

DOCUMENT A

Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 13 July 2017 from 2.00 p.m. to 2.35 p.m.

Present: Robert Salisbury (Chairman)
John Wilkinson (Vice-Chairman)

Ginny Heard
Christopher Hersey
Colin Holden*
* Absent

Bob Mainstone*
Edward Matthews
Norman Mockford

Anthony Watts Williams
Peter Wyan

Also Present: Councillors Jonathan Ash-Edwards, Margaret Hersey and Andrew MacNaughton.

1. SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE – COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4

The Committee noted that Councillor Margaret Hersey is substituting for Councillor Colin Holden.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Committee noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Colin Holden and Councillor Bob Mainstone.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of 15th June 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED

DM/17/1136 Perrymount House, 38-42 Perrymount Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3DN

Susan Dubberley, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report to Members stating that this was an amendment to a previously accepted planning application (DM/16/0665) for a four-storey, 78 bed hotel and associated restaurant. This site is situated to the south of Clair Hall and to the east of Clair Court, an existing residential block of flats.

The original application was granted in October 2016 and this amendment was due to an easement on the northern carriageway providing access to the nearby flats. As

a result of this, the building footprint has been redesigned, along with the addition of an all-glazed curved ground floor café and the removal of the previously approved stepped arrangement. These changes do result in a minor change to the existing proposed undercroft car park layout.

A daylight and sunlight assessment has been made for the affected properties within Clair Court. The assessment is introduced by stating that if there is 20% reduction or more in daylight; the loss becomes materially noticeable. The assessment found that there would be between a 20% and 40% reduction for bedroom and kitchen windows to three flats located at ground first and second floor at the western end of Clair Court. Planning Officers however, consider this to be a marginal level of non-compliance.

The Senior Planning Officer concluded the report by showing Members pictures of the proposed development and recommending the application for approval.

Councillor Jonathan Ash-Edwards, District Ward Member for Haywards Heath – Heath, gave a balanced outline of the application. He stated that there was a need for a hotel within Haywards Heath as part of the emerging economic strategy. He does however; acknowledge the impact that the redesign of the site has on the neighbouring Clair Court. He cited that the 20-39% reduction of light would prove materially noticeable for residents. In addition, he questioned as to whether the size and design of the proposed building is now too great for the site. He asked the Committee to carefully balance the positives and negatives of the application before making their decision.

One member raised his concern for the application. He stated that the reduction of light to Clair Court would have a negative effect on the welfare of residents. He stated the welfare of the residents is more important than the economic advantages of the site and therefore, would not support the application.

Another member welcomed the changes to the west elevation of the site. He did however; raise concern for the loss of light to residents. He asked a question in regards to an injunction due to the loss of light which the owners of the flats in Clair Court said they would take.

Franca Currall, Solicitor & Deputy Monitoring Officer, answered this question by stating that this was a private matter and not a planning consideration issue.

A further member stated that she was torn on her views for the application. She did appreciate the need for a hotel within the area but had concern for the residents' welfare. She asked as to whether the size of the building could be reduced to alleviate these concerns.

The Chairman answered this query by confirming that the developer requires the site to be a 78 bed hotel and it is a case of finding an appropriate balance. He reiterated the economic benefit that this application would provide to the area.

One member echoed the sentiments of the Chairman, agreeing that due to the need for a hotel within the area, this application would signify an economic benefit. He agreed that the lighting reduction for Clair Court is an issue however, said that the Planning Officers had approved the reductions and that they are qualified to do so.

The Chairman then went on to say that this application would form part of the Haywards Heath Masterplan. He referenced the height of the proposed building,

confirming that this would not look out of place with the surrounding area, due to other planned developments which form the Masterplan.

A member disagreed with a previous sentiment in regards to the Planning Officers being qualified to approve the loss of light. He stated that the loss of light would provide a significant impact to the residents. A further member agreed with this sentiment stating that the reduction is significant.

One member wished to reference page 11 of the report which indicated that Haywards Heath Town Council did not raise any objection to the proposal. The Chairman then reminded members that this application would provide self-sustainable economic growth for the area and that the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan does carry weight within the approval.

Councillor Edward Matthews proposed that the application be refused on the grounds that the residents of Clair Court would experience a significant loss of light due to the overbearing impact of the proposed building and this was seconded by Councillor Ginny Heard. 4 members voted in favour of the proposal and 4 members voted against the proposal, the Chairman had the casting vote, whereby he rejected the proposal.

The Chairman then moved the application as recommended, 4 members voted in favour of the application and 4 members voted against. The chairman again, had the casting vote and moved to vote in favour of the application.

RESOLVED

To approve the application subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A.

6. ITEMS CONSIDERED URGENT BUSINESS

None.

Chairman.