

**Minutes of a meeting of Planning Committee  
held on Thursday, 11th February, 2021  
from 4.00 - 6.15 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

**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 MacNaughton declared a prejudicial interest in item 6 DM/20/3955, as he was the Cabinet Member who approved the sale of the land and agreed to withdraw for the item.

Cllr Dabell declared a personal interest in item 6 DM/20/3955, as he is a Member of East Grinstead Town Council and sits on East Grinstead Town Council's Planning Committee, which had previously debated the application. He confirmed that he reserved his right to speak at the Town Council's Planning Committee but was attending the meeting with an open mind to hear representations from Officers, Public Speakers, and Members of the Committee.

Cllr Pulfer declared a prejudicial interest in item 7 DM/20/3988, as the tree subject to the application is on his land and he confirmed he would withdraw for the item.

The Chairman declared a personal interest in item 6 DM/20/3955 as the application falls within his ward and he was a Member of the Cabinet when Cabinet agreed the land could be disposed of.

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

The Chairman had no urgent business.

**5 DM/20/1516 - PIKFIELD ENGINEERING LTD FACTORY, DURKINS ROAD, EAST GRINSTEAD, RH19 2ER.**

Andrew Watt, Senior Planning Officer introduced the application which sought approval for demolition of an existing building and the erection of a building comprising eight dwellings.

Katie Turner, a local resident spoke against the application.

Angela Joseph, local resident spoke against the application.

Joanne Halcrow, local resident spoke against the application.

Hamish Watson, architect spoke in favour of the application.

Members highlighted their concerns of overdevelopment, parking for the development, accessibility for refuse lorries and potential noise pollution. One Member noted that the closing of windows to decrease noise volume was not acceptable, especially in warm weather.

Members expressed concern that the design was not in keeping with the character of the local area. A Member stated that the design did not create a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape; and would dominate the surrounding area.

The Senior Planning Officer said that there are no visitor parking spaces, but there are no parking restrictions in the surrounding area. He noted that the Highways Authority considers parking provision in the area to be acceptable. Regarding refuse vehicles, he clarified that the site plan showed there was sufficient width for access to the site and that the Environmental Health Officer had not raised objections to the application on the issue of noise from the adjoining industrial estate. There has been negotiation between the agent and the Council's Environmental Health Department to carry out a representative noise measurement.

Another Member expressed concern that the Highways Authority had not visited the site and believed the authority should have undertaken a site visit to provide a more considered report. The additional capacity in the area would impact the local sewage infrastructure. The Chairman confirmed that the Highways Authority had not objected, and they only carried out a visit if requested by officers and ward members under the Council's traffic light scheme.

A Member said that if the land was on a genuine brownfield site, then the site should be developed for alternative use.

Senior Planning Officer advised that there would not be a significant loss of privacy to residents in Durkins Road due to the proposed design and residents were currently able to see into neighbouring gardens.

The Chairman took Members to the vote to approve the application in accordance with the Officer Recommendations and the Agenda Update Sheet, which was proposed by Councillor Coote and seconded by Cllr Coe Gunnell-White. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the Committee voted with four in favour and seven against, the motion failed.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
G. Allen		Y	
R. Cartwright		Y	
E. Coe-Gunnell White	Y		
P. Coote	Y		
J. Dabell		Y	
R. Eggleston		Y	
A. MacNaughton	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		
C. Phillips		Y	
D. Sweatman		Y	

The Chairman asked Members if there was a proposer and seconder for an alternative motion. Cllr Sweatman proposed to refuse the application which was seconded by Cllr Eggleston. The Chairman asked for further explanation for the reasons to overturn the recommendation. Overdevelopment, environmental issues, as well as the comfort of the future residents, were highlighted as key factors in their votes.

The Team Leader noted Members' concerns of overdevelopment but said this was not sufficient on its own. Members would need to highlight specific issues of the development. He confirmed environmental concerns were not sufficient as there had been no objection from the Environmental Officer.

The Chairman emphasised that any reasons for a refusal of the application needed to be robust and defensible at appeal. A Member expressed concern at being asked to cast votes for a second time. He felt that it would be beneficial if the application was deferred to a later committee meeting.

After legal consultation, the Chairman noted that the Committee had not agreed on the reasons for a refusal and the motion to refuse was withdrawn. He asked if there was a proposer and seconder for a second motion to approve the application. The Vice-Chair said he had been in planning for years and said this would be an indefensible case at appeal and to take a second vote.

The Chairman requested a new proposer and a new seconder. Cllr MacNaughton proposed the motion to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendations, which the Chairman seconded. A recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer and the application was approved with four in favour, one against, and six abstentions.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
G. Allen			Y
R. Cartwright			Y
E. Coe-Gunnell White	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 granted subject to the conditions set out in Appendix A, subject to the completion of a satisfactory S106 Legal Agreement and/or legal undertaking to secure the required level of SAMM and SANG contributions and infrastructure contributions.

If by 11 May 2021, the applicants have not submitted a satisfactory signed S106 Legal Agreement and/or legal undertaking securing the necessary financial contributions, then it is recommended that planning permission be refused at the discretion of the Divisional Leader for Planning and Economy for the following reason(s):

'The application fails to comply with Policy DP20 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies EG3, EG5, and EG11 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and paragraphs 54 and 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of the infrastructure required to serve the development.' 'The proposal does not adequately mitigate the potential impact on the Ashdown Forest SPA and therefore would be contrary to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, Policy DP17 of the Mid Sussex District Plan, Policies EG5 and EG16 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan and paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework.'

[Cllr MacNaughton removed himself from the discussion and voting at 5:36 pm.]

[Cllr Coe-Gunnel White left the meeting at 5:36 pm.]

### **6 DM/20/3955 - LAND SOUTH OF SOUTHEND COTTAGE, BRIGHTON ROAD, HANDCROSS, RH17 6BZ.**

Deborah Lynn, Planning Officer introduced the report. She drew Members' attention to the Agenda Update Sheet, which listed a late letter of objection from local residents, an additional condition and informative and referenced amended plans.

The Chairman noted that the application was before the committee as the site is located on land owned by Mid Sussex District Council. He added that he felt satisfied it was a good use of the land.

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.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
G. Allen	Y		
R. Cartwright	Y		
P. Coote	Y		
J. Dabell	Y		
R. Eggleston	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		

C. Phillips	Y		
M. Pulfer	Y		
D. Sweatman	Y		

## RESOLVED

That permission be granted subject to the conditions outlined in Appendix A and the condition and informative in the Agenda Update Sheet.

[Cllr MacNaughton returned to the meeting at 5:56 pm.]

[Cllr Pulfer removed himself from the discussion and voting at 5:56 pm.]

### 7 **DM/20/3988 - 6 BURMA CLOSE, HAYWARDS HEATH, RH16 3JE.**

The Members confirmed to the Chairman that an introduction was not required for this application and they did not need to see any photos. The Members were asked to consider a tree in a protected group in Burma Close.

The motion to grant permission for the proposed tree works in accordance with the officer recommendation was proposed by Cllr Coote and seconded by Cllr Eggleston. 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		
R. Eggleston	Y		
A. MacNaughton	Y		
G. Marsh	Y		
C. Phillips	Y		
D. Sweatman	Y		

## RESOLVED:

That permission be granted for the proposed tree work subject to conditions suggested in Appendix A.

[Cllr Pulfer returned to the meeting at 5:57 pm.]

### 8 **DM/20/4535 - MSDC STATION CAR PARK, STATION ROAD, BURGESS HILL, RH15 9DG.**

Katherine Williams, Planning Officer, introduced the report. The application sought permission for a shipping container within Station Road Car Park, Burgess Hill with a 2-metre-high close boarded timber fence and the application site is located on land owned by Mid Sussex District Council.

Chris Founds, the agent spoke in favour of the application.

The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the agenda update sheet, which addressed some of the comments from neighbours, adding that the proposal part of the Full Fibre project.

Members discussed the issue of noise and fencing. The importance of the Full Fibre project work was highlighted.

Nicholas Bennett, Senior Environmental Health Officer advised that due to the location of the ventilation system, the shielding of noise would be provided by the far end of the container. Noise levels would meet the guidelines for night-time emissions.

The motion to approve the application in accordance with the officer recommendation was proposed by Cllr Coote and seconded by Cllr Sweatman. The Chairman took the motion to a vote and a recorded vote was carried out by the Legal Officer. The application was approved with 8 votes in favour and 2 votes against.

<b>Councillor</b>	<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
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 outlined at Appendix A.

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

None.

The meeting finished at 6.15 pm

Chairman