

Planning Committee

27 September 2016 - At a meeting of the Committee held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Mrs Mockridge (Chairman), Mr Clark*, Mr Crow, Mrs Hall, Mrs Kitchen, Mr McAra, Mr S. Oakley, Mr J. Rogers and Mr R. Rogers.

*Mr Clark arrived at 10.32.

Apologies: Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Brunsdon, Mr Quinn and Mr Wickremaratchi.

Substitutes: None.

Declarations of Interest

160. Mrs Kitchen declared a personal interest in application WSCC/028/16/NH, Former Wealden Brickworks (Site HB) because she is a Horsham District Council Councillor.

Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 September 2016

161. Resolved – That the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6 September 2016 be agreed as a correct record.

Regulation 3 Application

WSCC/047/16/CC Expansion of school including a two storey extension, revised car park arrangements, highway layby and footpath links, and associated hard/soft landscaping at Parklands Community Primary School, Durnford Close, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 3AG

162. The Committee considered a report by the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes). The report was introduced by the County Planning Manager who provided a presentation on the proposals, details of consultation and key issues in respect of the application. The Committee were advised that Chichester City Council have now responded to the consultation, stating no objection. There has been no response so far from Chichester District Council, however, it should be noted they did respond to a previous application which was subsequently withdrawn and replaced with the current application. No objection but concern was raised about the relocated netball court being closer to housing; the removal of the temporary classrooms, the new vehicle drop off area and layby were welcomed.

163. Catherine Cannon, local resident spoke in objection to the application. The design encourages cars closer to the school; where it ought to encourage active modes of transport. Assumed figures for travel to school are flawed: alternative methods of transport are over-estimated, and travel by car is under-estimated. Pedestrians still have to cross traffic flows to access school grounds. The layby will bring parked cars closer to pedestrians and the 15 minute waiting time won't be observed. The crossing location is too close to the junction. Parents will park in the drop-off zone and stay until school starts, limiting numbers able to use this zone, thereby causing traffic problems. The proposed entrance should be moved

from opposite the entry to the church car park at St Wilfrids: also, parents are advised this is a private car park, so it should not be in the Travel Plan. Alternatives could be the Baptist Church which has offered use of their car park, and parking by the shops on Oliver Whitby Road. Car share and walking buses could be encouraged. Durnford Close should be residents parking only. The proposed cycle and scooter parking is insufficient and not undercover.

164. Leigh Hunnikin, Project Manager, Capital Planning & Projects spoke in support of the application. The development is needed due to growth in pupil numbers in Chichester and to offer children places close to home. Pupil numbers will continue to gradually increase until the school reaches full capacity in 2021. The proposed additional buildings meet guidelines for pupil and staff numbers. The new small hall is required to allow hot meals to be served and to deliver the PE and music curriculum; additional facilities including pupil WCs, group rooms and a replacement Special Support Centre. External area sizes are not statutory, but the County Council and the School are satisfied that guidelines have been met. There is no objection from Sport England. The Travel Plan has been updated. An on-site drop off/pick up area has been created to reduce the impact of additional cars and there are further works to improve access to the school and waiting areas for parents and additional scooter and cycle parking. Additional TROs can be funded from the project budget, subject to approvals.

165. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the County Planning Manager, where applicable:

Need for development

Point raised – the requirement for additional school places is acknowledged and the grounds are large enough to accommodate the development.

Site Drainage

Points raised – As noted in the Committee report, there is a history of flooding on the site causing water run-off and surface water flooding in nearby roads. The Committee acknowledges this is a concern and proposals should mitigate any adverse impact where possible; the Committee wishes the school to seriously consider using the recommended porous surfacing for hardstanding and parking areas and to utilise soft landscaping and planting, wherever possible and in the most appropriate areas, to support improvements to drainage.

Response – It is expected with the current proposals that there will be betterment in site drainage. Some site re-profiling is required and further groundwater monitoring and testing must be put in place before condition 3 is discharged. The School is considering recommendations for porous surfacing: costs are higher and more maintenance is required, but this type of surfacing is more flexible in terms of where it can be laid. Additional planting can help to form part of the drainage structure. Officers should have flexibility to approve the scheme which best suits the situation in discharge of the condition.

Impact of Fencing

Point raised – That the proposal fencing is utilitarian and it could be viewed as dehumanising to fence children in.

Removal of Trees

Point raised – Concern was raised about the removal of mature trees on site to make way for access to the on-site parking/drop off.

Response – The WSCC Trees Officer is satisfied that enough has been done to minimise the impact on trees; the removal of trees is not ideal but many mature trees will remain, new trees will be planted, and the site will remain well planted and well screened at the front.

School Travel Plan and impact on the Highways

Point raised – It is disappointing that that content of the School Travel Plan is not specified. Concerned parties should be encouraged to raise the matters of parking and use of alternative transport methods with the School and the County Local Committee (CLC). Clarification on the impact of increased pupil number and travel by car to the school was sought.

Response – The current School Travel Plan was submitted with the application and is available with other planning documents online. The school updates the Travel Plan once a year. Condition 6 requires an updated Plan to be submitted and approved prior to first occupation of the development to take account of the additional pupils, once their home locations are known. The Plan doesn't form part of the mitigation strategy, but it should promote alternative means of transport including public transport, walking, cycling and park and stride to reduce car usage. The condition is enforceable. The anticipated additional pupil numbers arriving by car is 42, but it is felt this is an overestimate as it does not allow for siblings or car sharing, and impacts should also be mitigated by proposed reconfiguration of parking and drop-off arrangements.

Additional TROs

Point raised – If additional TROs are required will they be proposed and funded through the CLC?

Response – Any proposal will be dealt with separately and there are new proposals by government which should help speed up the process.

166. The recommendation, proposed by Mr McAra and seconded by Mr Clark, was put to the Committee and approved unanimously.

167. Resolved - That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions and informatives (as amended) set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

168. There was a short recess at 11.17. The Committee reconvened at 11.22.

Waste Planning Application

WSCC/028/16/NH Variation of condition 1 (amended site layout) and 25 (storage of imported wastes and processed materials) of WSCC/077/15/NH at Former Wealden Brickworks (Site HB), Langhurstwood Road, Horsham, West Sussex, RH12 4QD

169. The Committee considered a report by the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes). The report was introduced by the Strategic Planning Manager who provided a presentation on the proposals, details of consultation and key issues in respect of the application. The Committee was

advised that further to Horsham District Council's Environmental Health Officer's objection on the basis that dust emissions cannot be controlled, Langhurstwood Road Residents' Association has also objected to the application based on these comments and that Local member Peter Catchpole, Member for Holbook has stated that he supports the Residents' Associations objections. It should be noted that the crushing and processing of waste materials is subject to a Dust Management Plan and the application is temporary to allow for assessment of any impact arising from the proposals.

170. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the County Planning Manager and Solicitor, where applicable:

Breaches of planning conditions

Point raised - Concerns were raised about previous non-compliance with planning conditions by the applicant and their use of applications to vary conditions to get around these.

Response – The current issue was picked up by planning officers during a site visit; this application is the preferred method of resolution to regularise operations, which must be considered prior to formal enforcement action.

Impact of noise and dust

Point raised – The impact of noise and dust is not insignificant.

Response – The crushing and processing of waste materials is already allowed outside and is subject to a Dust Management Plan, which would also cover the matter of the storage of materials without the use of bays.

Impact on drainage and potential contamination of wider area

Points raised – Allowing stockpiles outside means there will be more contamination of the wider industrial area due to debris carried in water run-off, because they are not protected from rainfall like stockpiles in covered bays. Additionally, buildings on the site do not have full guttering and rainwater runs off roofs onto the site and not into the drains. These issues, added to water from dampening down, may cause contamination and drainage problems for nearby businesses. Also, additional material running off the stockpiles will adhere to vehicle wheels and cause debris on the road.

Response – It is agreed that stockpiles may contain finer materials and they are more likely to be carried off site. A condition requiring updated surface water management details could be considered. Highways legislation requires that businesses do not allow roads to become unsafe, but a condition could be considered to prevent debris being tracked onto roads.

Impact on Highways

Point raised – Clarification was sought over whether there will be any additional HGV movements.

Response – No additional HGV movement are requested in this application. The applicant is currently operating within the allowable HGV capacity.

Siting of the weighbridge

Point raised – The weighbridge should be sited within the bund as its proposed location outside of the bund to the south of the site could potentially cause narrowing of the road and danger to traffic.

Response – Officers have limited powers in relation to approval of positioning of the weighbridge and cannot require this to be in a certain position, but only advise if a proposed position is acceptable.

171. Mr Oakley proposed that the item be deferred for further information and consideration by officers on based on the following: -

- that the Committee is not satisfied that sufficient evidence has been provided that to show that drainage arrangements are of correct size and capacity to manage water and debris run off; and
- that there is insufficient information to assess the duty of care to other users in relation to contamination of the wider site and the impact on roads to and from the site.

This was seconded by Mr J. Rogers.

172. The Committee voted on the proposal to defer the item, the majority voted in favour of a deferral.

173. Resolved – That the application is deferred for further information and consideration of the issues as set out in Minute 171.

Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

174. The Committee received and noted a report by the Strategic Planning, County Planning Manager on applications awaiting determination (copy appended to the signed minutes) detailing the schedule of County Matter applications and the schedule of applications submitted under the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 – Regulation 3.

Report of Delegated Action

175. The Committee received and noted a report by the Strategic Planning, County Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes) applications approved subject to conditions under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Regulation 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992 since the Planning Committee meeting on 6 September 2016.

Date of Next Meeting

176. The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Tuesday 1 November 2016 at 10.30 a.m.

The meeting closed at 11.54 pm

Chairman