

Planning Committee

27 June 2017 - At a meeting of the Committee held at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall, Chichester.

Present: Lt Cdr Atkins, Lt Col Barton, Mr Crow (Chairman), Mr Jupp, Mrs Kitchen, Mr S. Oakley, and Mrs Russell.

Apologies: Mr Barrett-Miles, Mrs Duncton, Mr Quinn

Absent: Mr Patel

Part I

Declarations of Interest

1. In accordance with the County Council's code of conduct Mr Crow declared a personal interest as a member of Crawley Borough Council which is a consultee on Planning Application WSCC/013/17/CR (Item 7i).

Membership

2. Resolved – That the Committee noted the membership confirmed at Council on 16 May 2017 including the two unfilled vacancies from the Liberal Democrat Group.

Terms of Reference

3. Resolved – That the Committee noted the Terms of Reference

Minutes of Part of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 February 2017

4. Resolved – That the Part I minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 February 2017 be agreed as a correct record.

Urgent Matters

5. There were no urgent matters.

Part II Matters

6. The Committee agreed that all Part II matters should be considered in Part II at the end of the meeting.

Regulation 3 Application:

WSCC/013/17/CR Addition of two and single storey extensions to allow increase in pupil numbers from 2 forms of entry to 3 and associated works including increase in car parking, level crossings and making permanent the 2 classroom Nursery building. Northgate Primary School, Green Lane, Northgate, Crawley, West Sussex, RH10 8DX

7. The Committee considered a report by the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes). The report was introduced by James Neave, Principal Planner, who provided a presentation on the proposals, details of consultation and key issues in respect of the application. The following additional points of clarification were provided in addition to information in the report, as follows:

8. Geraint Thomas, the Crawley Borough Councillor for Northgate, spoke against the application; his comments were as follows: There are ongoing issues with journeys to and from the school, by car and there had been no investigation of where the additional children would come from. Crawley Borough Council's Planning Committee had objected unanimously to the application. Most of the original highways proposals had been dropped from the scheme and the proposed Barnfield zebra crossing was a fair distance from the school. The current 'park and stride' located at Northgate Playing Fields was too far away. There needed to be a pick up and drop off point located within the school. No consideration had been given to the concerns of local people and further consideration should be given to their concerns. Consideration should be given to the use of Caledonian House Car Park as a 'Park and Stride' location.

9. Dr Barry Jones, a Northgate Resident, spoke against the application; his comments were as follows: Welcomed the increase in staff parking but still felt that this would likely be insufficient. Was grateful that planners had listened to residents' concerns and dropped the proposals for a zebra crossing in Green Lane and the crossing/'build out' options in Hollybush Road. Felt that the application itself was full of inaccuracies and errors. For many years there have been issues concerning congestion around Northgate School. A number of suggestions have been made by residents to reduce this but the Highways response in all cases has been that any alterations would result in higher speeds and a greater risk to children crossing the road. Barnfield Road, Hollybush Road and Green Lane are the first roads outside the Controlled Parking Zone and all day parking along these roads has resulted in further traffic congestion. This is heightened at pick up and drop off of times and most residents have given up trying to leave or return to their homes during these times. The plans submitted by the contractor show that the construction traffic will enter the site through the Car Park for the Sure Start Centre and then proceed along the back of the centre to the school along a new road. Since this road will be required to carry heavy lorries it will need to be constructed to a reasonable standard and returned to grass at the end of the project. The school has a significant area of playing field that isn't heavily used. Leaving this roadway in place and extending it to a new entrance/exit in Green Lane or designing a different route with the aim of using it as a pick up and

Agenda Item No. 2

drop off area would answer the resident's requests. The whole scheme and subsequent investigations have concentrated entirely on the safety of the children, which while important, has totally ignored the difficulties experienced by the residents of this area.

10. Graham Olway, Principal Manager (Capital Planning and Projects), spoke in support of the application; his comments were as follows: There had been high pupil growth in the Crawley area. Ideally children would live locally to schools but parental preference means that they can apply for a school further away. Consulted in 2014 on planning school places for the future and agreed to phase additional places at Northgate. Conscious of Highways concerns raised by residents but most schools experience congestion issues at pick up and drop off times. 75% of pupils at this school travel in a sustainable manner. Some pupils do travel by car but are being encouraged to travel via other means where possible. Demolishing the unused Caretakers house will limit impact of all day staff parking on local highway network. Proposals will allow the school to provide specialist spaces for children and young people.

11. Sue Mullins, the County Council Member for Northgate & West Green, spoke on the application; her comments were as follows: The delay to the plans had had a detrimental effect to staff and pupils at the school. Expanding schools was never a cheap option and sought assurances that there would be a budget available for the much needed internal refurbishment works. The planners and architects had been very responsive to the needs of staff and students. The plans for the buildings will have little or no impact on residents. 75% of children arriving on foot are really good but there are still a lot of pupils arriving by car. Houses on Hollybush Road have driveways but there is still a lot of on-street parking. All the roads surrounding the school have parking issues as they are just outside the Controlled Parking Zone. Would have been useful to see an analysis of which crossing points are most used to ensure the zebra crossing will be used. The Caretakers house is only suitable for demolition and to be used as additional staff parking. Need to look again at whether the construction access road can be used as a drop off/pick up point.

12. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Planning Officers, where applicable:

Loss of the Caretaker's House

Point raised – it is understood that one of the reasons for the Crawley Borough Council objection includes the loss of the caretaker's house. Could officers provide further advice on the planning merits of this point?

Response – Officers confirmed that the loss of the caretaker's house was a material consideration but the committee would need to determine how much weight to give the issue. Policy H1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan was cited however, officers felt this primarily related to the provision of new housing. The caretaker's house been redundant for considerable time and was required to enable the provision of additional parking to facilitate the proposed expansion of the school. The school site is constrained with limited area for expansion. Any future use of the house would unlikely to be possible due to the difficulty in segregating it from the wider school and child safety issues. On balance officers consider that the loss of the dwelling is acceptable as it has limited future use, being located within a

school, and its removal would facilitate the provision of school places, a clear educational need.

Drop Off/Pick Up Point on site

Point raised – can a drop off/pick up point be provided on site, possibly by making use of the construction access road? Could this be secured by conditions?

Response – the Committee had to consider the application in front of them. Notwithstanding this the submitted documents suggest that this had been examined but was not considered possible as a new access would further encourage traffic on narrow roads already the subject of concern locally, would result in the loss of significant mature trees, or would require significant engineering options owing to site levels.. The construction access was a temporary road and any permanent retention would likely result in a loss of parking for the Sure Start Centre and a loss of playing field for the school which it is likely that Sport England would object to. It would not be appropriate to secure a new access by condition as this would amount to substantially different proposals and would be likely to require a planning permission in its own right. Further any such proposals would require further consultation/advertisement. The Committee had to consider the application in front of them

Park and Stride

Point raised – does the car park agreement for the current Park and Stride need to be secured?

Response – officers understand that the school has some form of agreement for the use of the Park and Stride location at the Northgate Playing Fields Car Park with Crawley Borough Council. However, how secure this agreement is, or future arrangements are unknown. Importantly, the location and use of the park and stride locations will require continued monitoring and review through a School Travel Plan.

Zebra Crossing

Point raised – What is the rationale for the proposed Zebra Crossing on Hollybush Road?

Response –the Highway Authority had indicated that it would constitute an improvement to pedestrian infrastructure in the vicinity of the site to both the benefit of both pupils and local residents and encouraging sustainable travel modes.

Impact on the Highway

Point raised – concerned about the impact of additional traffic on the highway.

Response – although the development is likely to result in an increase in vehicular trips during drop off and pick up times, common with all most schools, this impact is short lived and at regular times. The Highway Authority raises no objection on highway safety or capacity grounds. The School Travel Plan would be constantly developing and the additional numbers of children attending the school would be phased.

Drainage

Point raised – concerned about the impact upon drainage and potential to cause flooding elsewhere.

Response – The site is not in an area at risk of flooding and the WSCC Drainage advisor is not aware of historic flooding or drainage problems at the site. An outline drainage strategy has been provided which includes permeable surfacing, and subject to conditions the drainage advisor is satisfied, concluding that flood risk overall is low.

Construction Management Plan

Point raised – concerned that there was not a proposed condition relating to a construction management plan to cover hours of work, vehicle parking and movements. Particularly given the concerns highlighted by local residents.

Response – generally construction matters are covered by other health and safety requirements and legislation such as the Control of pollution act and Highways licencing but the applicant had already submitted an outline plan indicating likely controls. Members could add a condition should they wish too, and officers have a standard form of wording used historically for such conditions.

13. Mr Oakley proposed, seconded by Mr Jupp, that a condition be added to include a Construction Management Plan to cover the Hours of Work, Vehicle Movements and Vehicle Parking. This was approved by the Committee.

14. The substantive recommendation, with the additional conditional, proposed by Mrs Kitchen and seconded by Mr Oakley, was put to the Committee and approved by the majority.

15. Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and informatives, set out in Appendix 1 of the report, as agreed by the Committee.

Regulation 3 Application:

WSCC/007/17/WB Change of use of agricultural land to school playing field with associated fencing. Bramber Primary School, Bramber Road, Broadwater, Worthing, BN14 8QB

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

17. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Principal Planner, where applicable:

- **Drainage** – the drainage engineer was satisfied regarding site drainage and that that the scheme did not constitute a flood risk but would need to see a scheme for surface water drainage should planning permission be granted.

Agenda Item No. 2

- **Trees on site** – the boundary treatment surrounding the site was hedgerow surrounding a low fence to retain an open aspect.

18. The substantive recommendation, proposed by Lt Cdr Atkins and seconded by Lt Col Barton, was put to the Committee and approved unanimously.

19. Resolved – That planning permission be granted subject to conditions and informatives, set out in Appendix 1 of the report, as agreed by the Committee.

Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

20. 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

21. 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 28 February 2017.

Review of the Local List for the Validation of Planning Applications

22. The Committee considered a report by the Head of Planning Services (copy appended to the signed minutes). The report was introduced by Jane Moseley, County Planning Manager.

23. The Committee requested that Construction Management Plans be added to the Design Access Statements.

24. The substantive recommendation, proposed by Mr S. Oakley and seconded by Mrs Kitchen, was put to the Committee and approved unanimously.

Date of Next Meeting

25. The next meeting of Planning Committee will be held on Tuesday 18 July 2017 at 10.30 a.m. at County Hall North, Horsham.

Part II

26. Resolved – That under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it contains information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings as defined in Part I of Schedule 12A of the Act by virtue of the paragraph specified under the item, and in all the circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption of that information outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

Summary of Matters discussed in the absence of the Press and Public

Appeals Update

(Exempt – paragraph 5, Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings)

27. Resolved – That the Part II minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 28 February 2017 be agreed as a correct record.