

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee
held on Thursday, 11th March, 2021
from 4.00 - 5.46 pm**

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

G Allen	J Dabell	C Phillips
R Cartwright	R Eggleston	M Pulfer
E Coe-	A MacNaughton	D Sweatman
Gunnell White		

Absent: Councillor N Walker

Also Present: Councillors De Mierre, Llewellyn-Burke, Knight and Webster

1 ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETINGS EXPLANATION.

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

2 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies were received from Councillor Walker.

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

Cllr Pulfer declared a personal interest in Item 6 (DM/20/1503), as he is Vice Chair of Haywards Heath Town Council's Planning Committee, which had previously debated the application. He declared that he approached the matter with an open mind.

4 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 21 JANUARY AND 11 FEBRUARY 2021

Subject to the following changes:

1. Cllr Eggleston to be noted as present for the meeting of 21 January 2021, and
2. Cllr Dabell's vote of "Against" on the first motion of Item 5 DM/20/1516 to be recorded for the meeting of 11 February 2021

the minutes of the meetings of the Planning Committees held on 21 January and 11 February 2021 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.

The Chairman had no urgent business.

6 DM/20/1503 - OAKWOOD, AMBERLEY CLOSE, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 4BG.

Steven King, Planning Applications Team Leader, introduced the application which sought approval for the partial demolition of the existing southern wing and construction of a part two-storey and part three-storey extension to an existing care home to provide 31 new bedrooms, resulting in a total of 60 bedrooms on the site and 50 car parking spaces. He noted that the design had been altered during the course of the application to address officers' concerns. The design of the scheme took advantage of the change in levels through the site and made good use of the space. There is no impact on the settings of Great Haywards Farm and Great Haywards Barn, which are both Grade Two listed, because of intervening buildings between the site of the planning application and the listed buildings.

He added that matters pertaining to access were considered on page 34 of the committee report. There are currently 29 parking spaces and the proposal will result in 50 spaces on the site, including disabled spaces and Electric Car (EV) Charging Points. He pointed Members' attention to the fact that the Highways Authority had raised no objection and that there would not be any significant impact on the Highway Network from the proposal. In terms of highway safety, there were no grounds to reject the application. He highlighted a key issue was neighbouring amenities (discussed on page 35 of the report). He pointed Members to policy DP26 and that there would not be significant harm caused to the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring flats. Regarding drainage, he confirmed that there are no objections from Southern Water or the Local Flood Authority or the Council's Drainage Engineer. The Council's ecological consultant has also raised no objection. Though some concerns had been raised about the impact on trees on the southern boundary of the site, the Tree Officer had raised no objections and the proposed extension was outside the root protection area of protected trees.

The Planning Applications Team Leader concluded that he believed there would be clear benefits from the scheme including improvements to the facilities in the site, the provision of the additional bedrooms, for which there is a clear need with the aging population as well as the economic benefits, with a further 9 staff being employed. He recommended that the Members consider it for approval.

Lyndsey Ratcliffe, a local resident spoke against the application.

Andrew Wilson, local resident spoke against the application.

Ozkan Turgutlu, local resident spoke against the application.

Huw James, agent for the application, spoke in favour of the application.

Tracy Evans, Chief Executive of Sussex Housing & Care, spoke in favour of the application.

Cllr De Mierre, Ward Member, spoke against the application, citing concerns about the height of the extension, which she felt would impinge on neighbouring properties, as well as potential damage of the trees during the period of construction and access to the site.

Cllr Jim Knight, Ward Member, spoke against the application. He believed the proposed elevations would dominate the landscape and were out of keeping with the area, along with loss of privacy for existing residents.

A Member expressed support for the additional opportunities and employment the extended building could offer, though he expressed concerns with the topography and the height of the building.

A Member queried if the increased number of beds would lead to an increase in the number of visitors and queried the number of parking spaces provided. Another Member was concerned about traffic to the site. Another Member indicated that he could not see any substantial reasons to refuse the application. One Member had concerns with the fact the extension would double the size of the building, and whether this still complies with DP26 in terms of creating a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of surrounding buildings and landscape. He also noted DP41 regarding flood risk and drainage as he had concerns over whether the extension deals with the issue of lack of drainage on site.

Addressing concerns expressed by Members, the Planning Applications Team Leader acknowledged that Policy E9 of Neighbourhood Plan covers how proposals sit in their context and DP26 of the District Plan is a more up to date policy with similar aims. He noted that it was down to planning judgement to determine if it meets the criteria in these two policies. He advised that there had been extensive negotiation on the design and that the Urban Designer is now satisfied that the proposed elevations now fit comfortably within the site. With regards to drainage he highlighted that the Council's Drainage Officer had not expressed any objection to the plans and was content with the proposals to drain the site, noting that the technical details can be dealt with by planning condition. Following concerns from residents about the impact on neighbouring properties, he didn't believe that the proposal would have an adverse impact in terms of a loss of light to the properties to the south because of their distance from the proposed extension and the fact that the extension was to the north of the neighbouring houses at Ferny Croft.

Another Member noted there was a growing need for nursing homes in the area and expressed the view that there was sufficient space between the site and the neighbouring properties.

The Chairman took Members to the vote to approve the application as detailed in the Officer Recommendation as amended by the Agenda Update Sheet. This was proposed by the Vice-Chairman and seconded by Cllr MacNaughton. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved with 7 votes in favour and 3 against.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
G. Allen	Y		
R. Cartwright	Y		
P. Coote	Y		
J. Dabell	Y		
R. Eggleston		Y	
A. MacNaughton	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		
C. Phillips		Y	
M. Pulfer		Y	
D. Sweatman	Y		

RESOLVED

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

(Cllr Coe-Gunnel White left the meeting at 4:15pm.)

7 DM/20/4426 - LITTLE TORCH, 4 HASSOCKS ROAD, HURSTPIERPOINT, HASSOCKS, WEST SUSSEX, BN6 9QN.

Stuart Malcolm, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the item which sought full planning permission for the change of use of Little Torch from Class C2 (residential institutions) to Class C3 (dwelling houses) to form 10 residential units including 8 flats and 2 houses together with car parking and associated development. He drew Members' attention to the Agenda Update Sheet and an additional letter of representation from a neighbour.

He indicated that there had been no objections from the highways authority or environmental protection officers in respect of the use of the access and driveway. He confirmed that Members must give considerable importance and weight to the less than substantial harm to the heritage assets that had been identified by the Conservation Officer. He stated that as per para 196 of the NPPF, this less than substantial harm needed to be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. He confirmed that planning officers consider that the provision of 10 residential units in this sustainable location would bring economic and social benefits that outweigh the less than substantial harm identified. He added that the proposal would have only a minor impact on the South Downs National Park to the south and that significant harm to residential amenity could not be demonstrated, so duly recommended the application for approval.

Guy Dixon, the agent, spoke in favour of the application.

The Vice-Chairman proposed the motion to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation, which was seconded by Cllr Phillips.

The Chairman took Members to the vote to approve the application in accordance with the Officer Recommendations and the Agenda Update Sheet. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was unanimously approved.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
G. Allen	Y		
R. Cartwright	Y		
P. Coote	Y		
J. Dabell	Y		
A MacNaughton	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		
C. Phillips	Y		
M. Pulfer	Y		
D. Sweatman	Y		

RESOLVED

A

Subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 planning obligation securing the necessary financial contributions towards infrastructure, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A

B

If the applicants have not completed a satisfactory signed planning obligation securing the necessary financial contributions towards infrastructure by the 11th June 2021, then permission be refused, at the discretion of the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy, for the following reason:

'In the absence of a signed legal agreement the application fails to deliver the necessary financial contributions towards infrastructure and as such conflicts with Policy DP20 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, criteria (g) of Policy HurstH6, the Council's SPD on Development Infrastructure and Contributions and the NPPF.'

(Cllr Eggleston left the meeting at 5:22pm.)

8 DM/20/3832 - EVERGREEN FARM, WEST HOATHLY ROAD, EAST GRINSTEAD, WEST SUSSEX, RH19 4NE.

Anna Tidey, Planning Officer, presented the report on the application to discharge an occupancy requirement under a planning obligation attached to planning reference 11/01105/EOT at a property known as Evergreen Farm, off West Hoathly Road in East Grinstead. Planning Permission was granted under 11/01105/EOT for the erection of a replacement farmhouse at the site in 2011. She brought to Members' attention an error on Page 105 of the report as set out in the Agenda Update Sheet.

The motion to approve the discharge of the S106 planning obligation in accordance with the officer recommendation was proposed by Cllr Sweatman and seconded by Cllr Dabell. The Chairman took the motion to a vote and a recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was unanimously approved.

Councillor	For	Against	Abstain
G. Allen	Y		
R. Cartwright	Y		
P. Coote	Y		
J. Dabell	Y		
A. MacNaughton	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		
C. Phillips	Y		
D. Sweatman	Y		
M. Pulfer	Y		

RESOLVED:

That the S106 planning obligation dated 5 September 2011 be discharged.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 5.46 pm

Chairman