

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee  
held on Thursday, 10th February, 2022  
from 4.00 - 4.19 pm**

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

P Brown	B Forbes	D Sweatman
R Cartwright	C Phillips	
J Dabell	M Pulfer	

**Absent:** Councillors R Eggleston and N Walker

**Also Present:** Councillors T Hussain, R Bates and R Salisbury

**1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillors Eggleston and Walker.

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

In relation to item DM/21/3785 – 6 Burma Close, Haywards Heath, West Sussex, RH16 3JE, Councillor Pulfer declared a prejudicial interest in the item as he is the landowner. He confirmed he would remove himself from the meeting for the discussion and voting on the item.

**3 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 13 JANUARY 2022.**

The Chairman acknowledged an amendment to the minutes, which had been proposed by Councillor Brown. This was in relation to Item 10 DM/21/4173 – Community Centre, 124 Wyvern Way, Burgess Hill, West Sussex RH15. The Chairman read the amended text and took Members to a vote to agree the minutes as amended. The Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 13 January 2022 as amended were agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

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

The Chairman had no urgent business.

Councillor Pulfer removed himself from the meeting at 4.05pm

**5 DM/21/3785 - 6 BURMA CLOSE, HAYWARDS HEATH, WEST SUSSEX, RH16 3JE**

Nick Rogers, Business Unit Leader for Development Management introduced the application which sought permission for works to a number of trees at 6 Burma

Close, Haywards Heath. The works, as amended, were considered appropriate to allow more light to reach the pond without undue harm to the health or amenity value of the trees, and as such the proposals comply with policy DP37 of the Mid Sussex District Plan. He drew Members' attention to the further information contained in the Agenda Update Sheet which detailed the recommendation that consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in appendix A.

The Chairman reminded Members the application had been brought before the Committee as the applicant is a Member of the Planning Committee. It would have otherwise been a delegated decision recommended for approval.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendation to approve the application as outlined in the report, and the conditions set out in Appendix A on the Agenda Update sheet. This was proposed by Councillor Coote and seconded by Councillor Phillips. The recommendation was approved unanimously.

### **RESOLVED**

That consent be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A and the Agenda Update Sheet;

### **Recommended Conditions**

1. The tree works hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of 2 years from the date of this consent.

Reason: To accord with section 17 (4) of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation) (England) Regulations 2012.

2. The work shall be carried out in accordance with BS 3998:2010 "Recommendation for Tree Work".

Reason: To ensure that the work is carried out to a satisfactory standard.

Councillor Pulfer returned to the meeting at 4.07pm

## **6 DM/21/3763 - CROSS CONSTRUCTION DEVELOPMENT SITE, ROCKY LANE, HAYWARDS HEATH, WEST SUSSEX, RH16 4XL**

Caroline Grist, Planning Officer introduced the report which sought permission for the cross-construction development site at Rocky Lane, Haywards Heath, to erect 9 apartments within a single three storey building, along with access, parking and landscaping. It follows the refusal of a similar application for 9 dwellings in April 2021 (DM/20/3456). The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which includes an additional reason for refusal alongside the reason set out in Appendix A. She noted that there are matters that weigh in favour of the development, (such as providing 9 houses within the built-up area, 3 of which will be affordable housing with associated infrastructure contributions) and there have been no formal objections from the Highways Authority, Environmental Protection Officer and Network Rail. However, when considering the planning balance, the development is deemed to have a significantly harmful impact to the semi-rural character of the area, partly due to the loss of agreed landscaping which was a mitigation as part of the original Kilwood Apartments development, and an adverse impact to the existing trees which are to be relocated.

A Member noted that historically the land had been owned by Crest and under the terms of the application for the existing development was to be landscaped to mitigate the visual impact of the development into Haywards Heath. Under this application the new developer was proposing to develop land allocated for landscaping. He also noted his concern that current residential parking spaces would be lost as a result of the development.

A Member commented on the proposals of ample cycling storage for residents promoted by the developer, raising his concerns about the security of the site for existing cycle storage at block C following a site visit. He referenced DP21 of the Mid Sussex District Plan which promotes the increased use of alternative transport where suitable facilities for secure storage have been provided and did not feel that the current storage on site met this requirement. The Chairman advised the initial application was approved prior to the adoption of the District Plan but confirmed that any new applications would need to meet the requirements of DP21.

A Member emphasised it was important to keep the existing green spaces between the Towns and was supportive of the recommendation to refuse the application.

The Chairman took Members to a vote on the recommendations as set out in the report along with the additional reason for refusal set out in Appendix A and in the Agenda Update Sheet in relation to the S106 agreement not yet being agreed. This was proposed by Councillor Coote, seconded by Councillor Pulfer and approved by the Committee unanimously.

#### **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be refused for reasons outlined in Appendix A of the report and the Agenda Update Summary Sheet.

#### **7 QUESTIONS PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE 10.2 DUE NOTICE OF WHICH HAS BEEN GIVEN.**

None.

The meeting finished at 4.19 pm

Chairman