

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee
held on Thursday, 11th June, 2020
from 4.00 - 5.17 pm**

Present: G Marsh (Chairman)
P Coote (Vice-Chair)

G Allen	R Eggleston	M Pulfer
R Cartwright	A MacNaughton	D Sweatman
J Dabell	C Phillips	N Walker

Absent: Councillor E Coe-Gunnell White

Also Present: Councillor J Llewellyn-Burke

1 ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETINGS EXPLANATION.

The Chairman introduced the meeting and took a roll call of Members in attendance. The Legal Representative explained the virtual meeting procedure.

2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies were received from Councillor Coe-Gunnell White.

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

No declarations were received.

4 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 19 MARCH 2020.

The Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 19 March 2020 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.

6 DM/19/3769 - WOODFIELD HOUSE, ISSACS LANE, BURGESS HILL, RH15 8RA.

Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader introduced the application which sought outline planning permission for 30 new dwellings including 30% affordable housing with access via Isaac's Lane, the provision of public open space, associated infrastructure and landscaping (resubmission of application DM/18/3052). All Matters reserved except for access.

He drew members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which was circulated by email and available online. This included revised comments from the Council's Community Leisure Officer regarding infrastructure contributions and 2 additional conditions which are similar to those imposed on the Northern Arc development which is adjacent to this site.

He highlighted the relevant planning history of the site as it is bounded by the Northern Arc development, a strategic development in the District with planning permission granted for over 3000 homes, schools, business floor space and infrastructure. Phase 1 of this development is adjacent to the site, and completion of the first houses is due in 2021. He also highlighted the main issues as set out in the report and noted that although the site sits within a countryside area as defined in the District Plan, there are significant considerations that justify planning permission approval in this case as the site is surrounded on 3 sides by the Northern Arc development.

Tim Rodway spoke in favour of the application on behalf of the applicant.

A Member noted the need for traffic monitoring especially at the construction stage, suggesting a banksman to allow trucks in and out. The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that a detailed construction management plan would be in place prior to any work commencing.

A Member raised concern about the policy implications and timing of the outline application as he noted a number of reasons weighing against the proposal. He felt that undue weight was being placed on the site's location in relation to the Northern Arc Development, which is not yet built, and its inclusion in the Site Allocations Development Plan Document (Sites Allocation DPD) which is not yet approved. Concern was raised by two Members that the timing was premature as it opens up the chance of other developers submitting applications on a similar basis.

The Chairman noted that there is no precedence with planning applications so future applications are not considered in relation to this one. The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that under planning law, applications have to be determined in accordance with the Development Plan unless there are material considerations otherwise. In this case it does comply with a number of policies in the development plan and although it is in countryside, it will be surrounded on three sides by houses and a secondary school shortly. He advised Members that as set out in the committee report the Sites Allocation DPD has little weight at the moment, but as the site will be bounded on 3 sides by the Northern Arc , it is very likely that officers would have recommended this application for approval based on this fact alone.

A Member expressed concern regarding the trees along the road and hoped that only those necessary will be felled. He also sought assurance that the developer will maintain any replanting for a 3 year period after vacating the site, to ensure plants are not left to die. He also expressed a wish for any construction to be sited at least 15m from any ancient woodland, although it was clarified that there is no ancient woodland near this particular site. He also raised a question regarding the sustainability of the site in the time leading up to the full development of the Northern Arc Site, as children will need access to a school, and residents will require at least one car so there will need to be adequate provision for this, and provision to pay for any cabling for electric car chargers.

The Planning Applications Team Leader confirmed that the internal layout of the site provided at this stage is indicative only to demonstrate that this number of dwellings

could be accommodated within the site. Electric Car charging points are to be reserved by condition and will be included. Regarding trees, all of the frontage trees will be removed to provide the required visibility splays however replanting will be required within the site and there is a landscaping condition (no.7) which requires 5 years care. In response to concerns regarding the timing of the site, he noted that the Northern Arc is a flagship Homes England project, scheduled to be delivered at pace with the homes and school nearest the site being completed in the first phase of development.

In response to a concern from a Member that this application will open up possibilities for 'Northern Arc creep', the Chairman noted that there are no other sites in a similar position to this site, and the Northern Arc phasing plan indicated that there is no further possibility of creepage closer to Haywards Heath.

Three Members noted that the site is in a unique position that lends itself to being developed and that there has been limited objections to the application.

A Member requested that Section 106 contributions be considered for the town centre of Burgess Hill considering its proximity. It was noted that he can make that representation as the Section 106 agreement has not yet been completed.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to approve the application, which was proposed by Councillor Coote and seconded by Councillor Walker. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved unanimously.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
Allen, G	✓		
Cartwright, C	✓		
Coote, P	✓		
Dabell, J	✓		
Eggleston, R	✓		
MacNaughton, A	✓		
Marsh, G	✓		
Phillips, C	✓		
Pulfer, M	✓		
Sweatman, D	✓		
Walker, N	✓		

RESOLVED

That Planning permission is approved subject to the recommendations below and the conditions contained in the Agenda Update Sheet:

Recommendation A

It is recommended that planning permission is granted subject to the conditions listed in the appendix and the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the necessary affordable housing and infrastructure provision.

Recommendation B

It is recommended that if the applicants have not submitted a satisfactory signed S106 Legal Agreement/or legal undertaking securing the necessary infrastructure

payments and affordable housing provision by the 11 September 2020, then permission be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Lead for Planning and Economy, for the following reason:

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 and the required affordable housing.'

7 DM/20/0525 - TWINEHAM RECREATION GROUND, CHURCH LANE, TWINEHAM, RH17 5NR.

Katherine Williams, Planning Officer, introduced the application which sought planning permission to demolish the present brick built cricket pavilion and replace with a larger wooden pavilion with a toilet and drain to cesspit.

She drew Member's attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and noted that the replacement pavilion will be larger and more centrally placed than the existing one. The Council's Engineer is satisfied with the drainage and cesspit provisions and in terms of the mature trees on the western boundaries, there are tree protection measures put forward by the applicant which are conditioned and deemed acceptable.

Cllr Annie Hurst, Chairman of Twineham Parish Council spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman noted that it was before the Committee as the pavilion is on Council owned land and the cricket members have raised the money for the new building, replacing the old one which was significantly damaged during recent storms.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to approve the application, which was proposed by Councillor Coote and seconded by Councillor MacNaughton. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved unanimously.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
Allen, G	✓		
Cartwright, C	✓		
Coote, P	✓		
Dabell, J	✓		
Eggleston, R	✓		
MacNaughton, A	✓		
Marsh, G	✓		
Phillips, C	✓		
Pulfer, M	✓		
Sweatman, D	✓		
Walker, N	✓		

RESOLVED

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

8 DM/20/0937 - THE PAVILION, ST JOHNS PARK, PARK ROAD, BURGESS HILL, RH15 8HG.

Joseph Swift, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which sought planning permission for the corner infill extension to the north side, the insertion of bi-fold doors to the social area and the erection of a hyper shade canopy.

He noted that the park is located in the built-up area of Burgess Hill and within a conservation area. He confirmed the Council's Tree Officer has no objections subject to it being carried out as detailed in the arboriculture report. He noted that it was a modest extension of an appropriate design size and scale, with no detriment to neighbouring amenities. The Chairman noted that the site was on Council land.

Councillor Eggleston, as Ward Councillor supported the application, noting that it is a welcome improvement for one of the best cricket clubs in West Sussex, and will potentially encourage further use of the pavilion by the existing play group and others.

A Member noted that the improvement was beneficial for Burgess Hill and a good addition to existing cricket facilities within a nice park.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to approve the application, which was proposed by Councillor Eggleston and seconded by Councillor MacNaughton. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved unanimously.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
Allen, G	✓		
Cartwright, C	✓		
Coote, P	✓		
Dabell, J	✓		
Eggleston, R	✓		
MacNaughton, A	✓		
Marsh, G	✓		
Phillips, C	✓		
Pulfer, M	✓		
Sweatman, D	✓		
Walker, N	✓		

RESOLVED

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

9 DM/20/1108 - UNIT B, THE ORCHARDS SHOPPING CENTRE, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 3QH.

Caroline Grist, Planning Officer introduced the application which sought permission to remove existing signs and replace with 3 new updated brand logo fascia signs, one illuminated. She noted that due to the corner position of the retail unit it faced both on to the street and within the Orchards Shipping Centre. The new signs are a new style but a similar size and location and permission for similar illuminated signs has been granted for shops across the street. The proposal is considered appropriate

in terms of design and would not affect the amenity of the area. There are no objections in terms of public safety and the level of illumination is considered to be appropriate. The Chairman noted that the Orchards Shipping Centre site was owned by the Council.

A Member welcomed the application especially as it positively reflects the store's preparations to reopen after the recent Government Covid 19 restrictions are lifted.

A Member queried if there were restrictions on how late the lights can stay on. The Planning Officer confirmed that there are no conditions on this, and no conditions on the other similar applications across the street. It is not likely to hinder residential properties as it is in a predominantly retail environment.

The Chairman moved to the recommendation to approve the application, which was proposed by Councillor Pulfer and seconded by Councillor MacNaughton. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved unanimously.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
Allen, G	✓		
Cartwright, C	✓		
Coote, P	✓		
Dabell, J	✓		
Eggleston, R	✓		
MacNaughton, A	✓		
Marsh, G	✓		
Phillips, C	✓		
Pulfer, M	✓		
Sweatman, D	✓		
Walker, N	✓		

RESOLVED

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

10 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.

None.

The meeting finished at 5.17 pm

Chairman