

**Minutes of a meeting of District Planning Committee  
held on Thursday 15th September 2022  
from 2.00 pm - 3.34 pm**

**Present:** D Sweatman (Chairman)  
B Forbes (Vice-Chair)

R Bates  
P Coote  
A Eves

S Hatton  
R Jackson  
C Laband

A Peacock  
C Trumble  
R Whittaker

**Absent:** Councillors G Marsh

**Also Present:** Councillors Henwood, Phillips & Salisbury.

**1. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

Apologies were received from Councillor Marsh.

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

Cllr Jackson declared a personal interest in Item 6 - DM/21/3279 - Burgess Hill Northern Arc, Land North and North West of Burgess Hill, Between Bedelands Nature Reserve in the East and Goddard's Green Waste Water Treatment Works in the West as part the application falls within his Ward.

**3. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 16 JUNE 2022.**

The minutes of the meeting of the committee held on 16 June 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 confirmed he had no urgent business.

**5. DM/21/3805 - BARBOUR DRIVE, COPTHORNE, WEST SUSSEX, RH10 3JY.**

Steve Ashdown, Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement, introduced the report which sought full planning permission for the erection of a single employment building for storage and distribution (Use Class B8), providing a total of 10,769sqm of floorspace on land north of the A264 Copthorne Way, Copthorne.

Tom Clark, Solicitor to the Council, read out a written representation from Stuart Leaver in objection to the application.

Steve Molnar, Agent of the Applicant, spoke in favour of the application.

Chris Phillips, Ward Member, spoke against the application. He outlined the history of the site which has maintained the rural view of Copthorne as you enter the village and protected them from noise and traffic from the A264. He drew attention to two warehouses near the site which already generate noise, mainly from HGV vehicle movements. He noted the additional 160+ HGV vehicles from the proposed site and contended that the traffic and noise would cause substantial harm. He accepted that the site was included in the Site Allocations DPD however the proposed scheme is different to the previously proposed as it is absent of any Business or Light Industrial allocation. He concluded by stating that the site is disproportionately large and is an overdevelopment of the site.

The Chairman confirmed that the site is SA4 of the Site Allocations DPD and that the developer has identified a need for Use Class B8.

The Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement referred to Paragraph 83 of the NPPF on P.20 of report which indicates that B8 Warehouses should be located in suitably accessible locations, the site offers this.

A Member noted the reference of the relocation the cycle and pedestrian path and asked for further details.

The Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement showed the route on the presentation which provided a route from north to south through the site.

A Member noted his site visit where he observed two other units in the area and asked whether the proposed development would compound the queuing problem. He also asked whether there have been complaints of the two units already in the area.

The Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement replied that the only complaints he received are through the representations. He added that West Sussex County Council Highways are aware of the proposal and the current units and have not raised an objection.

A Member sought clarification as to why the site had not been designed for the vehicle parking to be on the site of the A264.

The Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement confirmed that he had raised the question with the developers at an initial stage of discussion. It was noted that access to the site would be from Barbour Drive, regardless of where the service yard is located as this is the only access to the site. As the yard is 90m from the properties, the Environmental Health Officer was instead concerned with the noise from night time traffic movements on Barbour Drive. However, having looked at all the evidence, the Environmental Health Officer has not raised an objection and it is not considered that there are sufficient grounds to refuse the application on this issue alone.

A Member expressed disappointed that there are not smaller units on the development that were previously assured by the developer.

A Member noted that Environmental Health Officers, Planning Officers and local residents are not happy with the application and so asked who decides the mitigations.

The Planning Team Leader for Major Development & Enforcement explained that the Environmental Health Officer reviewed the issue very carefully and it is not considered that the Council cannot sustain a reason for refusal on noise grounds. While the Council can control mitigations on site, it cannot control the use of the road or road users through planning conditions.

A Member stated that the principle of the development has been established. He reiterated issues around sound and the mitigations reported on P.20. of the report however concluded that there would be difficulty in refusing the application. He proposed moving to approve the recommendation.

A Member appreciated that the principle of development has been established however raised concerns with the reversing beeps of the lorries and the bright lights on the service yard. She believed that the application should not go ahead especially because its size and that it will be operated 24 hours a day.

A Member noted a typographical error in the last five words of Condition 9.

The Chairman noted that no Member wished to speak so moved to the recommendation to approve the application with amended conditions, proposed by Councillor Trumble and seconded by Councillor Laband, which was approved with nine votes in favour and two against.

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A, updates from the Agenda Update Sheet and the typographical amendment of Condition 9.

### **6. DM/21/3279 - BURGESS HILL NORTHERN ARC, LAND NORTH AND NORTH WEST OF BURGESS HILL, BETWEEN BEDELANDS NATURE RESERVE IN THE EAST AND GODDARD'S GREEN WASTE WATER TREATMENT WORKS IN THE WEST.**

Louise Yandell, Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager, introduced the application which sought to amend conditions 5, 6, 7, 11, 22 and 35 and remove conditions 50 and 51 from the previously approved application DM/18/5114. She outlined that the area of land that houses Bodle Brothers has been sold to the business and the houses planned for the site will not be accommodated elsewhere in the District.

Nicholas Milnrer, Planning Lead at Homes England, spoke in favour of the application.

The Chairman noted the concern amongst Members in respect of the 65m drainage pipe however stated that water must flow to its natural nearest course to minimise the ecological impact.

A Member referred to P.73 regarding the sale of Bodle Brothers back to the business and asked whether there was any other reason to justify the sale.

The Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager replied that there was no other reason to sell it aside from them wanting to retain the land.

Tom Clark, Assistant Director of Legal & Democratic Services, explained that Bodle Brothers had an arrangement with Homes England and have since renegotiated.

The Member then asked how the local choice will be exercised.

The Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager explained that Conditions 50 & 51 secure the public art delivery with expected consultations of local groups and Town Council to inform the delivery strategy.

The Member noted the woodland buffer and sought clarification as to how compensatory measure of 30 was decided.

The Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager confirmed that the measurement was a recommendation from the Council's ecology consultants.

The Member referred to P.102 and the ICT contributions and sought assurances that the provision of the infrastructure will be delivered in the best way possible.

The Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager outlined that Homes England and West Sussex County Council decided it would be better for either the County Council or the Academy to deliver the computer systems as a result of the financial contributions.

A Member stressed the importance of the green circle featured in the development and felt happy the circle goes through the buffer zone.

A Member asked whether the loss of woodland would be gained back through open land. He also sought clarification on the Public Transport Strategy.

The Northern Arc Strategic Development Delivery Manager explained that the pipe will run through the trees and landscape therefore will need to be replaced with trees and planting in the new area. She clarified that previously Homes England were providing the Public Transport Strategy however this will now be provided by West Sussex County Council given that they are the public highway authority.

A Member expressed regret that there is any interference with ancient woodland and the loss of the gold course. She underscored the need for cycle storage at Burgess Hill Train Station to realise the benefits of creating the cycle paths across the town.

A Member complimented the work of the officers and proposed to move to the recommendation to approve the application.

The Chairman noted that no Member wished to speak so moved to the recommendation to approve the application which was agreed unanimously.

## **RESOLVED**

That, subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 planning obligation securing the necessary infrastructure and affordable housing, planning permission be granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 3.34 pm

Chairman