Recommendations of the Planning & Services Committee meeting held on 7th November 2024

DC/24/1047- Pulborough Stud Blackgate Lane Pulborough West Sussex
Extension of an existing equestrian exercise arena
PPC Comments: No Objection

DC/24/1453/DC/24/1454 – Random Cottage, Gay street, Pulborough, West Sussex
Demolition of the glazed roof open link structure. Erection of a single storey link extension and a first floor roof extension with new dormer window. Rebuild and extend existing chimney, re-thatch existing cottage and barn and repaint existing cottage in heritage primrose yellow. Widening of the existing driveway and entrance. (Householder Application & Listed building Consent)
PPC Comments: The Committee recommended that the erection of the single storey link extension elevations are glass/glazed - No Objection

DC/24/1506 – Nutbourne Place farm, Nutbourne Lane, Nutbourne, West Sussex
Replacement of existing nursery building (with planning approval for conversion to a dwelling and staff restroom) with an energy efficient dwelling and associated staff facilities, ground mounted solar panels, upgrading of glasshouses to make them water and energy efficient and biodiversity enhancements.
PPC Comments: No Objection

DC/24/1528 - Stane Farm Stane Street Codmore Hill Pulborough
Erection of 2 no. buildings to provide 10 no. storage units in place of existing storage containers on western boundary.
PPC Comments: No Objection

DC/24/0552 – Ebbsworth Cottage The Street, Nutbourne, West Sussex
Creation of car parking and driveway and facing existing concrete retaining walls with stone to match the front garden wall, extension of existing garden wall.
PPC Comments: Objection – as previously stated The objection is rooted in the size of the concrete close to house and the size of the parking and amenity. The concrete base extends up to the walls, creating a visually prominent feature that dominates the property/landscape. This use of concrete, especially in front of the walls, is not in harmony with the surrounding properties, where gravel and open parking are more prevalent. Additionally, there are concerns about flooding on to the main road, given the impermeable nature of concrete surfaces. The expansive use of concrete not only exacerbates these flooding concerns but also monopolises a significant portion of the driveway space. Opting for a more traditional gravel surface would not only address these water seepage worries but also blend better with the neighbourhood aesthetics. In a previous application, the Inspector noted at appeal the following in section 14 - Paragraph 205 of the Framework advises that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

Consistent with that approach, paragraph 206 says that any harm to, or loss of, the significance of a designated heritage asset, including from its alteration, should require clear and convincing justification.
The Planning application is unchanged from the previous application which was refused DC/23/0339 which also went to appeal. The footprint Has not changed, no benefit for off road parking the benefits do not outweigh the harm to the heritage asset.

CA/24/0034 – Pulborough Recreation Ground, Rectory Close, Pulborough
Surgery to 1x Lime (Works to Trees in a Conservation Area)
PPC Comments: No Comment, tree on parish land please refer to Andy Bush.

CA/24/0035 – Westminster House, Flat 2 Station Road Pulborough
Fell 1x Goat Willow (Works to Trees in a Conservation Area)
PPC Comments: Objection - On the grounds that the application details on your website. The applicant has ticked no to the TPO question when the application from HDC states development type is TPO.

DC/24/1346 – Mead House Tudor Close Pulborough West Sussex
Erection of a single storey side and rear extension
PPC Comments: No Objection

DC/24/1573 – Staalcot Farm, Stall House Lane, North Heath, Pulborough
Use of land for the stationing of 4no. static caravans for residential purposes, together with the formation of hardstanding and associated landscaping and the construction of associated utility buildings.
PPC Comments: The committee strongly objects to this application. This application is identical to DC/23/2098 in every aspect except water neutrality. There has been no water quality assessment since 1937. Water quality assessment should be conducted before planning permission is granted. Water neutrality statement/calculation as per Part G of the Building Regulations is not accurate. The proposed borehole is within 50 metres of a septic tank (Laural Cottage), which is not permissible. It is also too close to the proposed Caravans. The application is also proposing 4 cess pits which need to be 50 metres from the borehole which is not achievable on the proposed site. There is also concern over the following policies:

- Policy 26 Countryside Protection – Outside the built-up area boundaries the rural character of the countryside will be protected against inappropriate development.
- Policy 32 Quality of New Development – The development should complement locally distinctive characters and heritage – This application is directly opposite a historic listed building.
- Policy 33 Development Principles – Development will be required to ensure a design that avoids unacceptable harm to the occupiers/users of nearby property and land. This clearly fails as it is directly opposite an historic listed building.
- Policy 34 Cultural and Heritage Assets – Development should retain and improve the setting of heritage assets including views, public rights of way, trees and landscape features, including historic public realm features". This is adjacent to a public footpath that is within the development. As per the previous report from the heritage officer.

There has been no traffic assessment undertaken yet especially when vehicle movements along this very narrow country lane could increase dramatically. These vehicle movements would cross two public footpaths and with no designated areas for walkers, horse riders,
cyclists or vehicles. Therefore, the application fails policy 40 of Horsham Planning Policy Framework on points 4, 5 and 6 of the policy:
4. Includes opportunities for sustainable transport which reduce the need for major infrastructure and cut carbon emissions
5. Is located in areas where there are, or will be a choice in the modes of transport available.
6. Minimises the distance people need to travel and minimises the conflict between traffic, cyclists and pedestrians.
As this application is not consistent with the following policies - 23, 25, 32 and 33 of the HDC Planning Framework 2015. The proposed development does not support Policy 40 'Sustainable Transport', in particular points 2, 5 and 6 which are deemed relevant to this application.

DC/24/1650 – Oak Ridge, Rectory Lane, Pulborough, West Sussex
Surgery to 2x Pine, 1x Walnut, 1x Chestnut and 1x Oak.
PPC Comments: No Objection

DC/24/1572 – Shepherds Thatch, Nutbourne Lane, Nutbourne, West Sussex
Erection of a close boarded boundary fence on western length of the southern border of the property.
PPC Comments: No Objection