

**Minutes of a meeting of District Planning Committee
held on Thursday, 6th September, 2018
from 2.00 - 2.52 pm**

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

Chris Hersey
Colin Holden
Gary Marsh

Norman Mockford
Dick Sweatman
Anthony Watts Williams

Margaret Hersey

Absent: Councillors Pru Moore and Peter Wyan

**1 TO NOTE SUBSTITUTES IN ACCORDANCE WITH COUNCIL PROCEDURE
RULE 4 - SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES ETC.**

The Committee noted that Councillor Margaret Hersey substituted for Councillor Moore.

2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

The Committee noted that apologies had been received from Councillors Moore and Wyan.

**3 TO RECEIVE DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST FROM MEMBERS IN RESPECT
OF ANY MATTER ON THE AGENDA.**

Councillor Christopher Hersey and Margaret Hersey both declared non-predetermined interests as serving Members of Lindfield Rural Parish Council; they advised that they have not taken part in any discussions on this application at the Parish Council.

**4 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON
9 AUGUST 2018.**

The Minutes of the Committee held on 9 August 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman after an amendment was made to the comments made by Councillor Clarke with regard to DM/17/2739 – Hurst Farm. He commented that the residents will have to cross the road from West to East to walk to the new school, shop or hospital up Hurstwood Lane as no footpath has been included on the plan. The residents from the existing houses on the east side and the new development would need to cross to the west side to access the path for the town centre or bus stop for the town or station as the path is only on the west side and no path on the east side of Fox Hill.

**5 TO CONSIDER THE REPORT OF THE DIVISIONAL LEADER FOR PLANNING
AND ECONOMY UPON PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS
SUBMITTED TO THE COMMITTEE FOR DETERMINATION.**

DM/17/3413 - Land at 37 - 55 Perrymount Road and 1 - 5 Clair Road Haywards Heath West Sussex RH16 3BN

The Chairman advised Committee that since the last application for this site the District Plan had been adopted and the new National Planning Policy Framework came into effect in July; the details of this planning application were identical to that which were reported to the Committee in January 2018 except for a proposed change in the location of the proposed vehicular access onto Clair Road.

Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader introduced the report and drew Members attention to a couple of extra conditions which were detailed on the agenda update sheet.

The Chairman noted that no Members wished to speak so moved to the recommendation, which was agreed unanimously.

RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the conditions suggested in Appendix A, the additional conditions outlined in the Agenda Update Sheet and the completion of a section 106 legal agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure provision and affordable housing.

DM/18/1394 - Land at Barn Cottage Lewes Road Scaynes Hill Haywards Heath Reserved Matters Application in Relation to Outline Planning DM/16/3119 For 51 Dwellings for the Matters of the Appearance, Landscaping, Layout and Scale. New Plans Received Showing Amendments to Design.

Susan Dubberley, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report and drew Member's attention to the agenda update sheet which contained details of the representations and amended conditions.

The Officer advised that currently the site is an open field with a two store building with a single storey extension, and highlighted areas of ancient woodland adjacent to the site. The scheme is a perimeter block layout with a mix of detached and semi-detached units with two x 3 storey blocks of flats at the entrance to the site. Following receipt of some objections the design was amended and the Urban Designer has no objections to the revised design and layout. She advised that there is a 15 meter buffer zone with the ancient woodland and that the Arboriculturist had no objections to the scheme.

Ms Kathrin Mann, on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application. She advised that the design needed to take into consideration the sloping topography of the site and now had a perimeter design to protect the ancient woodland. The level of houses facing the Hillcrest properties had been reduced and the application had been revised in collaboration with the Independent Design Review Panel and the Urban Designer to meet all their requirements.

Councillor Linda Stockwell, ward Member for High Weald, spoke in objection to the application and was concerned with the two blocks of flats sited at the entrance to the development, which is also the highest point of the site. She advised that Scaynes Hill is a Category 3 settlement with no buildings over 2 storeys high. She commented that the blocks of flats will dominate the area, are out of keeping with the design of the rest of the village and the application does not take into account DP26 of the District Plan which states that the design " creates a sense of place while

addressing the character and scale of the surrounding building and landscape". With regard to the Hillcrest properties she welcomed the provision of large shrubs to screen the properties but not block their view, which would comply with DP26 of the District Plan which states that the application does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents which also includes privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight.

Several Members were also concerned with the positioning and height of the blocks of flats at the highest point of the site and that DP3 of the District Plan was relevant as Scaynes Hill is a Category 3 settlement and the blocks of flats not in keeping with the character of the village; two storey blocks of flats were more in keeping with the rest of the village. The Chairman asked Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader, to clarify the validity of DP3 in this application. The Officer advised that DP3 related to Village and Neighbourhood centre development. He advised that the policy was split into two parts: the first part related to village centres – Crawley Down, Cuckfield, Hurstpierpoint and Hassocks; the second part related to Small Village Centre Centres and Neighbourhood Centres in the towns and was concerned with the change of use of buildings. As Such the Team Leader advised that policy DP3 was not relevant to the determination of this application, the relevant policy for this application was DP26. A Member responded asking whether Scaynes Hill was a small or large village and that under DP26 the design did not reflect the character of the village.

A Member commented on the resolved boundary landscaping and wanted confirmation that the landscaping condition would ensure no planting of trees but only shrubs adjacent to the Hillcrest properties.

In response to queries concerning the location / design of the flats the Senior Planning Officer advised that the Urban Designer is content with the design.

A Member queried on the location of affordable housing within the site, one block of flats would be all affordable housing and it had not been spread around the whole site. In response the Senior Planning Officer advised that the Housing Department were content with the spread of the affordable housing on the site.

A Member stated that the blocks of flats were the contentious issue, and guided by the Ward Members, he was minded to oppose the application even though the applicant could appeal the decision if the application was refused.

The Planning Applications Team Leader advised that the Committee must look at the application as a whole. He advised that the layout was sound, the trees were protected, the layout provided a proper street scene and the fact that the flats would be 3 storeys and would be higher than any building in the village was not a reason to refuse the application, there has to be some identifiable harm from the proposed flats. Outline planning permission had already been granted for up to 51 units on this site and that the National Planning Policy Framework supports good design. He reminded Members that applicants had the right to appeal and the Independent Design Review Panel and the Councils Urban Designer had both supported the scheme. The Planning Applications Team Leader advised that in his view a refusal on the height of the blocks of flats would be difficult to defend at an appeal.

A Member responded that he was trying to get a good design throughout the site and suggested refusing the application as the siting of the flats at the entrance to the scheme did not reflect the character of the village. In response a Member advised that it was difficult to refuse as the Independent Design Review Panel supported the

scheme, the flats were a major issue and wanted the developer to note this. However he was minded to support the proposal.

In response to a comment that the Independent Design Review Panel thought the siting of the flats at the entrance was unsatisfactory and the elevations / roof forms were unbalanced, the Senior Planning Officer advised Members that comments were made before the final amendments were agreed with the Urban Designer and the Design Review Panel was content with the Urban Designer negotiating amendments.

The Chairman reminded the Committee of the amendments agreed by the Independent Design Review Panel and the Urban Designer. He noted that the Committee must have a sound planning reason to refuse the application.

In response to a question the Senior Planning Officer advised the Committee that the Independent Design Review Panel do consider the scheme in the round, including the overall look of the scheme and how it fits in with the locality.

Councillor Christopher Hersey proposed a motion to refuse the application as it did not meet DP26 of the District Plan as the siting of the flats was not well designed within the scheme and did not reflect the character of the village. Councillor Edward Matthews seconded the motion.

The Chairman took Members to vote on the motion which were refused with 6 votes in favour and 3 votes against.

RESOLVED

That the application is refused because it is out of keeping with the rural village due to the height and scale of the two blocks of flats at a high point on the site contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2018. The Chairman and Vice-Chairman to be consulted on the exact wording of the refusal reason by officers.

6 TO CONSIDER ANY ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS.

None.

7 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.

None.

Chairman.

The meeting finished at 2.52 pm

Chairman