

## DOCUMENT A

### Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 07 September 2017 from 2.00 p.m. to 3.55 p.m.

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

Ginny Heard  
Christopher Hersey  
Colin Holden  
\* Absent

Norman Mockford\*  
Edward Matthews\*

Anthony Watts Williams  
Peter Wyan

**Also Present:** Councillors Margaret Hersey, Andrew MacNaughton and Linda Stockwell.

The Chairman brought to the attention of Members the recent passing of Councillor Bob Mainstone who was a valued Member of the Planning Committee. The Chairman then invited Members, Officers and those in the public gallery to stand in a minute's silence in memory of Councillor Bob Mainstone.

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

None

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Committee noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Edward Matthews and Councillor Norman Mockford.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Christopher Hersey declared an interest in DM/17/2271 as the site sits within his Ward. He stated that he comes to the meeting with open mind to consider the representations of the public speakers, Officers and Members of the Committee and is not predetermined.

**4. MINUTES**

The Minutes of 9th August 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED**

DM/17/0205 – Land Adjacent To Superstore, Hammonds Ridge, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9LS

Susan Dubberley, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Report for the erection of 51 dwellings (16 affordable) with new access, including access for the community facility. She explained how the site lies within the built up area of Burgess Hill situated east of the Tesco Superstore and because the Council cannot currently

demonstrate an agreed five year land supply paragraph 49 of the National Planning Policy Framework is applicable in this deliberation.

Paul Madge, local resident, spoke against the application. Tom Hayhurst, architect, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member believed the design of the flats was out-keeping with the local area so queried why the recommendation was to approve. A second Member also thought the design was disappointing.

The Chairman directed the Member to the report of the Urban Designer and asked the Senior Planning Officer to comment.

The Senior Planning Officer outlined how on the original scheme there were more houses which faced onto Tesco's car park however this was changed to flats and subsequently the design was changed in response to the design panel and Urban Designer's comments.

The Chairman then reiterated his point regarding the design stating to Members that they require planning reasons to refuse the application.

A Member brought to the attention of the committee an existing problem in the local area with parking. He described the parking at 8pm as being difficult as residents return home from work and park on the road causing an obstruction.

The Vice-Chairman commented on this detailing how the number of car parking spaces is suitable for this development and that Members cannot use an application to solve the issues of a previous application. The Chairman added that if residents have concerns around parking, it is the responsibility of the Police and not the Planning Committee.

One Member queried if the Urban Designer had made amendments to his initial Summary and Overall Assessment of the development in Appendix B in which he objected to the design of the scheme.

Susan Dubberley, Senior Planning Officer, confirmed to the Member that the Urban Designer had made amendments to his comments which were included in Appendix B of the Report. She states that he is now content with the design following amendments from the applicant which resulted from his initial comments.

As no other Members wished to speak, the Chairman then moved the application as recommended which was agreed unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

That permission be approved subject to the completion of a legal Agreement to secure affordable housing and infrastructure contributions and the conditions set in Appendix A.

DM/17/1329 – Land South West Of Handcross Primary School, London Road, Handcross, West Sussex, RH17 6HB

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations, introduced the Report for a reserved matters application for 75 dwellings and drew Member's

attention to the Agenda Update Sheet. He outlined how the following application DM/17/1331 is subject to the outcome of the current application being discussed. This is due to an issue with the clustering where only 20 affordable dwellings instead of 23 dwellings could be provided in the current scheme however the following application on the agenda aims to make up the shortfall from this application. The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations added that the Urban Designer has no objection to the application and although more of trees will have to be removed than originally expected, the Tree Officer is also content.

The Chairman noted that there were no speakers and Members were content with the application so moved to the recommendation which was agreed unanimously. Members also agreed to delegate their powers to officers in regard to resolving the issue with the overspill of affordable housing through a Section 106 variation.

## **RESOLVED**

That Reserved Matters consent be granted, subject to the conditions listed at Appendix A.

DM/17/1331 – Land South West Of Handcross Primary School, London Road, Handcross, West Sussex, RH17 6HB

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations, introduced the Report for 21 dwellings with 9 affordable housing units which include 3 additional units from the previous application above what was required by the existing policy. This was required as a result of the outcome of the previously approved application. He added that following the comments made by the Urban Designer to put the flats together the applicants are willing to make the requested changes to their application.

The Chairman noted that there were no speakers and Members were content with the application so moved to the recommendation which was agreed unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

That permission be granted, subject to the conditions listed at Appendix A and a Section 106 agreement to include the affordable homes as described.

DM/17/2271 – Land To The East Of High Beech Lane/, Land North Of Barrington Close, Barrington Close, Lindfield, West Sussex, RH16 2DQ

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations, introduced the Report for an outline application for 43 dwellings and 3 custom build plots. He drew Member's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and outlined how all matters, apart from access, are reserved.

The Chairman began the discussion by querying whether the self-build plots will require a second application.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations confirmed that they would be subject to a further Reserved Matter submission.

Councillor Margaret Hersey, Member of Lindfield Parish Council, spoke against the application.

Hilary May, local resident, and Gil Kennedy, Chairman of the Lindfield Preservation Society, spoke against the application.

Andrew Munton, applicant, and Robert Pummey, architect, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Linda Stockwell, Ward Member for High Weald, spoke against the application.

The Chairman reiterated his previously point by stating that any planning application should address the issues that the application causes and that an application cannot be used to solve existing problems.

A Member mentioned that in a 2016 SHLAA assessment this was listed as a 3 tick site however he raised concerns regarding access with only one access route provided in the scheme.

Another Member took issue with the access of the development with vegetation having to be removed and flattened to create the access. He added that the Lindfield Neighborhood Plan has been made following comment from the Planning Inspector so it should be given weight in the discussion.

Tom Clark, Solicitor to the Council, explained that the Lindfield Neighborhood Plan did not allocate any housing supply so could not be given full weight in the discussion. He informed Members that they must make a balancing exercise as described in Paragraph 14 of the NPPF.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations added that the design of the access is in accordance with national standards. In respect to impact on the character of the area through the loss of vegetation he made reference to the Penland Farm scheme that was allowed on appeal, despite the impact of significant highway infrastructure on the appearance of the area. Furthermore, he mentioned the previous application on the site was withdrawn following concerns raised by officers but this current application has addressed those concerns as no objections have been raised by those same officers.

A Member believed there to be no planning reason for refusal but wanted confirmation that the area of the access road would not be subject to any development.

Tom Clark, Solicitor to the Council, confirmed that within the S106 agreement the land would be kept as it is and could come under Council ownership, however these matters would be for discussion as part of the S106 Agreement.

Nick Rogers, Business Unit Leader for Development Management, suggested that following the speakers comments he recommends a condition in relation to site levels and the completion of a land stability report.

The Vice-Chairman commented that there would be a character impact on High Beech Lane and fears for the access however WSCC Highways have approved so he is content.

A Member requested clarification on the contents of condition 10.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations explained how the final details regarding drainage would be confirmed at a later date as part of the condition however drainage officers are content with the plans.

The Chairman noted that there were no more speakers and Members had not moved a motion to refuse the application so moved to the recommendation which was agreed with 5 in favour and 2 against.

### **RESOLVED**

It is recommended that planning permission be approved subject to the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure affordable housing and infrastructure contributions and the conditions set in Appendix A.

### **6. ITEMS CONSIDERED URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

Chairman.