

HENFIELD PARISH COUNCIL
PLANS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Plans Advisory Committee

held on **Thursday 5th November 2020 at 7:00pm** via Zoom conferencing

Present: Cllrs N Stevens (Chairman), A Donoghue, M Eastwood, E Goodyear, G Perry, J Potts (HDC), A Rickard.

In Attendance: Mr J Dunckley, Mr R O'Sullivan, two residents of Henfield, Mrs B Samrah (Parish Administrator)

MINUTES

1. DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

There were none

2. APOLOGIES

Cllr R Shaw

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 15th October 2020

Approved to be signed by the Chairman at a later date in the Parish Office.

4. MATTERS ARISING

There were none.

OPEN FORUM

The Chairman introduced Mr Dunckley of Birchfield Nursey (DC/20/1906) who said that the trees he had cut down had all had permission from Will Jones, HDC's Tree Office and were either dead or dangerous. He also said that they have tried to make a success of the nursery business, but it wasn't viable. He accepted that by opening the new entrance on A281 he has harmed the street scene but that was only done because of the parking of a van on the original opening and that was not of their doing. Mr Dunckley confirmed that the new application is not for new housing but for a sustainable business. The new venture will generate less activity than the nursery would have done. The site would be returned to its previous state but with new landscaping and allow for modest employment and sustainable use of the existing buildings.

A resident spoke on behalf of Campaign to Protect Rural Henfield (CPRH) and said that what had happened is that large area of what was rural land has been converted to a large area of hardstanding which is an eyesore to people entering Henfield and to residents and it looks a mess. HDC had asked for the restoration of that hardstanding to grassland and the Building Inspector wanted evidence of what happened and when it happened. It's a complex chronological history, ultimately the hardstanding had been put there lawfully in about February this year. He also said that from CPRH's point of view it's difficult to litigate once it had the inspector's approval

In terms of facilities that are there, he said that there were various enforcement notices which hadn't been complied with. He said that he doubted the claim that there would be lots of jobs provided and felt that it would be impossible to stop this becoming a business park. He also said that if HDC were to approve planning that any conditions should be stringent and very much complied with to the letter of the law. He felt that what had been done had gone against the spirit of good neighbourliness. What is seen from the road is not as attractive as what was there before.

A neighbour of Mr Dunckley's who had lived in his home for 6 years, said he had put up with a lot more of noise than he would have expected had it been a nursery with sensible business hours, he also said that there was a lot of evening and night time activity; a lot of material being brought in late at night and the general business. The mechanics and carpentry workshop were way beyond what he had expected. Apart from the noise he also felt that its visual impact was not good and with unsightly fencing around it. He said he found it hard to believe that anything that is planned there is actually going to materialise. He had supported the new entrance on the proviso that the Highways conditions set would be complied with and they have not. The plans show extensive groundwork and extensive fencing that will cost hundreds of thousands

of pounds and that he doubted they could recoup that through storage, he did not think it would be a viable business. The Heras fence around the site has been there so long, there has been no upgrade and he couldn't see what is in the application will materialise. He also said that there was continual burning on site even up to a few nights ago. His other concerns were noise, visual impact and security; anything stored there will be susceptible to theft, the poly tunnels are not really suitable for storage. He felt that it should stay as an agricultural site.

Mr O'Sullivan (DC/20/1953 and DC/20/1954) explained that he had lived in Oak Cottage for 2 years and has already invested quite heavily in it, especially the grounds and he had an in-depth survey conducted by a specialist in this field and when several problems identified because of poor repairs since turn of this century. There is a lot of work that needs to be done to preserve the fabric of the building. He wants to upgrade it to 21st century with repairs and remove a single skin extension replacing it with kitchen/dining room extension. It had been rendered in the 1950s or 1970s with cement and that had caused the original timber framework to rot, we want to remove render and leave wall exposed. The repairs will be a huge benefit to the heritage of the property.

5. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUCEMENTS

The Chairman had no announcements

6. CONSULTATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS

DC/20/1850

Rayner Court, Cagefoot Lane, Henfield BN5 9HD

Proposed Replacement of all windows and doors

Mr A Cheek

No Objection – all agreed subject to windows being red or brown wood-effect PVC, to match existing, not white

DC/20/1891

Walders Cottage, Church Lane, Henfield BN5 9NY

Removal of fireplace and plaster from existing wall. Restore existing inglenook fireplace, bread oven and ash pit and installation of a wood burning stove (Listed Building Consent)

Mr G Sinclair

No Objection – all agreed subject to Listed Building Officer's consent

DC/20/1900

Mobile Home, Catsfold Farm, West End Lane, Henfield BN5 9RG

Demolition of existing single storey dwelling and reduction of curtilage. Erection of a double storey dwelling.

Mr and Mrs D Williams

Objection – all agreed. Contrary to HDPF policies 2, 3, 20, 25, 26, 28, 28.2, 32 and 33. The committee commented that to state Henfield Parish Council and Horsham District Council are not fulfilling land supply is incorrect. Henfield have a Neighbourhood Plan ready to go to referendum and does not support development in this area. Please link this application to that submitted by Catsfold Farm DC/20/0178.

DC/20/1906

Birchfield Nursery, Kidders Lane, Henfield BN5 9AB

Change in use of the premises to mixed-use purposes for Use Classes B8, E and as a base for a garden design and landscaping business.

Mr R Dunckley

Objection – 6 agreed, 1 against The Committee considered that the proposal was an over-industrialisation of an agricultural site. The site lay outside the built-up area boundary and was not a designated industrial site in the Horsham District Local Plan or the Henfield Neighbourhood Plan; and was contrary to HDC Planning Polices 10, 25 and 26. The Committee would encourage HDC to carry out the existing enforcement notices when permitted.

DC/20/1925

Henfield Tennis Club, Northcroft, Henfield BN5 9QB
Application to shorten 3 floodlight poles by 2 metres each and replace lamps with LEDs
Mr M Tooth
No Objection – all agreed

DC/20/1934
9 Chestnut End, Henfield BN5 9PG
Surgery to 1 x Ash
Mrs F Bloor
No Objection – all agreed

DC/20/1953
Oak Cottage, Church Lane, Henfield BN5 9NY
Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a covered store adjacent to existing shed. Construction of patio to the rear. Removal and installation of a single door to the north-east elevation and internal layout alterations (Householder Application)
Mr R O'Sullivan
No Objection – all agreed subject to Listed Building Officer's consent

DC/20/1954
Oak Cottage, Church Lane, Henfield BN5 9NY
Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a covered store adjacent to existing shed. Construction of patio to the rear. Removal and installation of a single door to the north-east elevation and internal layout alterations (Listed Building Consent)
Mr R O'Sullivan
No Objection – all agreed subject to Listed Building Officer's consent

DC/20/1959
Ridgecote, New Hall Lane, Small Dole, Henfield BN5 9YH
Erection of a first floor extension and balcony to the rear to form habitable accommodation together with associated internal alterations
Mr and Mrs N Luke
No Objection – all agreed

DC/20/2001
50 Wantley Hill Estate, Henfield BN5 9JS
Variation of Condition 2 attached to previously approved application reference: DC/19/2297 (Retrospective application for a change of use of swimming pool to mixed commercial and residential use) Amendment sought in respect of approved operating hours
Mrs Z Boniface
No Objection – all agreed

DC/20/2005
Ivy Cottage, High Street, Henfield BN5 9HP
Erection of a single storey rear extension (Listed Building Consent)
Mr C Sykes
No Objection – all agreed subject to Listed Building Officer's consent

DC/20/2018
3 London Road, Henfield BN5 9JJ
Surgery to 1 x Sycamore (Works to trees in a Conservation Area)
Ms J Slaughter
No Objection – all agreed subject to Tree Officer's consent

DC/20/2039
39 The Hooks, Henfield, BN5 9UY
Surgery to 1 x Liquid Amber
Mr H Martin
No Objection – all agreed subject to Tree Officer's consent

DC/20/2040
37 The Hooks, Henfield, BN5 9UY
Surgery to 1 x Lime
Mr J Wirdman
No Objection – all agreed subject to Tree Officer's consent

DC/20/2043
Library, High Street, Henfield BN5 9HN
Fell 2 x Trees of unknown Species (Works to Trees in a Conservation Area)
Mr N Weston
No Objection – all agreed subject to leaving the Bay Magnolia tree in situ

7. APPEALS

DC/20/0427

Land North of Sandy Lane, Henfield BN5

Outline planning application with all matters reserved (except access) for 35 dwellings, including 35% affordable housing with vehicular and pedestrian access via Dropping Holms, the provision of public open space, associated infrastructure and landscaping.

Mr W Adams

This was duly noted. A resident said that he hoped he could rely on the support of HPC and Cllr Eastwood said that since HPC had already objected to this plan earlier they had shown their support.

DC/20/0484

16 Southview Terrace, Henfield, BN5 9ES

Demolition of existing garage. Erection of a single storey side extension with roof terrace, installation of rear dormer and 2No rooflights to the front elevation.

Mrs E Evans

The Chairman said that the Committee had already objected to this planning application since it was not considered to be sympathetic to the Victorian Terrace and out of proportion. Cllr Eastwood asked whether HPC should be represented at a hearing and the Chairman said that since HDC were also objecting he did not feel that was necessary.

8. CORRESPONDENCE

1. Response to Planning for the Future – Prepared by Ray Osgood
This was duly noted
2. Senlac – DC/20/0049 – Response from Ray Osgood
It was duly noted.
3. Birchfield Nursery – DC/20/1906 – email from Mike Morgan
It was duly noted

9. ANY OTHER URGENT MATTERS TO BE RAISED BY COUNCILLORS

There were none.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

Thursday 19th November 2020 at 7:00pm via Zoom conferencing.

The meeting finished at 8.24pm