

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee  
held on Wednesday, 29th May, 2019  
from 7.00 - 8.12 pm**

**Present:**

G Allen	P Coote	G Marsh
P Budgen	J Dabell	M Pulfer
R Cartwright	R Eggleston	D Sweatman
E Coe-Gunnell White	A MacNaughton	N Walker

**Also Present:** Councillors Ash-Edwards, Salisbury and Webster.

**1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

None as all Members were present.

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

Councillor Budgen declared a personal interest in DM/18/5130 – Oaktree Farm, Burgess Hill Road, Ansty, RH17 5AH as his business is a client of the company that is providing the development for the applicant.

**3 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE A, HELD ON 11 APRIL 2019 AND PLANNING COMMITTEE B, HELD ON 28 MARCH 2019.**

The Minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committee A, held on 11 April 2019 and Planning Committee B, held on 28 March 2019 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Chairman confirmed that he had no urgent business.

**5 DM/18/5130 - OAKTREE FARM, BURGESS HILL ROAD, ANSTY, RH17 5AH**

The Chairman introduced the report and confirmed with Members that they did not require a presentation from officers. He took Members to the recommendation to approve which was agreed unanimously.

**RESOLVED**

That permission be granted subject to the conditions listed at Appendix A.

## **6 DM/19/0404 - HIGH TREES, 41 HICKMANS LANE, LINDFIELD, RH16 2BZ**

Katherine Williams, Planning Officer, introduced the report which sought permission for the part demolition of the existing detached house and the proposed erection of single and two storey extensions to the front, side and rear elevations at 41 Hickmans Lane, Lindfield. She noted that the previous application was refused due to the overbearing and unneighbourly nature of the previously proposed 2-storey elevation. She drew attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which detailed a revision to the wording on P.35 of the report.

Martin Kenward, local resident, spoke against the application.

Graham Middle, speaking on behalf of the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

Michelle Harper, planning consultant for Ellen Associates, spoke in support of the application.

Councillor Ash-Edwards, Ward Member for Lindfield, spoke neutrally on the application. He invited Members to consider the work that has been done to address the objections that were raised at the previous Planning Committee and the changes made to the extension to make it less overbearing. He also drew attention concerns raised by the resident of No.43 who highlighted the applicant's intention to remove the hedge row on the boundary between their properties, creating a loss of landscape.

Steven King, Planning Applications Team Leader, addressed the comments made by the speakers. He highlighted that it was for Members to consider the application afresh, whether it overcomes the reasons for the refusal on the previous application and whether the current scheme is acceptable in relation to its design and impact on neighbouring properties.

A Member sought clarification on the distance between the revised application and the properties surrounding it.

The Planning Officer directed the Member's attention to P.63 which detailed the separation distance between the proposed extension and the neighbouring properties. She confirmed that the distance between the application and No. 35 is 11.5m; between No. 37 is 9.8m and between No. 39 is 12.5m.

A Member noted that he had walked down the footpath adjacent to the property and could not find any issue with the property potentially being overbearing. He raised his concerns over the provision of parking and how the garage is of a poor design and layout. He also raised his concerns over the proposed balcony and the possible effect it may have on the neighbouring properties. He believed the issue of parking and balcony contributed to the significant harm of amenity and therefore conflicted with Policy DP.26 of the District Plan.

A Member sought the officer's advice over a comment made by a public speaker in which it was stated that there is an intention to remove the hedge which provides screening between the properties. He noted that in the report the officer relied on the hedge to provide the screening.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the boundary line of the planning application went through the centre of the hedge. The Planning Applications

Team advised that the applicant will not be able to remove hedging that is not within their ownership.

A Member noted the concerns raised over car parking however highlighted the consultation with West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Highways in the report who did not raise an objection to the scheme.

In response to a query from a Member the Planning Applications Team Leader advised that as the property is located in the end of a cul-de-sac, vehicle speeds would be low and there would be no highway safety issues from the proposed access arrangements. He advised that if vehicles had to manoeuvre within the site to access the garage, this would not constitute a highway safety problem. He referred to the fact that WSCC Highways have no objection to the application.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to approve the application which was agreed with 9 votes in favour of the application and 3 against.

#### **RESOLVED**

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

#### **7 DM/19/0670 - HAYWARDS HEATH RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB, SPORTS PAVILION, WHITEMANS GREEN, RH17 5HX.**

Steven King, Planning Applications Team Leader, introduced the report which sought full planning consent for a replacement clubhouse and new storage facility following the demolition of the existing premises.

Phil Herbert, commercial director at HHRFC, spoke in favour of the application.

Peter Chisholm, representative of HHRFC, spoke in favour of the application.

Councillor Salisbury, Ward Member for Cuckfield, spoke in favour of the application. He agreed with the comments that described the proposal as transformative and stated that it is of a first-class design. He expressed how much of a joy it is to see all the users of the club on Saturday morning when he drives past Whitemas Green.

A Member expressed how great it is to see the all the users of the club when he drives past the application site. He stated that although the site may be located in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), there couldn't be a more perfect place to house a facility like this and expressed gladness that the club is successful enough to build such a great venue.

#### **RESOLVED**

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

#### **8 DM/19/0777 - HURSTPIERPOINT EX SERVICEMENS CLUB, WILLOW WAY, HURSTPIERPOINT, BN6 9TH.**

The Chairman introduced the report and confirmed with Members that they did not require a presentation from officers. He took Members to the recommendation to approve which was agreed unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

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

### **9 DM/18/4711 - 78B WEST STREET, EAST GRINSTEAD, RH19 4EJ.**

The Chairman introduced the application, noting that the application was called-in by the previous ward members who were not re-elected.

Steven King, Planning Applications Team Leader, introduced the report which sought planning permission to convert two flats into one property – returning it back to its original state.

James Cox, owner and resident of both flats, spoke in favour of the application.

Paul Carter, local resident, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member believed that the significant harm does not outweigh the benefits of returning the property back to its original state.

A Member sought clarification on the precedent that may be created by approving the application and whether approving the application could be used by others elsewhere in the district to turn their flats into one property.

The Planning Applications Team Leader stated that although each application must be considered on its own merits, consistency of decision making is important in the planning system. He added that if this application was approved other applicants could argue that the Council had set a precedent and prompt others to make similar applications. The Planning Applications Team Leader advised that the District Council has a challenging housing target to deliver and the loss of residential accommodation would hinder this. He also advised that it was open to the applicants to invest in the two flats to improve them if they considered that they needed refurbishing

A Member agreed with the comments that a precedent may be set if the application were to be refused. He outlined that he would be open-minded to look at the application if there was additional information supporting the application.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to refuse the application which was agreed with 9 votes for refusal and 3 against.

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be refused for the reasons outlined in Appendix A.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 8.12 pm

Chairman