	Roffey North
Site Address: 51 Greenfields Road	
Proposal: Erection of a two storey annexe to existing dwelling.	
Parish Council Comment Objection – overdevelopment of the site and concern that the annexe will be sold off as a separate dwelling in the future.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1341	Roffey South
Site Address: Land at Forest Close	
Proposal: Surgery to 2 x Horse Chestnut and 1 x Lime	
Parish Council Comment No objection subject to comments from the HDC Tree Officer.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1346	Holbrook West
Site Address: 2 Park Farm Road	
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension featuring 3x rooflights and replacement of existing rear kitchen window with door.	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	

One declaration of interest.

DC/18/1356	Roffey North
Site Address: 11 Conifers Close	
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1358	Holbrook East
Site Address: Rosedene 10 North Heath Lane Proposal: Erection of a single storey side extension	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1364	Roffey South
Site Address: 6 Windmill Close Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side extension, and single storey front and side extensions.	
Parish Council Comment No objection.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1397	Roffey North
Site Address: Rouden's Yard Parsonage Farm Industrial Estate Parsonage Way Proposal: Application to confirm the lawful use of the identified land at Parsonage Farm and to establish the continuous use of land for B8 purposes for a period in excess of ten years (Certificate of Lawful Development - Existing)	
Parish Council Comment No objection but the Committee would like the planning authority to note that it may cause problems for the future development of the site.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1413	Roffey North
Site Address: The Twitten Millthorpe Road Proposal: Surgery to 5 x Sycamore Trees	
Parish Council Comment No objection subject to comments from the HDC Tree Officer.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1444	Holbrook West
Site Address: 115 Pondtail Road Proposal: Erection of first floor extensions to create a first floor to facilitate the creation of a detached two storey dwelling house from a bungalow.	
Parish Council Comment No objection in principal although there may be overshadowing to the neighbouring house.	
HDC Decision	

DC/18/1485	Roffey South
Site Address: 7 Woodland Way	
Proposal: Surgery to 2 x Oak Trees	
Parish Council Comment No objection subject to comments from the HDC Tree Officer.	
HDC Decision	PERMITTED

S106/18/0012	Holbrook East
Site Address: The Holbrook Club North Heath Lane	
Proposal: S106 Deed of Variation in relation to affordable housing provision, to comply with the Registered Provider's funding requirements in relation to paragraph, 7 and 8 of schedule 3	
Parish Council Comment No comment, the application wasn't fully understood.	
HDC Decision	

WSCC/024/18/NH	Holbrook West
Site Address: Holbrook Primary School, Holbrook School Lane	
Proposal: Amendment to condition 1 of planning permission WSCC/041/13/NH to allow the continued use and siting of a temporary classroom unit	
Parish Council Comment No objection on the condition it is for a period of no more than 5 years.	
HDC Decision	