

**Minutes of a meeting of District Planning Committee  
held on Thursday, 20th August, 2020  
from 2.30 pm - 3.31 pm**

**Present:** R Salisbury (Chair)  
D Sweatman (Vice-Chair)

R Bates  
A Eves  
S Hatton

R Jackson  
C Laband  
A Peacock

R Webb  
R Whittaker

**Absent:** Councillors E Coe-Gunnell White and N Walker

**Also Present:** Councillor Webster

**1. ROLL CALL AND VIRTUAL MEETINGS EXPLANATION.**

The Chairman commenced the roll call to confirm the Members present. Tom Clark, Head of Regulatory Services provided a virtual meeting explanation.

**2. TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

None.

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

Cllr Laband declared a non pre-determined interest in Item 6 DM/19/5207 as he is a Member of Haywards Heath Town Council.

**4. TO CONFIRM MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING OF THE DISTRICT PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON 16 JULY 2020.**

After an amendment to s are voting record the Minutes of the Committee meeting held on 16 July 2020 were agreed as a correct record after a minor amendment and signed electronically by the Chairman.

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

None.

**6. DM/19/5207 - ROOKERY FARM, ROCKY LANE, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 4RW**

Steve Ashdown, Major Development & Investigations Team Leader drew Members attention to the Agenda Update Sheet which had been emailed and was available online. The update sheet detailed comments received from Ansty Parish Council regarding the access to the site, comments by the Urban Designer and comments

from West Sussex Fire & Rescue Service which would be covered by an additional condition. He also provided, a verbal update, noting that conditions 19 and 20 were duplicates, and advised the committee of the increased contributions in relation to the additional buildings: formal sports £27,226, community building £16,120, and local community infrastructure £17,700. He confirmed that the West Sussex contributions are calculated by a formula to ensure no double counting of the properties in the application.

He introduced the report seeking planning permission for 72 residential dwellings, with changes to scheme already approved for 49 dwellings and therefore an additional 23 dwellings. The earlier schemes had already been approved under DM/16/4496 and DM/17/4190. He highlighted the dwellings that were part of the revised application, noted that the access had already been constructed, areas ancient woodland, to the south and east of the site which were not within the application site and were covered by extant permissions.

The site is within the Development Plan, Neighbourhood Plan and builtup area. He noted the changes to the layout of approved dwellings, providing semi-detached and terraced houses and an apartment block. The intensification of the site was due to a reduction in no of 4-bed units and an uplift in smaller units. The new mix was more in line with the District need and an additional 7 affordable units would be provided. He highlighted that the number of car parking spaces was just below West Sussex standards, but the site has a travel plan and the reduced level is acceptable. The Urban Designer comments had been addressed by the revised drawing detailing stepped gabled roofs. He concluded that the application was in accordance with the Development Plan and the principle of develop is acceptable. The increase in density is not a material impact on the character of the development.

Mrs Stephanie Went, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Mr R. Brocklehurst, local resident, spoke in objection to the application.

Ms J. Sparkes, agent, spoke in support of the application.

Members noted that the revised housing mix better meets the needs of the District and noted the increased number of affordable units. Members discussed the issues of sustainability including Electric Vehicle Charging points (EVC), installation of gas boilers and sustainable transport, the adjacent Ancient Woodland, footpath 104CR, condition 5 which related to asbestos on the site and the badger sett.

The Chairman stated that there was asbestos on the site as it used to be working farm and the Planning Officer could discuss the closure of footpath 104CR with the developer. He highlighted the swales and buffers which were outside the application site and had already been covered in previous applications.

A Member expressed concern about the contaminated land and queried whether conditions on the extant permissions should have been discharged. The Team Leader confirmed ongoing discussions with the Planning Officer, and that submissions had been received to rectify this. However, he noted that this was separate to this application and was being addressed as a matter of urgency.

In response to Members questions the Team Leader confirmed the badger sett had been secured through the outline permission was covered under conditions relating to ecology and had been approved. A licence can be obtained through Natural England if required. The developer has chosen a fabric first approach to address

climate change, with restrictions on daily water consumption and water butts; the application meets District Plan Policy DP39 on sustainability. ECVs were secured as part of air quality mitigations and details will be submitted in relation to condition 13, future proofing of the development for further provision can be discussed with the developer. He confirmed there was no footpath connection from the east of the site to Fox Hill. The site is permeable to footpath 104CR which goes south to Burgess Hill and there is a link north to Haywards Heath. The Ancient Woodland buffer zone has been secured and is not being altered as result of the application.

The Chairman noted that if the additional units are within development boundary of the extant permission, the developer can be flexible and react to market conditions. In response to Members comments he noted that the performance of South East Water is being investigated following the recent interruptions in the local water supply, but this is outside the control of the Council.

The Team Leader noted that speed indicator signs are outside the application, highway mitigations have been secured and no further additions are required. Condition 16 requires the developer to agree and implement a detailed landscaping scheme which will be maintained for a set time frame.

As there were no further speakers the Chairman took the Members to the recommendations and Councillor Laband proposed that the Committee approve the application in line with the Officer's recommendation, this was seconded by Councillor Sweatman.

The Legal Officer took a named vote on the recommendations with the changes in the update sheet and the Committee voted unanimously in favour of the motion.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstained</b>
Bates, R.	✓		
Eves, A.	✓		
Hatton, S.	✓		
Jackson, R.	✓		
Laband, C.	✓		
Peacock, A.	✓		
Salisbury, R.	✓		
Sweatman, D.	✓		
Webb, R.	✓		
Whittaker, R.	✓		

## **RESOLVED**

That planning permission be granted for this development subject to the conditions set out in appendix A and the Agenda Update Sheet.

### **Recommendation A**

It is recommended that permission be granted, subject to the completion of a section 106 planning agreement to secure the necessary infrastructure contributions and affordable housing and the conditions listed at Appendix A.

### **Recommendation B**

It is recommended that if a satisfactory legal agreement has not been entered into by 20th November then the application be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Leader, Planning and Economy for the following reason:

The proposal fails to provide the necessary infrastructure to serve the development and fails to provide the required affordable housing. The scheme therefore conflicts with policies DP20 and DP31 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-2031.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 3.31 pm

Chairman