

**Minutes of a meeting of District Planning Committee  
held on Thursday, 15th April, 2021  
from 2.00 pm - 3.54 pm**

**Present:** R Salisbury (Chair)  
D Sweatman (Vice-Chair)

R Bates  
J Dabell  
A Eves

S Hatton  
R Jackson  
C Laband

A Peacock  
R Webb  
R Whittaker

**Absent:** Councillor G Marsh

**Also Present:** J Ash-Edwards, R de Mierre, J Llewellyn-Burke and  
A MacNaughton

**1. ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETING EXPLANATION.**

The Chairman commenced the meeting with a one-minute silence in memory of HRH Prince Philip the Duke of Edinburgh. He took a roll call to confirm the Members present. Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services provided a virtual meeting explanation. The Chairman outlined the public speaking procedure.

**2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Cllr Marsh.

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

None.

**4. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2021.**

The Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 14 January 2021 were agreed as a correct record and signed electronically by the Chairman.

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

None.

The Chairman confirmed that all Members had received the Agenda Update Sheet. He highlighted that to reach a decision on an application the Members refer the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Mid Sussex Design Guide, the District Plan and other supplementary planning documents.

**6. DM/20/2640 - MARYLANDS NURSERY SITE, COWFOLD ROAD, BOLNEY, RH17 5QR.**

Joanne Fisher, Senior Planning Officer introduced the report seeking demolition of the single dwelling and outbuildings and erection of B8 floorspace (including ancillary office space) across 3 buildings, with hard and soft landscaping, parking and servicing. Revised access would be provided from the A272/A23 western roundabout closing the existing vehicular access closed on Cowfold Road. Additional highway information was received on 03/03/2021 and included an updated noise assessment. The site would provide 103 parking spaces including 12 ECV charge points, 7 mobility bays, 9 car sharing bays and 32 cycle parking spaces. Landscaping within the car parking area would soften the hard surfaces. She advised that unit 1 would have a double barrel roof, and units 2 and 3 would be one building, each with a 2-storey glazed entrance. The existing established trees will remain, and additional mixed native trees and hedgerow would be planted. The Councils Landscape Officer supports the Landscaping Masterplan.

The Planning Officer outlined the main issues where the application conflicted with the District Plan and the material considerations. The land has been allocated for employment uses and the site has gone through selection with the Site Allocation Development Plan Document (SA DPD). This has been submitted for examination and carries significant weight. The site would provide a comprehensive redevelopment seeking to improve the character of the area. The buildings have been laid out to make an effective use of the topography and landscaping to mitigate the impact of the development against existing and proposed dense vegetation. The colours of the elevations seek to blend in with the surrounding trees and vegetation. The parking provision meets the parking standards in West Sussex County Council guidance and there are alternative travel arrangements in a travel plan. There will be no significant detriment to nearby amenities. Although the principle of the application does not comply with Policy DP12, there are other material considerations which outweigh this conflict which are set out in the Officers report and this presentation, the most specific is that the proposal is allocated for Storage and Distribution employment uses under Policy SA6 of the emerging Site Allocation DPD. As the document has been submitted for examination it carries significant weight. Overall, Officers consider that the planning balance falls significantly in favour of approving the planning application. It was noted that the Agenda Update sheet confirmed the deletion of condition 15 which was a duplication of condition 14.

Tom Clark, Solicitor read the submission from Cllr Trelfall, Charman of Bolney Parish Council Planning Committee. They were generally supportive of development of the site but expressed concerns with the impact of the tall buildings on raised ground levels to the neighbouring area.

Mr Barton, applicant spoke in support of the application.

Several Members showed support of the application at a sustainable location close to the A23 and stated that it would improve the visual appearance of the current unsightly site. They commended the provision of cycle spaces but expressed concern as there was no safe direct access to the nearby National Cycle Network which had not been mentioned in the Travel Plan. It was noted that Bolney Neighbourhood Plan supports safe cycle routes to the village. Members sought clarification on the environmental noise impact assessment and acoustics barriers, external lighting, the impact of the change of levels to the site.

A Member highlighted that the application would help the Council in meeting District Plan Policy DP1 to achieve 543 jobs per annum.

The Planning Officer confirmation condition 24 states no external lighting should be installed without prior approval and acoustics barriers can be dealt with under condition 20 which covers the hard/soft landscaping. The Urban Designer had not seen the revised levels, but the officers were satisfied with the information received and the landscape designer was happy with the mitigations. She highlighted there had been some confusion from the comments from the Parish Council in relation to the height of the building as the data used in the sections and levels is from sea level. With reference to the residential property, condition 21 detailed the acoustic screening and with the background noise of the A23 if was deemed acceptable.

The Chairman highlighted the specific role of the Urban Designer and noted that planning officers can consider further information without gaining his further comments as he is a consultee.

Steven Shaw, Team Manager from West Sussex Highways responded on the two issues highway issues raised by Members: the signalisation of the A272 London Road junction as part of the Northern Arc scheme and the extended left turn lane filter to increase stacking capacity and assist those turning left. The signalisation of the junction would be triggered once 400 people occupy the Northern Arc development. This improvement would address the impact of the Northern Arc on the local area. The construction of the left turn filter lane would be brought forward and must be completed before the first property is occupied on the Northern Arc development.

The Chairman noted the concerns of Twineham Parish Council on the impact on B and C class roads in the area. He asked the Highways Officer to comment of the possibility of constructing a roundabout at the junction with Cowfold Road and asked if West Sussex had completed any modelling.

The Highways Officer had noted the concerns of Bolney Parish Council of traffic leaving the M23 leading to congestion at the junction and traffic existing at the Hickstead junction using rural roads to avoid congestion. He was not aware of any traffic data to verify this. The developer had modelled the junction which will have over capacity to cater for traffic growth over time and not just traffic from this development. He confirmed that developers must only mitigate for the impact of their development, they are not obliged to mitigate existing traffic issues. The mitigation put forward by the developer meets the impact. A roundabout had not been formally assessed by the Highway Authority and there was no formal option proposed with a roundabout.

Members expressed concern on the uncontrolled pedestrian crossing, improvements at the Cowfold Road junction, connectivity of the site to the NCN, sustainability and bio-diversity of the development,

The Highways Officer advised that it was not appropriate to have a controlled crossing at this location and signals are installed where there is a heavier use by pedestrians. The crossing would be too close to the junction and it was not appropriate for a signalised junction as the stopping distances were short. He reiterated that the developer only mitigates the impact from their development, a new access to the site and left flank to the junction with the A272. He confirmed there was no direct connection to the NCN in the application and did not expect high level of

trips by cycles to the location. The secured cycle parking would encourage the use of cycles and a Travel Plan had been secured by a condition.

The Chairman advised a road safety audit will have been completed and there would be no improvements to the roads in area in this application. Any runoff from the site would be covered by a condition.

The Planning Officer confirmed that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) proposals had been put forward for this site and the barrel-vaulted roof was unsuitable for solar panels. The developer had ecological enhancements in the application, but these did not include boxes for wildlife.

As there were no further speakers the Chairman took the Members to the recommendations and Councillor Peacock proposed that the Committee approve the application in line with the Officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Laband.

The Solicitor took a named vote on the officer's recommendation with the changes in the agenda update sheet and the Committee voted unanimously in favour of the motion.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstained
Bates, R.	Y		
Dabell, J	Y		
Eves, A.	Y		
Hatton, S.	Y		
Jackson, R.	Y		
Laband, C.	Y		
Peacock, A	Y		
Salisbury, R.	Y		
Sweatman, D.	Y		
Webb, R.	Y		
Whittaker, R.	Y		

## **RESOLVED**

### **Recommendation A**

It is recommended that planning permission be approved subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement to secure infrastructure contributions and affordable housing and the conditions set in Appendix A.

### **Recommendation B**

It is recommended that if the applicants have not submitted a satisfactory signed planning obligation securing the necessary infrastructure payments and affordable housing by the 15th July 2021, then it is recommended that permission be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Lead for Planning and Economy, for the following reasons:

1. 'The application fails to comply with policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in respect of the infrastructure required to serve the development.'

## **7. DM/20/3516 - MAXWELTON HOUSE, 41-43 BOLTRO ROAD, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 1BJ.**

Joanne Fisher, Senior Planning Officer introduced the report. The application proposed the demolition of existing office building and provision of 54 apartments with associated parking and landscaping. She drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and highlighted that the update included responses the Highways Authority which had been omitted from Appendix B and comments from West Sussex CCG regarding healthcare provision, updated WSCC contributions as less flats were proposed and a recommended condition relating to a travel plan.

The Planning Officer advised that the site is within the builtup area of Haywards Heath and the development provides 37 flats for market housing and 17 affordable flats. The development would provide 30 % affordable housing. The building would be split into five vertically proportioned bays with two main entrance cores to the front and rear of the buildings and comprise seven storeys in height. The upper two storeys are stepped in on the roof. On the lower ground floor there would be undercroft parking, bin stores, cycle stores and lift and stair wells. There would be a total provision of a 28 car parking spaces, 9 having ECV points and 78 bike spaces. The parking is below WSCC standards but the site is in a sustainable location close to the town centre, bus stops and the railway line. The Applicant used local census data to support the parking provision but an extra nine spaces may be required and could be accommodated through on-street parking. A Travel Plan will be provided. The Highways Authority support the scheme. The site had not been identified as an employment site and redevelopment to residential was acceptable and would provide additional windfall housing. The Mid Sussex Design Guide supports site optimisation in this location. Due to the levels of the site, the building would read as a four-storey building due to the lower ground level and the two additional stories on the roof set back and in from the main building line. The proposed design minimises the prominence of the building. A different material will be used for the upper levels to minimise the impact of the taller building. The Urban Designer and Design Review Panel support the scheme. It is considered that there will be less than substantial harm to Muster Green Conservation Area and the public benefits of the development out-weigh the harm. It is considered that the proposal would not cause detriment to residential amenities surrounding the site.

Mr Robert Wild, resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Members expressed concern over the level of car parking provision. They discussed the provision for cycles and the Car Club, the height of the building and the materials for the two upper storeys.

Members noted the sustainable location of the development , that Haywards Heath Town Council supported the application and queried the impact of the development on the local schools.

The Chairman confirmed the ECV points were covered by condition 14. He highlighted that it was not for the Council to comment on the provision for the Car Club. He reminded Members to refer to the Mid Sussex Design Guide when commenting on the application. He confirmed the Urban Designer and Design Review Panel used the guide to assess the building and they support the scheme. He noted the top floors would be constructed of zinc to minimise the visual impact of the upper 2 storeys. The bulk of the building would be viewed as 4 storeys from the road due to the topography and red brick had been requested as it is a predominate feature in the locality. The algorithms used to calculate the number of school children were tried and tested, and the development would yield between 3 to 5 school aged children.

The Planning Officer advised the Highway Authority were satisfied with the parking space dimensions. The Car Club could be considered as part of the Travel Plan and the Council can encourage the scheme as part of a condition and increase the number of car spaces to 3. The building would have 68 solar panels producing a peak output of 16.1 kwph.

Sally Blomfield, Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy confirmed the child yield calculator is based on robust evidence and a special team at County Hall provide this evidence.

As there were no further speakers the Chairman took the Members to the recommendations and Councillor Laband proposed that the Committee approve the application in line with the Officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Webb.

The Solicitor took a named vote on the officer's recommendation with the changes in the update sheet and the Committee voted 10 in favour of the motion and one abstention.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstained
Bates, R.			Y
Dabell, J	Y		
Eves, A.	Y		
Hatton, S.	Y		
Jackson, R.	Y		
Laband, C.	Y		
Peacock, A	Y		
Salisbury, R.	Y		
Sweatman, D.	Y		
Webb, R.	Y		
Whittaker, R	Y		

## **RESOLVED**

### **Recommendation A**

It is recommended that planning permission be approved subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement to secure infrastructure contributions and affordable housing and the conditions set in Appendix A.

### **Recommendation B**

It is recommended that if the applicants have not submitted a satisfactory signed planning obligation securing the necessary infrastructure payments and affordable housing by the 15th July 2021, then it is recommended that permission be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Lead for Planning and Economy, for the following reasons:

1. 'The application fails to comply with policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in respect of the infrastructure and affordable housing required to serve the development.'

## **8. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

None.

The meeting finished at 3.54 pm

Chairman