

Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 18 October 2018 from 2:00 p.m. to 2:18 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 Ryan

* Absent

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

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

Councillor Margaret Hersey substituted for Councillor Holden.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies had been received from Councillors Matthews and Holden.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

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

None.

5. APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS CONSIDERED

DM/18/258 - 21 - 23 PERRYMOUNT ROAD HAYWARDS HEATH WEST SUSSEX

Joanne Fisher, Senior Planning Officer introduced the report which detailed the application seeking outline planning permission to replace the existing 2,995sqm office building and replace with 7,575sqm office building with parking for approximately 91 vehicles and landscaped realm. She drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and provided a verbal update on pg 25 condition 15 which now read "Prior to the commencement of construction of any part of the building subject of this permission, including construction of foundations, details of the electric charging vehicle points including the location of these spaces have been provided and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These spaces shall thereafter be retained for their designated use". The proposal would provide economic benefits to the area and retain employment land within Perrymount Road within a sustainable location. She identified the two main issues of the design of the replacement building, and the impact on the amenities of the neighbouring commercial occupier. Officers consider that the design and scale is appropriate to the character of the area. With regards to neighbouring amenities, the relationship with the neighbouring flats opposite is acceptable. The adjoining commercial property has

raised concerns to the proposal in respect of the new office building and its impact on daylight, sunlight and enjoyment of the existing office conditions. Policy DP26 of the District Plan relates to residential amenities and does not consider the impact to commercial properties. In addition the BRE guidance in relation to daylight and sunlight has no requirement to protect occupants of commercial buildings. The neighbour has raised further concerns in respect of right to light, however this is not a planning matter.

In response to a question the Senior Planning Officer identified the shared access with the adjoining building and informed the Committee that construction traffic would be controlled by a construction management plan.

Several Members commented that the development would provide increased office space for Haywards Heath boosting economic growth in the area.

The Chairman noted the building is to be of a contemporary design with a high use of glass. The design has the support of the Council's Urban Designer and condition 5 requires an elevational vignette of the front façade to ensure the quality of the detailing of the building.

The Chairman informed Committee that the development has included provision for cycle racks and was close to sustainable transport facilities.

The Chairman noted that no Members wished to speak so moved to Recommendations A and B and the Agenda Update Sheet, these were approved unanimously.

RESOLVED

That planning permission be granted subject to the following recommendations and amendments in the Agenda Update Sheet.

Recommendation A

That planning permission is approved subject to the completion of a S106 Legal Agreement to secure infrastructure contributions 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 by the 18th January 2019, 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 policy DP20 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in respect of the infrastructure required to serve the development'.

6. QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10

None.

The meeting closed at 2:18.

Chairman.