

Planning Committee

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

Present: Mrs Brunsdon (Chairman), Mr Barrett-Miles, Mr Clark, Mr Crow, Mrs Hall, Mrs Mockridge, Mr S. Oakley, Mr Quinn, Mr R. Rogers and Mr Wickremaratchi.

Apologies were received from Mr McAra and Mr J. Rogers. Mrs Kitchen was absent.

Part I

Declarations of Interest

63. Mr R Rogers declared a personal interest in Item 5(i), application WSCC/017/16/R Rustington Community Primary School, as one of the speakers objecting to the application was known to him.

Part I Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24 May 2016

64. Resolved – that the Part I minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 24 May 2016 be agreed as a correct record.

Part II Matters

65. The Committee agreed that the Part II minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2016 be considered in Part II at the end of the meeting.

Regulation 3 Applications

WSCC/017/16/R Construction of new classroom block to provide 6 additional classrooms. Extension of hall to provide additional capacity and formation of new entrance to school buildings at Rustington Community Primary School, North Lane, Rustington, West Sussex BN16 3PW.

66. 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.

67. Mrs Marilyn Burt spoke in objection to the application as a resident and on behalf of other residents of North Lane, Rustington. Residents have formed a local group to highlight existing traffic concerns and those arising from the application. The catchment area of the school, now an Academy, has grown. Children come from many miles around and this will lead to increased car use and traffic. The solution is a new school to take the extra capacity in the area. The two narrow roads either side of the school were only designed for local traffic and not to take the current volume including delivery lorries and buses. The design of the extension is not in keeping with the current building and the construction method is low quality with no sustainable energy facilities. There is poor lighting for the classrooms and access to the building for fire appliances is limited. Noise levels will increase and mitigation by staggering break times will not benefit the

children or the residents. An adjacent horse chestnut tree is also at risk from the close proximity of the proposed building.

68. Mr Jamie Bennett, Vice-Chairman of Rustington Parish Council spoke in objection to the application. There will be increased traffic to already congested roads. Other negative impacts for neighbours of the school will include increased on-street parking, increased traffic and light pollution and a loss of privacy for the residents of Old Manor Road. The mass and height of the proposed building will be detrimental to the residents of North Lane. There has been a lack of consultation with local residents. Mr Bennett requested that construction is prohibited for one hour at the beginning and end of the school day.

69. Mr Nick White, Headteacher of Rustington Community Primary School spoke in support of the application. There is enormous pressure on school places as described in the County Council's Planning School Places document. The additional 210 children will not be enrolled immediately, just 30 children per year. The majority of the new extension nestles near the school hall and will not encroach onto the school field. A School Travel Plan is in place and a number of programmes have been used to keep the children safe and improve their health and wellbeing including Walk to School days and Park and Stride. The School has listened to local residents and changed the times of the school day to mitigate the immediate pressure on local roads. The school maintains constant pressure on parents to encourage the right behaviour with regard to parking which is an issue for all schools in West Sussex.

70. Mr Graham Tyler, the local member spoke on the application. Mr Tyler considered that this is was an ill thought out application and showed a lack of understanding by the County's Highways Department. The proposed new entrance for pedestrians from a tree-lined busy road was in a Conservation Area and it will inevitably be used for parking. The new access should be stopped up again when the construction is completed as it was not needed. The Headteacher is aware of the problems in North Lane but County Council Highways is not giving the traffic issues sufficient consideration. The School Travel Plan was not sufficiently robust as the school had not checked whether the parking locations for Park and Stride were available. It is County Council policy not to use bollards to prevent parking on grass verges so this is unlikely to be an option to prevent parking in Old Manor Drive. The application should be deferred until the objections can be addressed.

71. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Strategic Planning Manager:

Traffic congestion and parking

Points raised – concern was raised that that the School Travel Plan (including a Park and Stride scheme) did not propose a realistic solution to reduce access to the school by car. The proposed pedestrian access from Old Manor Road will result in increased parking congestion in that road with an impact on residential amenity. There should be a TRO included in the planning approval to restrict parking in Old Manor Road including zig zag lines adjacent to the proposed access. This should be paid for by the developer.

Response – with reference to the concerns about the reality and feasibility of the Park and Stride scheme, this would have to be checked with the Safer Routes to School Team when the School Travel Plan was submitted to

satisfy condition 8. There was already a culture of Park and Stride at the school. The introduction of a traffic regulation order would be a matter for the County Local Committee.

Catchment Area

Point raised – asked whether the additional pupils will be travelling from the nearby built environment or from some distance away?

Response – the school was centrally placed in the catchment area. It was not possible to know how far all the children would travel. As an Academy the school has an extended catchment area.

Capacity of school site and DfE guidance

Points raised – asked whether the increase to a three form entry and the loss of hardstanding area would result in inadequate open space for the children. The site is 1.26 ha, DfE guidance advises that for a two form entry, 2 ha is needed.

Response – it is for the Local Education Authority to consider whether adequate provision of built and open space has been provided, with reference to government guidelines (not requirements). Sport England has no objection subject to the extension of the playing field to its specifications.

Trees

Point raised – will the belt of trees which surrounds the school have to be removed?

Response - There will be some loss of trees to accommodate the need to extend the school playing field but replacement trees would be required by condition as part of the landscaping scheme.

Air Quality

Points raised – has the issue of the air quality resulting from increased numbers of cars dropping off/picking up children been considered? There is a need for a specific response on air quality.

Response – Environmental Health has not raised objections. It is unlikely that there would be sufficient additional traffic for it to have an adverse effect on air quality.

Conservation Area

Point raised – requested confirmation about whether Old Manor Road is in a Conservation Area?

Response – the school is not within a conservation area, though the southern end of Old Manor Road is. The application falls some way out of the Conservation Area.

72. The Chairman proposed that the item be deferred for further information and consideration by officers on the following issues: -
- the evidence to support the Park and Stride scheme and the overarching Travel Plan for the school;
 - the option of not including the new pedestrian access into the school from Old Manor Road;

- the options available to the Planning Committee associated with the delivery of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO);
- the response from Environmental Health Officer regarding whether increased vehicle movements would result in air quality impacts; and
- Department for Education (DofE) guidance on land requirements for school redevelopment.

This was seconded by Mr Clark.

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

74. Resolved – That the application is deferred for further information and consideration of the issues as set out in Minute 72.

WSSC/012/16/BL Construction of a stand-alone 3 storey teaching and dining block and creation of an external dining space at the Weald School, Station Road, Billingshurst, West Sussex RH14 9RY

75. 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.

76. The Strategic Planning Manager advised that there were errors in the report. Informative C should refer to the Sussex Police response. The dimensions of the three storey teaching block referred to in Paragraph 4.2 should be 60 metres x 20 metres.

77. Mrs Amanda Jupp, the local member spoke in support of the application. With reference to the Construction Management Plan, Mrs Jupp requested that there should not be access to the site from Station Road. This is a busy road with a Nursery School. Access from Natts Lane should be discussed as there would be less impact than access from Stane Street. Mrs Jupp also requested that some soft landscaping be considered along the boundary with the houses in Hurstland. An application for Operation Watershed has been submitted to ensure that the adjacent Harbrook receives regular clearing to prevent risk of flooding. Mrs Jupp suggested that a parking permit arrangement with Horsham District Council could help mitigate parking issues. The Headteacher had reported that the school could have saved costs by engaging their own architects.

78. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Strategic Planning Manager and Senior Solicitor:

Landscaping and additional trees

Points raised – that consideration is given to landscaping on the south west side of the site to help soften the loss of amenity for residents

Response – Condition 8 requires the approval of a landscaping scheme. Additional planting on this boundary could be required by officers before discharging the condition. This requirement could be referenced by way of an informative.

Surface water and foul water drainage

Points raised – that a maintenance review of ditches in the vicinity of the site is carried out.

Response – Drainage schemes required by Conditions 3 and 4, were appropriate, they could include a requirement to review the condition/maintenance of connections into existing drainage and outfall ditches, where directly related to the development.

Prohibit access from Station Road for construction traffic

Points raised – could this be added to the Construction Management Plan (Condition 11).

Response – this is not necessary as the outline construction management plan sets out the intention to use a construction access from Stane Street which is already in operation as part of the wider school expansion. There is no previous history or likelihood of access to the construction site from Station Road.

79. The recommendation, with the addition of an Informative on extra planting as set out in Minute 78, was proposed by Mr S Oakley and seconded by Mr Clark. The Committee unanimously approved the recommendation.
80. Resolved – That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions and informatives (as amended) set out in Appendix 1 of the report.

WSSC/014/16/SU

Erection of new 2 storey modular teaching block, extension of existing main hall, extension of existing car park and new layout, extension of existing hard play area and construction of new canopy to link new build and existing St Nicholas and St Mary C of E Primary School, Eastern Avenue, Shoreham by Sea, West Sussex BN43 6PE

81. 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.
82. During the debate the Committee raised the points below and clarification was provided by the Strategic Planning Manager:

Residents' amenity

Points raised – concern was raised about the impact of the development on the amenity of the residents of 95 Eastern Avenue. Could consideration be given to tree planting along the northern boundary of the property with the school?

Response – this could be included as an informative. Proposed by Mr Barrett-Miles and seconded by Mr Clark.

Capacity of the site and loss of open space

Point raised – referred to an objection by Sport England on its website which differed from the statement in Paragraph 7.4 of the report.

Response – the updated response from Sport England was not put online in advance of the meeting. Sport England has no objection.

Tree removal

Point raised – asked about the number of trees that would be removed on the school site due to the development.

Response – it was confirmed that only one tree would be removed.

School Travel Plan

Point raised – consideration to be given in the School Travel Plan to the impact on the surrounding roads of the increase in numbers of children and staff at the school.

Response – the school can work with highways officers at the County Council and the County Local Committee to mitigate the impact of the increased traffic and parking issues in the area. This could be added as a condition.

83. Mr Clark proposed that a standard condition be added requiring an updated School Travel Plan, this was seconded by Mr Quinn. The final form of wording of the condition was delegated to the Strategic Planning Manager.

84. The recommendation, with the addition of a condition on the School Travel Plan and an Informative seeking soft landscaping on the northern boundary of 95 Eastern Avenue as set out in Minute 82, was proposed by Mr Barrett Miles and seconded by Mr Clark. The Committee unanimously approved the recommendation.

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

Report on Development Management Performance (1 April 2015 – 31 March 2016)

86. The Committee received and noted a report by the Strategic Planning Manager (copy appended to the signed minutes).

87. The report was introduced by the Strategic Planning Manager who highlighted the key points. 88% of all applications were determined on time which was an improvement on the previous year's performance of 72%. Although the number of applications was lower due to a decrease in Regulation 3 applications the number of minerals and waste applications was higher and these tend to be more complex and take more time. The Chairman asked for a comparison with neighbouring authorities of the percentage of applications determined on time. This information will be included in a future report. Mr Oakley asked for information on the percentage of applications that are determined by the Planning Committees of neighbouring authorities.

Update on Mineral, Waste and Regulation 3 Planning Applications

88. 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

89. 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 24 May 2016.

Date of Next Meeting

90. The Committee noted that the next scheduled meeting would be held on Tuesday 19 July 2016 at 10.30 a.m.

Part II

91. 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.

Appeals Update

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

92. Resolved – That the Part II minutes of the meeting held on 24 May 2016 be approved as a correct record and that they be signed by the Chairman.

The meeting closed at 1.15 pm

Chairman

**Summary of Matters discussed in the absence of the Press and Public –
21 June 2016**

Appeals Update

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

92. Planning Committee approved the Part II minutes of the Planning Committee of 24 May 2016.