

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee
held on Thursday, 14th April, 2022
from 4.00 - 5.40 pm**

Present: G Marsh (Chairman)
B Forbes (Vice-Chair)

P Brown C Phillips
R Cartwright M Pulfer

Absent: Councillors P Coote, J Dabell, R Eggleston, T Hussain,
D Sweatman and N Walker

1 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

In the absence of the Vice-Chairman on this occasion, the Chairman, Councillor Gary Marsh invited Councillor Bruce Forbes to be his Vice-Chairman for the duration of the meeting, which the Committee agreed.

Apologies were received from Councillors Coote, Dabell, Hussain, Sweatman and Walker.

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

None.

3 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE HELD ON 10 FEBRUARY 2022.

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 10 February 2022 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.

5 DM/19/3234 - LITTLE ABBOTSFORD, ISAACS LANE, BURGESS HILL, WEST SUSSEX, RH15 8RA.

Rachel Richardson, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which sought the outline planning permission for the demolition of Little Abbotsford and its ancillary buildings to provide 9 dwellings with associated parking, turning areas and new access onto Isaacs Lane. She drew Members attention to further information

contained in the Agenda Update Sheet and noted the detail to be considered at this stage is for access only with all other matters reserved for consideration under a subsequent Reserved Matters application.

The Senior Planning Officer highlighted that the site is within the built up area as defined in the Mid Sussex District Plan and the strategic 'Northern Arc' policy of the District Plan, although this site was not included in the approved Outline Planning Application for the Northern Arc. The 9 dwellings would consist of 5, three bed houses and 4, four bed houses, using functional materials consisting of local stock bricks, through colour rendered boarding or hanging tiles on the upper walls and plain machine tiles covering the roof. These adhere to the Mid Sussex Design Guide.

Finally, in response to the Local Highways Authority, previously requesting further information in the form of a revised Road Safety Audit, to assess the revised access arrangements, the Highway Authority have confirmed the access and parking arrangements were suitable for emergency and refuse vehicles.

The Chairman thanked officers for the report and explained that a full definition of S106 monies expenditure would be provided for applications going forward.

Mr Nigel Alderton, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

A Member expressed concerns regarding the design layout of parking provision away from the properties on site, which was not practical or easily visible to residents and the site is adjacent to a very busy main road which will become even busier as the Northern Arc development progresses. He also asked what provision was being made for Electric Vehicle charging points and adequate sustainable heating. In response to the parking, the Senior Planning Officer advised the plans showing the internal layout and elevations of the buildings were only indicative and therefore could be revised. They also comply with the Mid Sussex Design Guide. In addition, the dwellings would be 3 storeys with scope to overlook the parking bays. Regarding the latter points, these would form part of the Reserved Matters application, which the Chairman explained would be presented to the Committee when applicable.

A Member asked as a stipulation of the application, for all construction traffic to be stationed at the site with adequate wheel washing facilities. He also raised concerns about the disposal of sewage and surface water and that access to and from the site be more substantial for Waste contractors onto Isaacs Lane. Finally, he noted the lack of pavement provision. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that as part of the conditions of the application, all construction traffic would be parked on site and wheel washing could be included. Foul water and drainage would form part of the Reserved Matters stage and the application would need to comply with the drainage conditions on the outline consent before development commenced. Regarding the pavements, she advised the walkways, specifically Isaacs Lane, are detailed in the separate Northern Arc plans.

A Member asked for further clarification on the 'Grampian style' condition set out in the report. The Senior Planning Officer advised this was a condition stipulated by West Sussex County Council, where speed restrictions and road safety elements are agreed prior to the houses being built. Steven King, Planning Applications Team Leader emphasised it requires these details to be submitted to the Planning Authority before works can take place.

In response to a query as to why this particular site had not been acquired by Homes England as part of the Northern Arc development, the Chairman advised it did not form part of the four main landowners land allocated in the Northern Arc.

Finally, a Member asked for an update on the Northern Arc development, advising this would be useful for all Members. The Chairman advised he received regular updates from Acom and agreed for these to be sent to all Members.

The recommendation was moved from the Chair and the Chairman took Members to a vote to approve the outline permission as detailed in the report and the conditions set out in Appendix A and Appendix B. The recommendation was approved unanimously with 6 in favour of the application.

RESOLVED

That outline permission be granted subject to the recommendations below and amendments contained in the Agenda Update Sheet.

RECOMMENDATION A

That outline permission be granted subject to conditions listed in the appendix and the satisfactory completion of a Section 106 Agreement to secure financial contributions for infrastructure improvements.

RECOMMENDATION B

It is recommended that if the applicants have not submitted a satisfactory signed S106 Legal Agreement/or legal undertaking securing the necessary infrastructure payments and affordable housing provision by the 14 July 2022, then permission be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Lead for Planning and Economy, for the following reason:

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 DM/21/3755 - COURT MEADOW SCHOOL, HANLYE LANE, CUCKFIELD, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH17 5HN.

Joanne Fisher, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the application which sought the demolition of Court Meadow School buildings to provide 13 dwellings with parking and landscaping. She drew Members attention to the further information contained in the Agenda Update Sheet in relation to Appendix A – recommended conditions and updates to conditions 6 and 15. She noted the site is allocated under the Cuckfield Neighbourhood Plan, for approximately 10 dwellings. The proposed design would retain the current boundary shrubs and trees with additional planting and the design of the dwellings would consist of dark grey windows, doors and drainage. She noted that although this design was different to dwellings in close proximity, the properties have been designed to take into account local materials. The Councils Urban Designer has raised no objection to the design of the development. She advised a Fabric First approach was proposed for heating and Electrical Vehicle charging points would be provided. The development would make good use of a brownfield site and benefits from S106 contributions as detailed in the report. The proposal shows that the site would adequately accommodate 13 dwellings without being overdeveloped and would not detract from the adjacent Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

Mr Peter Rainier, agent for the applicant, spoke in support of the application.

The Chairman thanked officers for the report and emphasised the application would make very good use of a brownfield site, in particular the allocation of 4 affordable dwellings.

Members discussed the application in detail. A Member raised concerns (following a site visit) regarding the width of the public footpath adjacent to the site for pedestrians and access for cyclists turning north into the site or onto the main road. He expressed concerns these matters had not been fully addressed or resolved in the report, although officer's advice is there will be a neutral impact in respect of highway safety and safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. Another Member also raised concerns regarding the speed limits on Hanlye Lane and the need for widening the turning circle on the site and provision of a public footpath. The Senior Planning Officer clarified there is an existing footpath adjacent to the site and that there would be a footpath link from the development to this and that the Highways Authority considered the application acceptable in highway safety terms. In response to a query regarding construction traffic remaining on site and wheel washing to be provided, condition 4 requires details on construction parking, plant, materials, parking of vehicles and wheel washing.

The Chairman reassured Members in his experience the road is fairly safe and acknowledged the footpath is not widely used, however, it provides safe access as it is situated behind a hedge. He was unable to comment on the issue of turning into the site. He highlighted that West Sussex County Council owned and were responsible for the footpath.

Members were pleased the development forms part of the Cuckfield Neighbourhood plan and fully supported the use of the site. A Member also noted that in light of the sustainability challenges, this was a very good application.

The recommendation was moved from the Chair and the Chairman took Members to a vote that planning permission be approved with 5 in favour and 1 against, therefore the application was approved.

RESOLVED

The application was approved subject to the recommendations below and amendments contained in the Agenda Update Sheet.

RECOMMENDATION A

It is recommended that planning permission be approved subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement to secure infrastructure contributions and affordable housing 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 and affordable housing by the 14th July 2022, 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 policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan in respect of the infrastructure and affordable housing required to serve the development.'

7 DM/22/0204 - LITTLE PARK FARM, MARCHANTS CLOSE, HURSTPIERPOINT, HASSOCKS, BN6 9UZ.

The Chairman gave a brief overview on this application, reminding Members it had already been presented to the Planning Committee, however, due to a slight material change it was being resubmitted for transparency.

Anna Tidey, Planning Officer, introduced the application which sought permission for removal of a former dairy, mobile home and other outbuildings to construct 2 dwellings (revisions to approved scheme DM/21/2367) now including garages and alterations to eastern unit to accommodate rooms with the roof space, following approval by the Planning Committee in September 2021 under DM/21/2367. She drew Members attention to further information contained in the Agenda Update Sheet, to include an update to condition 18. The Planning Officer advised the site is smaller than described in the initial application and highlighted the addition of garages to Units b and C and extension of Unit C, as the significant changes.

Peter Rainier, agent for the applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

A Member expressed disappointment that the barn conversion from the original application had been removed and reinforced local resident's objections as the proposal has changed substantially since the previous application. He questioned why the application has come before the Cttee and questioned if the application was for works that are permitted development. In response to this, the Chairman advised that for transparency the application was resubmitted, and the Planning Officer advised the changes were substantially significant to present to the Committee and permitted development could not be granted until a dwelling was constructed

In response to a query from a Member about permitted development rights, the Planning Applications Team Leader explained that permitted development rights for dwellings only become available once a dwelling has been completed. In this case the buildings being discussed were not yet completed and therefore they have no permitted development rights at this point in time.

The recommendation was moved from the Chair and the Chairman took Members to a vote that planning permission be approved with 5 in favour and 1 against, therefore the application was approved.

RESOLVED

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

8 DM/22/0220 - THE HAVENS SPORTSFIELD CAR PARK, THE HAVEN CENTRE, HOPHURST LANE, CRAWLEY DOWN, RH10 4LJ.

The Chairman briefly reminded Members that Mid Sussex District Council were the landowners of the site hence its submission to the Planning Committee.

Joseph Swift, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the report which sought permission for variation of condition 2 relating to the Planning Application DM/20/3296 – to substitute drawings for those on the original approved scheme, in order to reduce the scale of the building with adjustments to external materials, design of roof and reduce the space between the car parking rows. He advised there were no further updates to the Agenda Update Sheet. He provided Members with drawings of the revised design plans for the roof and reduced tarmac surface between car parking spaces for context. He explained the reduction in height of the building will result in the building being approximately 1.6 metres lower than previously approved. He confirmed the application is deemed to comply with the Development Plan in the report and therefore is considered acceptable.

The Chairman thanked officers for the report and reminded Members the revised application is supported by the Parish Council.

A Member noted the design was more sensible and realistic on this application and was pleased it had been resubmitted.

A Member asked for clarity on whether the Hall would still be able to accommodate badminton under the new conditions and given the reduction in car parking space, was there adequate space for turning vehicles? The Senior Planning Officer confirmed the design of the roof still obtains the height for badminton now being a crown pitched roof and the proposal would still provide sufficient turning space for vehicles.

A Member asked for clarification as to whether the footprint of the building was the same as that of the previous building and has it moved on the plot. He expressed his concern that there was no provision for cyclists and asked what parking provision was available at the Football pitches. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed the footprint had not changed or moved and that parking was a consideration of the original application, this application was to only consider the change to condition 2.

The recommendation was moved from the Chair and the Chairman took Members to a vote that the application be approved with 6 in favour, the application was approved unanimously.

RESOLVED

The application was approved subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A.

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

1. Question from Councillor Paul Brown

Referring to the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting on 13th January 2022

Agenda Item 10. DM/21/4173

COMMUNITY CENTRE, 124 WYVERN WAY BURGESS HILL, WEST SUSSEX
RH15 0GB

“The Chairman noted Burgess Hill Town Council’s comments that it would be desirable to have covered bike racks and electric vehicle charging points. The need for cycle parking was reiterated by a Member of the committee. The Planning Team

Leader noted that there is sufficient space to place cycle racks and these would not require planning permission. It was agreed that the Planning Team Leader would write to the applicant to express desire for cycle parking on site to be taken forward. As the building is in Council ownership it would be something for the Council as Landlord to consider separately.”

Will the planning team leader provide copy of the correspondence with the applicant, the applicants reply and the status of any recommendation made?

2. Question from Councillor Paul Brown

Referring to Agendas of Planning Committee Meetings including this meeting's agenda 14th April 2022, it will be noted that the site address does not include the post code. In the minutes the agenda item number is followed by the site address **and** post code.

Agenda Item 6. DM/21/3755

“COURT MEADOW SCHOOL HANLYE LANE CUCKFIELD HAYWARDS HEATH DEMOLITION OF BUILDINGS AND ERECTION OF 13 DWELLINGS ALONG WITH PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 21/2/2022 SHOWING RETENTION OF TREES 6, 15,21, 23 AND 25, RE-POSITIONING OF PLOT 9, AMENDMENTS TO BOUNDARY OF PLOTS 1-3, CHANGES TO INTERNAL LAYOUT OF PLOTS,RELOCATION OF HOME OFFICE TO PLOT 7, AMENDED FENCE LINE, REMOVAL OF SHARED FOOTPATH TO SECONDARY ROAD AS WELL AS SUBMISSION OF ADDENDUM TO TRANSPORT STATEMENT, UPDATED ROAD SAFETY AUDIT AND LANDSCAPE MASTERPLAN. MR. JAMES TURNER”

In the interests of transparency and assisting locating application sites, can the post code be included in the Agenda of future Planning Committee Report Packs?

The Chairman on this occasion, confirmed that as the 10.2 questions were administrative rather than on planning policy matters, Councillor Brown would receive written responses from officers for both questions.

The meeting finished at 5.40 pm

Chairman