

## **Minutes of a meeting of the District Planning Committee held on 12 July 2018 from 2.00 p.m. to 2.23 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 Margaret Hersey, MacNaughton and Webster

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

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

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

The Committee noted that apologies had been received from Councillor Moore and Councillor Sweatman.

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

Councillor Holden declared a non-predetermination interest as he is a member of Burgess Hill Town Council who reviewed the application. He stated that he comes to this meeting with an open mind to consider the representations of the public speakers, Officers and Members of the Committee.

### **4. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the Committee held on 14 June 2018 were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

#### DM/18/1580 – The Martlets, Burgess Hill, West Sussex, RH15 9NN

Stephen Ashdown, Team Leader Major Development and Enforcement, introduced the report for a revised application to allow substitute drawings to be considered that provide for amendments to the form and appearance of certain elements of the approved development only. The application has been submitted under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act and seeks to vary condition 33 of planning permission DM/16/3314, which lists the approved plans associated with the scheme. Planning permission for a comprehensive development comprising retail floor space, residential units, a cinema, public library, a hotel and reconfigured car park was issued on the 14th March 2016 under reference DM/15/3858. A subsequent

application under Section 96A of the Town and Country Planning Act (DM/16/3314 refers) added a further condition to that permission to list the approved drawings as listed as an informative on the original decision notice issued by the Council.

The Officer highlighted the changes listed on page 12 and advised that the minor changes to the bulk of the cinema building would not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the building or the surrounding area. The Urban Designer had raised an issue with the louvres on the top of the apartment building, which hide the plant, but the plant has been located as far away for the edge of the building as possible. It was stated that the overall quality of the scheme was the same as that already approved.

The Officer confirmed that the number of car parking spaces for the apartments had been reduced to 110 as more space was required for the plant and lobby area in the underground car park. This provision conflicted with the requirements of the Burgess Hill Neighbourhood Plan but the approved scheme also had a shortfall, which had previously been approved, and changes to the public car park provide 14 more spaces.

The Chairman advised that there were only two issues, changes to car parking and the cinema roof, which was a necessity.

A Member welcomed the increased public car parking spaces but was concerned as there was no visitor parking provision; that residents of the flats were losing spaces and asked why residential parking was reduced and would any of the public spaces be reserved for residents' use.

The Team Leader Major Development and Enforcement confirmed he was not aware that there were any plans to reserve spaces in the public car park for residents of the flats. The original application had no provision for visitor parking and there is adequate parking within the Town Centre.

A Member replied that the layout looked similar but asked where the additional 14 spaces were.

The Officer advised that the configuration was different and there were subtle changes to the layout to increase the number of spaces.

A Member stated that although they were not happy with the visual aspect of the original design the revised design is an improvement and should be recommended. Regarding pg 12 they commented about the replacement of brickwork with render; brickwork would not deteriorate as quick and would look better than the suggested render in the long term. They also asked what the roof top smoke extractor plant was for.

The Officer advised that the urban designer had accepted the change to use render and the smoke extractor is part of the plant on the roof which the louvres protect. With regard to the use of render the change did not diminish the quality of the approved design and modern render is now more durable.

The Member wanted a review on the use of render; however the Chairman advised that the Urban Designer had accepted the change.

A Member highlighted pg 10 as there had been an objection as the redevelopment affected some properties parking facilities. The Officer advised that properties above

Church Walk have parking rights in the council car park. This was not a planning issue and had been dealt with in the original application.

The Chairman took Members to the recommendation as set out in the report and Agenda Update Sheet which was approved unanimously.

**RESOLVED**

That permission is to be granted subject to the conditions listed on Appendix A and the Agenda Update Sheet.

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

None.

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

None.

Meeting closed at 2:23.

Chairman.