

From: Planning@horsham.gov.uk
Sent: 27 January 2021 15:37
To: Planning
Subject: Comments for Planning Application DC/20/2596

Planning Application comments have been made. A summary of the comments is provided below.

Comments were submitted at 3:36 PM on 27 Jan 2021.

Application Summary

Address: Brinsbury Fields Stane Street North Heath West Sussex

Proposal: Reserved Matters application for appearance, layout, landscaping and scale pursuant to approved outline application DC/17/0177 (which included access from Stane Street A29) for up to 6 commercial buildings comprising a mix of B1, B2 and B8 Use Classes.

Case Officer: Matthew Porter

[Click for further information](#)

Customer Details

Address: 45 Welbeck Street London

Comments Details

Commenter Type: Neighbour

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Reasons for comment: - Other

Comments: Dear Sirs

Executive summary:

This reserved matters application fails to demonstrate how the proposed development has been designed to address the very special circumstances that are the only basis for an outline permission that was contrary to the development plan; and incorporates changes so substantial that they go well beyond what is admissible through a reserved matters application.

We are instructed by [REDACTED] of Heathcote, Stallhouse Lane, Pulborough to object to this Reserved Matters application, which is defective in several respects, as follows:

1.

When the outline planning application (DC/17/0177) was reported to Committee, the report made it very clear that the proposed development was a significant departure from the development plan. It was noted (para 6.69) that:

"Whilst the Site Specific Allocations of Land DPD and Brinsbury Centre of Rural Excellence SPD allow for development of the Campus, this is strictly on the proviso that such development helps secure the financial future of the campus, provides clear training links to support its status as a Centre for Rural Excellence, and reflects the rural location of the Brinsbury Campus without detracting from the rural environment. The examining Inspector for the DPD is clear in his expectation that if development under by Policy AL15 'became more than a small and limited means of achieving this need [to support the financial and educational needs of the Campus] then development should not be permitted.' Given the scale of the development across 6.8ha remote from the main Campus buildings, the proposal significantly exceeds the inspector's justification for supporting Policy AL15."

Planning permission was eventually granted, but only because of the very special circumstances of the requirements of Brinsbury College, and only on the basis of a Section 106 agreement that contained strict measures to ensure that the proposed development should be linked closely to College.

It follows that a reserved matters application should explain how the proposed development has been tailored to address the very special circumstances underlying the permission. While there are numerous references to Brinsbury College in Vail Williams' Planning Statement, there is no evidence of the proposed development having been designed with the College's requirements in mind, and so as to ensure that it is best placed to be occupied and operated so as to maximise the likelihood of educational and training links being developed with the College.

It is difficult to avoid the reader gaining the impression that the College's name was used to good effect to secure the outline planning permission, and that it is now being used as a gloss to assist with securing reserved matters consent, but that no attempt (let alone an attempt consistent with the best endeavours required by the Section 106 agreement) has been made to tailor the proposed development to the needs of occupiers who need and/or would take advantage of proximity to the College.

The Council should require evidence of the work that has been done to address the need for a meaningful educational and training link with the College before taking the effectively irreversible step of granting reserved matters consent. If it fails to do so, the buildings could prove to be of the wrong size, disposition and/or design to achieve the essential purpose for which outline permission was granted.

2.

The Planning Statement provided by Vail Williams states

that "The general layout of the site aligns with the approved proposed plot layout plan (ref: P104 P7 and Landscape Masterplan Strategy (ref: LDD1047/02 04))."

However, Condition 1 of the outline permission ref: DC/17/0177 requires the development to be "...carried out in accordance with the approved plans listed... Proposed plot layout P104 P4."

This is not merely a drafting error: the reserved matters submission appears to have been drawn up with reference only to revision P7, and so is inconsistent with the outline planning permission in several respects:

- a) Buildings shown as 'unit 1', 'unit 4' and 'unit 6' are not consistent with the approved plan in terms of layout and/or size;
- b) The location of recycling/refuse stores to the west is in different locations;
- c) A bus stop link path has been added.

The above list is not necessarily comprehensive.

There are similar issues with the Landscape Masterplan Strategy, where the reserved matters submission departs significantly from what was approved at outline stage. There are various inconsistencies, including:

- a) Substantially greater tree loss along the Stane Street frontage.
- b) The introduction of a sub-station by the site entrance.
- c) Visitor and staff car parking and cycle parking are inconsistent.
- d) Air source heat pumps have been introduced.
- e) Hardstanding has encroached into the "potential meadow habitat border/ecology buffer" by the railway.

Cumulatively, these are substantial departures from the outline permission, which cannot properly be dealt with through a reserved matters application. The applicant should be advised to withdraw and submit a s73 application to seek to amend the outline permission.

I shall be grateful for your acknowledgement of this letter, and if you will advise me of the advice you will be providing to the applicants.

Yours sincerely,

