

## **Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 4 October 2018 from 2:00 p.m. to 2:55 p.m.**

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

Pru Moore\*  
Christopher Hersey  
Colin Holden

Norman Mockford  
Edward Matthews  
Dick Sweatman

Anthony Watts Williams  
Peter Wyan

\* Absent

**Also Present:** Councillors Andrew McNaughton, Margaret Hersey, Pru Moore and Norman Webster.

### **1. SUBSTITUTES AT MEETINGS OF COMMITTEE – COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 4**

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

### **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

The Committee noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Pru Moore as she attended the meeting as the Ward Member for Burgess Hill - Leylands.

### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None.

### **4. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Committee held on 6 September 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

### **5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED**

DM/18/0509 - Land to the West of, Freeks Lane, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15  
8DG

Steve King, Planning Applications Team Leader introduced the report which detailed the application which sought outline planning permission for a residential development comprising up to 460 dwellings, public open space, recreation areas, play areas, associated infrastructure including roads, surface water attenuation and associated demolition (outline application with all matters reserved except for principal means of access from Maple Drive).

He drew Members attention to the information in the Agenda Update Sheet and the recommendation on p11 as the terms of the legal agreement had not been finalised. He advised that Burgess Hill Town Council had reconsidered in light of the commitment in the IDP and Planning Strategy to the early completion of the link road between the site and Isaacs Lane, provided their comments and now supported the application. Condition 18 had been removed as it was a duplicate of condition 12 and there were extra conditions covering ecology matters and additional highway works.

The Committee were informed that the outline planning application was to determine the access for the proposed development and that if this outline application was approved a reserved matters application would be received at a later date for the remaining matters. The Officer advised that the site was situated within an area that had been allocated for development in the District Plan. Key elements of the Northern Arc Masterplan were highlighted and plans providing indicative densities were displayed. The Officer noted that the application conformed with the principles set out in the Masterplan. The size of the site was 20 ha. He advised the Committee that there was a consented site to the south west of the application site and open fields to the west. The applicant had submitted a parameter plan showing broad areas of development within the site with public open spaces and play areas. The higher density areas would be at the southern end, medium density in the centre and low density at the northern end. The layout was only illustrative to highlight the means of access from Maple Drive and to show how the site could accommodate the proposed number of dwellings.

The Planning Applications Team Leader drew Members attention to the issues listed on p19 of the report but as the site had been allocated in the District Plan the principle of development had been established. He noted that the landscape impacts were detailed on p26 and that West Sussex County Council concluded that the development could be achieved with no severe highway impact. He advised that the design of the site would be a perimeter block layout with houses facing outwards towards the boundary treatments as detailed on p27. The housing mix was indicative and would be determined at reserved matters; the site would include 30% affordable housing which was acceptable and policy compliant. There were no significant amenity impacts to the properties in The Hawthorns. The site represented the first application for the development of the Northern Arc and the IDP and Phasing Strategy indicated that the application for the bridge and link road would be submitted and constructed early as it would provide a second access for the site. He highlighted condition 22 which stated that no more than 130 dwellings could be occupied until Section Five of the Northern Arc Avenue between Isaacs Lane, the site and the bridge associated with River Adur had been constructed. The Officer outlined how the site was intended to be drained and confirmed that the Council's Drainage Engineer was satisfied that the site could be satisfactorily drained. The detailed design of the drainage scheme for the site would be controlled by a planning condition and would be included in the reserved matters application.

Jim Strike from AECOM spoke in support of the application. He informed Committee that no changes had been made by Homes England to the original application first submitted by Rydon Homes. This would be the first development in the Northern Arc Masterplan. The proposal was for 30% affordable housing in accordance with the District Plan. The development would provide 7 ha of public open space including a replacement play area as the existing play area would be the location of the access to the site. He confirmed that no more than 130 dwellings would be occupied before the link road and bridge had been constructed. The internal road design to be

included in the reserved matters application would be designed to encourage low speed and would promote walking. The development would comply with Policies DP7 and DP9 of the District Plan.

Cllr Pru Moore spoke in support of the application and informed Committee that, the original applicant, Rydon Homes had consulted with the residents of her ward as they had not been receptive to the first scheme. The scheme had been redesigned to take into account the comments of local residents. She noted that the Officers work had protected the interests of the residents and that the link road and bridge would be completed in accordance with condition 22. Most comments she had received were concerned with traffic and had been addressed. A request was made for a condition to restrict the movement of construction traffic during school opening / closing hours and that the developers consult the young people about the design of the replacement play area. Cllr Moore commented that she had sent out 200 letters to local residents and had received only two replies from residents raising concerns.

The Chairman noted that this was the start of a significant development of many new sites and this application would feed into the Northern Arc Masterplan. He informed Members that they would not be discussing Section Five of the road (the bridge and link to Isaacs Lane) and the detailed application for Section Five would be received in the Spring 2019.

In response to a Member concern with the control of vehicles within the site, the Chairman advised that this would be a reserved matter and the Committee should only be concerned with access to the site.

A Member noted that a tenant farmer, with a lifetime tenancy, had been given three months' notice to vacate. The Planning Applications Team Leader advised that this was not a planning matter but he was aware that there had been further negotiations between the applicant and the tenant farmer to reach an agreement.

Simon Hall, West Sussex County Council replied to a Member's question regarding their response that there was no apparent severe highway and transport impact; this response related to a detailed assessment and any impact could be mitigated by conditions / improvements to the highway network.

A Member noted that no letters of objection had been received for this application.

In response to a question the Chairman informed Committee that condition 3 (h & i) covered storage on site, loading and unloading. The Planning Applications Team Leader added that if a vehicle was roadworthy and taxed they could not prevent the vehicle from parking on the highway, Maple Drive. However the site would be designed with sufficient designated parking area and the site manager should manage its use.

A Member noted that the report mentioned a current application DM/16/3947 for the 130 dwellings on the same site. He also asked whether the site would be designed to prevent all vehicles accessing Maple Drive.

The Planning Applications Team Leader replied that the application for 130 dwellings was expected to be withdrawn once this application for 460 dwellings had been determined.

Simon Hall confirmed that the application was designed to accommodate vehicles from all 460 dwellings.

A Member noted that there was an age restriction for the block of flats and this was in his opinion not acceptable; and also asked whether there would be safety measures around the ponds.

The Chairman informed Committee that the use of an age restriction, such as 55+, was common practice in the planning environment and any safety measures for the ponds would be a reserved matter. He confirmed that other off site areas would be improved as part of the scheme.

The Vice-Chairman commented that restrictions on construction traffic in the vicinity of the school would be a reserved matter and that the request for residents to be involved in the replacement play area had been noted by AECOM.

The Chairman noted that no Members wished to speak so moved to the recommendations contained in the report and the Agenda Update Sheet these were approved unanimously.

### **RESOLVED**

That permission is granted subject to the conditions listed in the appendix and agenda update sheet and the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement to secure the necessary affordable housing and infrastructure provision. Authority to be delegated to officers to negotiate and complete a satisfactory planning obligation. The final heads of terms to be agreed by the Divisional Leader Planning and Economy and Head of Regulatory Services and Solicitor in consultation with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the District Planning Committee

### **6. ITEMS THAT THE CHAIRMAN AGREES TO TAKE AS URGENT BUSINESS**

None.

### **7. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10**

None.

Meeting closed at 14:55

Chairman.