

DOCUMENT A

Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 25 January 2018 from 2.00 p.m. to 3.18 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, Webster and Whittaker.

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.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Committee held on 7 December 2017 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED

DM/17/2648 – Land To The South Of Pease Pottage Services, Land Parcel At 526143 133007, Brighton Road, Pease Pottage, West Sussex, RH11 9YA

Susan Dubberly, Senior Planning Officer informed Members of an additional drainage condition to be added. The Officer then introduced the Report for the creation of a new B2 use workshop building with ancillary offices and associated site works and landscaping. New plans received on the 11 July 2017 showed an increased width to the main building by 1.2m to provide 7.2 wide bay.

Councillor Gary Marsh as Ward Member spoke in support of the application due to its potential to create jobs in the area.

Several Members raised concern that application is being situated in an AONB and that the design of the buildings were not set out to enhance and sit visually within the surrounding landscape.

The Senior Planning Officer reminded Members of the potential for the site to become an island site as there has been development approved surrounding the site. She also informed Members that the design of site must be seen in context of the area.

Some Members commented that the development would make good use of the land as it would be unsuitable for residential use due to the noise pollution from the A23. Members also agreed with Officers assessment that the application would create a significant number of jobs and promote additional spending in the local economy, which reflected the Government's priority to promote sustainable development and economic growth.

A Member drew the Committees attention to the fact that there were no letters of representation against the proposal, the application complied with the principles and policies of the NPPF and that West Sussex Highways Authority had raised no objections. He believed the application should be approved.

The Vice-Chairman informed the Committee that the High Weald Joint Advisory Committee's objection was centred around the colours used on the development. He asked Officers whether the developers could be persuaded to adjust the colours used.

The Senior Planning Officer informed the Committee that a materials condition was included in the report.

The Chairman also requested that Officers used condition 6 to improve the landscaping on the boundary of the site.

The Chairman noted no more Members wished to speak and took the Committee to the Officers recommendation for approval, which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the application be approved subject to the recommended conditions set out in Appendix A and the additional drainage condition.

DM/17/3413 – Land At 37 – 55 Perrymount Road And 1 – 5 Clair Road, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3BN

Steven King, the Planning Applications Team Leader drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which included additional comments from Officers and an amendment to condition 10. The Officer then introduced the Report for the outline planning application for redevelopment of the site to provide up to 145 new residential units including 30% affordable housing and 1209sqm. of commercial floorspace (A2 use class), together with associated car parking. All matters to be reserved except from access. Amended plans were received on 14 December 2017 showing a reduction in the site area and a reduction in the proposed car parking from 103 to 88 spaces.

The transport planner working on the project Jamie Narborough and the agent Tim Rodway spoke in support of the application.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that cycle parking was shown on the illustrative floor plans. The details of the cycle parking would be set out at the reserved matters stage.

A Member commented on the good use of land and the positive move away from green field development. However, he raised concern over parking and that 57 units would be without parking. He informed Members that in Brighton developments were going underground to supply parking.

The Chairman reminded Members of a development in East Grinstead that was approved without any parking. He also noted that the additional cost of adding extra parking could mean the removal of the 30% affordable housing.

A Member queried whether the application had been in front of the Design Review Panel. He also commented that those who live in town centres do own cars and that there was insufficient parking however the issue of parking was still to be studied in detail by West Sussex Highways Agency.

The Planning Applications Team Leader informed Members that the Highways Authority were content with the amount of parking supplied. The Team Leader explained that if the Highway Authority thought the level of car parking would lead to any highway safety hazard then they would have said this in their consultation response. The Team Leader stated that Officers believed that the application struck the right balance between making optimal use of the site and providing sufficient car parking. He also confirmed that the application had been reviewed by the Design Review Panel at the pre application stage and had been through extensive negotiations. The issue of design would be looked at in more detail at the reserved matters stage. The Team Leader explained that at the reserved matters stage if it was considered that part of the development was too high, accommodation lost by reducing the height of one block could be made up elsewhere on other blocks. He also reminded Members that the scheme was for up to 145 dwellings so this allowed some flexibility.

The Chairman noted that the allocation of parking spaces to specified flats should aid mitigation of any parking issues.

A Member commented on the good opportunity that the site presents and that it would be paramount that any development would have to be of good design however he did have concern that any large development might overshadow neighbouring buildings. He noted that the insufficient parking would be exacerbated by any visitors to the flats. He also queried whether the bins would be of industrial size to cope with the large amount of properties, if so they would need to be collected by an external contractor.

The Planning Applications Team Leader informed Members that the issue of bins would return at the reserved matters stage and that there was a contingency to reduce the number of dwellings if the amount of bins allocated could not suitably service the site.

The Chairman noted no more Members wished to speak and took the Committee to the Officers recommendation for approval, which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That the application be approved subject to the recommended condition set out in Appendix A, the amendment to Condition 10 set out in the Agenda Update Sheet and the completion of a S106 agreement.

DM/17/3645 – Former Martells Department Store, 1- 4 Norman Gardens, And 26 -36 And 38A Queens Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4DW

Stuart Malcolm, Senior Planning Officer drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which amended the wording of several conditions and set out additional informatives. The Officer then introduced the Report which sought to amend conditions 24 (Energy Strategy) and 28 (Approved Plans) relating to planning application DM/15/5067 including: revisions to internal layout, mix and circulation; alterations to external appearance and proposed materials; additional on-site car parking and; an alternative energy strategy.

The Chairman informed Members that an additional Viability Assessment was carried out and it was still not currently viable for the developer to provide any Affordable Housing. However a further viability review would be required when 75% of the dwellings were occupied.

A Member commented that he had originally opposed the application as it was a monolithic block and dominated the skyline of the area. However, he wanted to withdraw the original objection as the updated application was a vast improvement.

The Chairman noted that the architects had changed from those who had worked on the original application hence the marked change.

A Member commented on how the new application built on the original and was an improvement.

The application was moved as recommended by Council Colin Trumble and this was seconded by Councillor Peter Wyan. As a result the application was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED

It is recommended that the application be approved subject to the recommended condition set out in Appendix A and the additional informatives set out in the Agenda Update Sheet.

DM/17/1490 – Land Parcel At 533365 138976, Turners Hill Road, Crawley Down, West Sussex

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader for Major Development and Investigations drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and to the recent emails received from the applicant's agent stating that there were fundamental errors in the report relating to both Habitat Regulations and highways matter. Officers were content that the information before the Committee was correct. The Officer introduced the Report to the Committee that the applicant had appealed against the Council's non-determination of the application and an Informal Hearing had been set up for the 27 February 2018 for an Inspector to hear the case. This Report was before Members to establish what decision the Council would have taken on the above application had it had the opportunity to do so. Officers will then prepare a statement of case for submission to the Inspector.

The Chairman noted no Members wished to speak so took the Committee to the Officers recommendation for approval, which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

It was resolved that had the Council had the opportunity to determine the application it would have refused the application for the reasons set out in the report and the Officers to submit to the Inspector those reasons.

6. ITEMS CONSIDERED URGENT BUSINESS

None.

Chairman.