

**Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee
held on 12 October 2017 from 2.00 p.m. to 3.32 p.m.**

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

Ginny Heard	Norman Mockford	Anthony Watts Williams
Christopher Hersey	Edward Matthews	Peter Wyan
Colin Holden	Colin Trumble	
* Absent		

Also Present: Councillors Marsh & MacNaughton

The Chairman Proposed that Councillor Hersey will be Vice-Chairman for the meeting, this was agreed unanimously.

**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 Wilkinson.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of 7 September 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED

DM/17/2534 – Land East Of Brighton Road, Brighton Road, Pease Pottage,
West Sussex, RH11 9YA

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader of Major Development and Investigations, drew Members attention to the agenda update sheet and the deletion of condition 1. This was because the Tree and Landscaping Officer was content with landscaping plans submitted after the Agenda had been circulated. The Officer then went on to introduce the Report for the construction of 156

dwellings, 24-bed hospice facility, community hub with associated access, parking open space and associated infrastructure and earthworks.

Councillors Gary Marsh and Andrew MacNaughton, Ward Members for Ardingly and Balcombe spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman opened discussion of the application to the committee at which point a Member commented on the Design Panels opinion that it was a missed opportunity and that the proposal is contrary to Objectives S1, S2 and S3 of the High Weald AONB Management Plan and does not conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald AONB contrary to Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act and the NPPF paragraph 115.

The Team Leader of Major Development and Investigations, informed the Committee that the Urban Designer believed the scheme commendably avoids the ubiquitous pseudo-traditional Sussex vernacular and the contemporary styled frontages benefit from some individuality that contributes to giving the scheme a sense of place. He commented that the Tree and Landscape Officer was content with the landscaping proposals for the site and he considered that the objectives S1, S2 and S3 of the AONB Management Plan were not conflicting with the proposal.

A Member queried whether the suggested conditions requested by the Urban Designer had been adequately incorporated. The Officer believed that the suggested condition 4 covered all the relevant issues.

A Member asked whether there were more illustrations of the proposed designs over concerns that the social housing design and the market housing design differed. The Officer explained the Housing Officer was content that a tenure blind design had been used and although the Design Panel originally raised concerns, this matter had been addressed.

Councillor Trumble moved to the recommendation for approval which was seconded by Councillor Matthews and agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That Reserved Matters application be granted, subject to the condition and informatives set out in Appendix A.

DM/17/2570 – No's 15 And 39 Crawley Down Road, Felbridge, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 2NT

Susan Dubberley, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Report outlining the application for the erection of 63 dwellings and new vehicular access onto Crawley Down Road required the demolition of existing buildings and structures at No's 15 and 39 Crawley Down Road. The Officer informed Members that the majority of site falls within Mid Sussex District Council, however the access falls within Tandridge District Council and they are currently considering an application for the proposed access. The Officer

guided Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included objections from Felbridge Parish Council, Tandridge District Council and 2 additional neighborhood representatives.

Rex Whittaker, the Ward Member for the Town Council, spoke against the application.

Jeremy Clarke, Claire Boughton-Tucker and Ian Gibson, were all residents who spoke in objection to the application.

James Bevis and Meryl Baker, the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Solicitor to the Council clarified that the issue of access to the proposed site was a matter for the Tandridge District Council and Surrey County Council as Highways Authority for that District.

In response to Councilors' questions, the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, informed the Committee that the matter of housing numbers (AON and unmet need), and therefore the 3 and 5 year housing land supply, were matters to be determined as part of the development plan and as such were still subject to the examination. Although at the last Hearing into the District Plan the Government Inspector indicated that he considered that a 5 year housing land supply could be demonstrated he indicated that this was tight and that, at this stage, this view could not be given any legal weight. The Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy reminded councilors that the housing supply policies of the emerging District plan were the subject of Main Modifications and the ongoing consultation and therefore little weight could be afforded to them at this stage. The Council has received legal advice that until the Government Inspectors report is published the Council cannot rely on any unofficial estimates of land supply.

A Member questioned why the Inspector into the Folders Lane Inquiry had referred to the fact that in his view Mid Sussex had over a 3 year housing land supply. The Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy confirmed that the housing land supply issue had not be subject of debate at the S78 Appeal as all had acknowledged that this was still subject of debate at the District Plan Examination in Public.

A Member questioned the reason for this application due to Tandridge District Councils objection in the Agenda Update Sheet. The Senior Planning Officer explained that as Tandridge had still to determine the application for the access from this site, they had included a holding objection in their recommendation to Mid Sussex District Council.

Another Member explained to the Committee that this application would exacerbate the traffic problems already found in the Crawley Down area and that the proposals would be contrary to the East Grinstead Neighborhood Plan Policies EG2a (1, 2 and 3), 5b, 5c and 11 the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 32.

One Member wanted to move against the recommendation but also indicated that he would agree to a deferral until the District Plan has been adopted as at that stage the 5 year housing land supply would be confirmed and the Policies of the East Grinstead Neighborhood Plan would have full weight..

The Solicitor to the Council advised the Committee that any decision made may still be subject to call in by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Several Members observed that the Committee must only look at the application in front of them and that they were struggling to find any sound planning reasons to move against the recommendation and that the site looked suitable for development.

The impact on a Grade II listed building was brought up by a Member and they went on to remind the rest of the Committee that this and the additional traffic to a site already at capacity, should be taken into consideration.

Councillor Matthews proposed to move against the recommendation and this was seconded by Councillor Wyan. There were 5 votes in favour and 4 votes against. The motion to refuse the application was agreed.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be refused on the following grounds:

1. That the application is contrary to the East Grinstead Neighborhood Plan Policies EG2a (1, 2 and 3), 5b, 5c, and 11.
2. That the application is contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 32.

(Exact wording to be agreed by Officers in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.)

6. ITEMS CONSIDERED URGENT BUSINESS

None.

Chairman.