

DOCUMENT A

Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 17 May 2018 from 2.00 p.m. to 3.25 p.m.

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

Christopher Hersey
Colin Holden
Edward Matthews
* Absent

Norman Mockford
Pru Moore
Dick Sweatman

Anthony Watts Williams
Peter Wyan

Also Present: Councillors MacNaughton & M. Hersey.

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

None.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

4. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Committee held on 19 April 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED

DM/17/4190 – Rookery Farm, Rocky Lane, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 4RW.

Steve Ashdown, Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations, introduced the report for the reserved matters application pursuant to condition 1 of outline approval DM/16/4496 for the scale, layout, landscaping and appearance of 320 new dwellings (96 affordable housing). He directed Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet, informing the committee of additional conditions, additional informatives and the rewording of Conditions. It was also noted that the fourth paragraph on P.28 should be removed as the content does not apply to the application. The Team Leader reminded Members that access had been approved as part of the outline planning permission and highlighted the main issues in connection with the application. He further informed Members that after the drafting of the report, an unnecessary incursion of path on Ancient Woodland to the west of the site was noticed. The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations suggested that the matter could be addressed via a planning condition, as set out in the update

sheet, and that officers would consult with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman once the details are submitted,

Roger Brocklehurst and Stephanie Went, Fox Hill Association Representatives, spoke against the application.

Roger White, Urban Designer for Barrett Homes, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member stated that the Haywards Heath Town Council (HHTC) comments stood out the most to him and referred to their consultation and made reference to 11 points raised by HHTC which the Member requested that Officers address. He also expressed his disappointment with the design of the scheme

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations confirmed that in terms of the trees, the breaking up of the parking areas and the design, the Landscape Officer and Urban Designer are content with the scheme. With respect to the design, the Urban Designer has worked extensively to make improvements to the scheme which had resulted in him removing an earlier objection. Condition 6 of the outline permission requires the submission of a Construction Management Plan and this will include details of the provision of a wheel wash facility, although ultimately mud on the road is an issue for the Local Highway Authority. A requirement to ensure that lorries are covered would be difficult to enforce and is more of a site management issue for the developers.

The Member sought clarification on Stephanie Went's comments regarding Natural England's recommendation that buffer zones should be increased from the minimum of 15m to 30m for larger scaled developments as he was not aware of this and that they should not contain swales.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations explained that he was aware of similar comments being received from the Woodland Trust on other applications however the outline consent had a parameter plan which made provision for a 15 meter buffer for the ancient woodland and the reserved matters is in accordance with that. He added that advice from the Council's ecology consultant is that he does not think the swales will have an impact on the ancient woodland itself, although he is seeking confirmation that RPA's will be protected (covered by a suggested condition). The Council's consultant is satisfied with the 15m buffer zone.

A Member enquired whether Policy DP26 of the District Plan had been met as he notes that DP26 requires a high quality design for developments and he cited the design and layout of Fox Hill. He felt the design for this development is bland.

The Chairman directed the Member to the Urban Designer's comments who describes the scheme as generally acceptable.

A Member expressed agreement with a number of the comments from HHTC. He noted that the roads are designed smaller than the standard road width which could prove a movement issue for emergency or refuse vehicles if residents parked their work vehicles on the road.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations confirmed that road widths is a matter for West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) however the road widths are 5m to 6m on the primary roads and 4.8m on secondary which in WSSCC's view is acceptable.

A Member highlighted the design issues with the development and felt that the NPPF restricts the design review making it difficult to object on those grounds. He noted the comments of the Landscape Officer on page 46 and enquired whether a planting schedule was covered in the report or whether it will needed to be addressed in future.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations outlined that the applicants will need to make a separate condition submission n with the inclusion of the planting schedule in order to discharge Condition 17. He explained that the Urban Designer had raised some concerns with regard to how some of proposed plots fit with the slope of the site however he was content that this can be addressed through a condition. With regard to general design matters, the Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations clarified that it is a difficult issue to debate as design of any development is subjective. He added that if the Urban Designer had considered the design of the scheme to be unacceptable then he would have raised an objection.

A Member noted that certain existing properties have a septic tank to remove their waste water much like the septic tank he has at his home. He described how he faces run-off from the septic tank and enquired if there will be run-off from these properties into the development.

The Team Leader for Major Development & Investigations directed the Member to P.33 which outlines the developer's response to drainage issues.

The Chairman noted that no Member wished to speak so moved to the recommendation to approve contained in the report which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the conditions suggested in Appendix A and the additional conditions and informatives outlined in the Agenda Update Sheet.

6. ITEMS CONSIDERED URGENT BUSINESS

None.

7. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

None.

3:25pm

Chairman