

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee B  
held on 7 June 2018  
from 7:00p.m. to 9:08p.m.**

**Present:** Chris Hersey (Chairman)  
Anthony Watts Williams (Vice-Chairman)

Phillip Coote	Andrew MacNaughton*	Robert Salisbury
Colin Holden*	Pru Moore*	Rex Whittaker*
Sue Hatton	Norman Mockford	

\* Absent

**Also Present:** Cllr Binks

**1. SUBSTITUTES**

Councillor Margaret Hersey substituted for Councillor Pru Moore. Councillor John Wilkinson substituted for Councillor Rex Whittaker. Councillor Colin Trumble substituted for Councillor Andrew MacNaughton.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies were received from Councillors Holden, MacNaughton, Moore and Whittaker.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

**4. MINUTES**

The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 9 and 10 May 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

**5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED**

DM/17/4392 – Land North And East Of Bolney Cricket Club, The Pavillion, Glebe Field, The Street, Bolney, West Sussex, RH17 5QP

Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader, introduced the report for the erection of 30 dwellings comprising of 2 one bedroom apartments, 10 two bedroom houses, 10 three bedroom houses and 8 four bedroom houses. He drew Member's attention to Agenda Update Sheet highlighting the change of wording to Condition 14 and the removal of all plan references on P.38 and P.39. He added that the site is allocated for residential development in the Bolney Neighbourhood Plan under policy BOLH4a for approximately 30 dwellings and as such the principle of developing the site accords with the development plan. It was also noted that the application has a slight conflict with policy BOLH1 in the Neighbourhood Plan regard to the mix of dwellings however officers do not consider this to be in itself a reason to resist the application.

Chris Hough, Planning Consultant for Rydon Homes, spoke in favour of the application.

A number of Members raised their concerns regarding the lack of “pepper potting” on the site.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the applicants had submitted the scheme with the affordable housing in the location shown on the plans and officers had not sought to amend this. He advised Members that the guidance relating to pepper potting referred to seeking to avoid clusters of more than 10 affordable dwellings in a single location and therefore this scheme did not conflict with this guidance. He also advised Members that the affordable dwellings would be tenure blind and would be of the same design standard as the market housing. He confirmed that he has consulted with the Housing Officer whom said they wouldn't seek to amend the scheme.

A Member noted that work vehicles which travel through her Ward of Lindfield are not covered properly at all resulting in its spoil being transferred to the road. She requested that a condition be put in place to ensure that the spoil is covered.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the covering of the work vehicles is covered by separate legislation. He advised that it can be referred to in the Traffic Management Plan.

A Member sought clarification on why the 2001 Census was used to calculate the County Council infrastructure contributions instead of the most recent 2011 Census. She also noted that there was no provision of drainage listed in the report so enquired if residents will be paying for the aspect of the development.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the Census data derived from the County Council so could not comment on its inclusion in the consultation. With regard to drainage, he confirmed that the Drainage condition included a requirement for details of the future Maintenance of the approved drainage system.

A Member raised his concerns over the design of the development and felt that the Urban Designer was not demanding enough during his consultation.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as set out in the report and the Agenda Update Sheet, which was approved unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted subject to the following recommendations:

**Recommendation A:** That planning permission be approved subject to the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure contributions affordable housing and the conditions set in Appendix A and the Agenda Update Sheet.

**Recommendation B:** That if the applicants have not completed a satisfactory signed planning obligation securing the necessary infrastructure payments and affordable housing by the 6th September 2018, then it is recommended that permission be refused, at the discretion of the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, for the following reason:

'In the absence of a signed legal agreement the application fails to deliver the necessary infrastructure and affordable housing and as such conflicts with Policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan and Policies BOLH3 and BOLA4 of the Neighbourhood Plan.'

DM/17/5124 – Sussex Lantern, Southdown Farm, Lodge Lane, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 8LX

Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader, introduced the report for the erection of a proposed new day care centre and retention of existing plant room and pottery building. He drew Member's attention the Agenda Update Sheet which outlined an amendment to the opening time condition following the Environmental Health Officer comments and a condition restricting the use of the building that which had been sought in the planning application and no other uses within Class D1 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. It was also noted that the site was granted planning consent in 2007 and 2008 with some work already started however, as pre commencement planning conditions had not been discharged a lawful start had not been made on implementing the 2008 permission and the consent had now expired.

Gloria Hill, Chief Executive of Sussex Lantern, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member outlined that the part developed site is an eyesore which can be viewed from the downs. He feels the new building will blend in well with the surrounding landscape.

A Member expressed her support for this type of facility. She also noted Lodge Lane being a busy road so drew attention to the need for a footway to the development along the Lane in order to make the site sustainable.

A Member felt that the new application was a huge improvement from the previous application permitted on the site.

A number of Members enquired if a Landscape Appraisal and Visual Impact Assessment had been carried out.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the applicants have not provided an Landscape Appraisal and Visual Impact Assessment but have provided pictures instead. He added that it is ultimately a decision for the Council to come to a view on in relation to the impact of the building on the character and appearance of the area, including the setting of the National Park. He considered that Officers had sufficient information to make a recommendation on the application. It was also mentioned that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was not carried out during the 2008 planning consent.

A Member enquired how the 29 parking spaces had been calculated against the number of users and staff members as he is aware that parking on Lodge Lane would be dangerous.

The Planning Applications Team Leader outlined that there will be 4 members of staff there daily and a few therapy staff there occasionally. He added that the applicants have stated that a significant number of users will arrive in a mini-bus.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as set out in the report and the Agenda Update Sheet, which was approved unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be approved subject to the conditions set in Appendix A and the Agenda Update Sheet.

DM/17/5213 – Land At Long Meadow, Station Road, Sharpthorne, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 4NY

Andrew Morrison, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report for the erection of 2 detached dwellings with garages. He drew Member's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which outlined the amendment to Recommendation A and B following the completion of the Ashdown Forest mitigation SAMM contributions and additional informatives on P.124.

William Buckley, West Hoathly Parish Council, and George Brinkhurst, local resident, spoke against the application.

Tim Rodway, agent of the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member expressed that he could not see the difference between the current application and the previous application. He enquired what the actual floor space of the current application is compared to the previous.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the Officers do not have the specific floor space for the previous application but the current application equates to 113sq/m<sup>2</sup> for each plot. It was stated that this represents a 21% reduction from the previous 3 unit scheme.

A Member sought clarification on what provision is in place for the collection as waste bins as he notes that the freighters cannot access the development.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that there will be a collection area to south of the site and freighters will have to either reverse to get into the development or the collection operatives will go to the collection area.

A Member sought clarification on why the Planning Inspector refused the previous applications.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the Inspector felt that both schemes at appeal would cause harm to the area of outstanding natural beauty and specifically the 4 unit scheme would have had an inappropriate impact on the neighbouring amenity.

A Member enquired if there would be an issue of overlooking.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that in the Officer's view there is only some degree of impact as the windows are not directly facing the other properties and it is was felt that overlooking will not be significant. He also noted that the Inspector did not consider overlooking an issue in the previous applications.

A Member questioned if the floor plan has been provided for the supply of gas to the properties.

The Chairman confirmed that gas supply is a Building Control issue and should not be considered at the Planning stage.

A Member enquired how the drainage will be provided in the scheme.

The Senior Planning Officer explained that the drainage will connect to main drainage pipe on Station Road.

A Member raised his concerns over access to the property. He then enquired whether the applicants could construct a window on the south facing side of Plot 1 which faces Bramble Cottages under permitted development.

The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that only frosted windows would be allowed to be put in such a place as any other type of windows would not be allowed under permitted development and would need planning permission.

Councillor Philip Coote raised his concerns over the windows which he felt were overlooking, effect of neighbouring amenity during construction of the properties, issues of access and overdevelopment of the site. Due to his concerns, the Member proposed a motion to refuse the application.

The Planning Applications Team Leader outlined that the Local Planning Authority would need to substantiate all reasons for refusing the application. He advised that access would be a weak reason for refusal because the Planning Inspector who had dealt with the two previous appeals at the site had not dismissed those appeal based on highways matters. He advised that the details of how the development was carried out could be controlled by a planning condition requiring approval of a Construction Management Plan.

Councillor Colin Trumble showed solidarity with the concerned Member and believed that the development would fail to enhance or conserve the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). He therefore proposed to second the application but on grounds that did not include access problems or construction.

This proposal to limit the reasons for refusal was accepted by Councillor Coote and the Chairman moved to the recommendation to refuse the application on this basis. Five Members voted in favour of the recommendation and four Members voted against.

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be refused on the grounds that it will neither conserve nor enhance the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and is inappropriate in the area officers to agree the wording in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman.

DM/18/0635 – B and B Packing Cases, The Nursery, Church Lane, Albourne, Hassocks, West Sussex, BN6 9BZ

Andrew Morrison, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report for the demolition of the existing building and the erection of a single residential (C3 Use Class) dwelling with associated works at B and B Packing Cases. He noted recent permission on the site for the conversion of the existing building into a single dwelling which in the officer's view has been afforded significant weight.

A Member expressed his agreement with the Albourne Parish Council's comments.

Councillor Salisbury commended the design of the building and proposed that the committee move to the recommendation. This was seconded by Councillor Coote.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as set out in the report which was approved unanimously.

**RESOLVED**

That planning permission be approved subject to the conditions outlined at Appendix A.

DM/18/1695 – Mount Noddy Pavilion, St Johns Road, East Grinstead, West Sussex, RH19 3LQ

As there were no speakers, the Chairman confirmed with Members that they did not require a presentation on the application.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as set out in the report which was approved unanimously.

**RESOLVED**

That permission is granted subject to the conditions outlined at appendix A.

**ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGET BUSINESS**

None.

**QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

None.

Meeting closed at 9:08.

Chairman.