

HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN COUNCIL

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 26 March 2018

C N Laband (*Chairman*)
M J Pulfer (*Vice Chairman*)
Mrs C Cheney
R J R Clarke
A C McPherson
H A Mundin

* Absent
** Apologies

Also present: Mr Eric Bassett, Chair of the Haywards Heath Society

Regarding application number DM/18/0733 – Tavistock and Summerhill School, Summerhill Lane (Lindfield parish):

Mrs Deborah Rendall and Mr David Quickfall, both of whom had registered to speak *against* the application;
Councillor Andrew Lea, West Sussex County Council Member for Lindfield and High Weald, and Mid Sussex District Council Member for Lindfield;
Councillor Mrs Anthea Lea, Mid Sussex District Council Member for Lindfield;
approximately 30 members of the public – mainly from Oak Bank, Summerhill Grange and Summerhill Lane – who were attending in order to observe the Committee's consideration of the proposals.

At the start of the meeting, the Chairman confirmed with those attending that there was no one who wished to or was intending to record proceedings. There was not.

120. Apologies

There were none.

121. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 5 March 2018 were taken as read, confirmed as a true record and duly signed by the Chairman.

122. Substitutes

There were none.

123. Members' Declarations of Interest

Councillor Howard Mundin made the following declaration:

"I declare a personal interest in all planning applications under agenda item 6 as an elected Member of Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) appointed to Planning

cont.

123. Members' Declarations of Interest (cont.)

Committee B. I further reserve the right to alter my views should the applications come before Planning Committee B, based on contributions from the public, other Members or reports from MSDC Officers."

Other declarations were made as follows:

Member	Application No.	Location	Nature of Interest
Cllr R J R Clarke	DM/18/0733	Former Tavistock and Summerhill School, Summerhill Lane, Lindfield	Knows a number of residents who live near the application site, e.g. Summerhill Grange; wife is a former governor of the School
Cllr R J R Clarke Cllr C N Laband Cllr M J Pulfer	DM/18/0420	108 Barnmead	Know the applicant, who is a former Haywards Heath Town Councillor and former Mid Sussex District Councillor

124. Planning Appeals

Members noted the following appeal **decision**, the appeal having been lodged as a result of MSDC's decision to refuse permission (application number DM/17/3335 refers):

Date Decided & References	Site	Description	Decision
12/02/2018 AP/18/0008 APP/D3830/D/17/3191575	53 Queens Road	Proposed rear extension and part loft conversion	Allowed

125. Licensing Applications

There were none.

126. Comments and Observations on Planning Applications

Members made comments and observations on 23 planning applications as per Appendix 1 attached.

127. Items Agreed as Urgent by the Chairman

There were none.

The meeting closed at 8:36pm.

APPENDIX 1

Week 1

DM/18/0182 – Oldfield, 55 Lewes Road

Franklands

Variation of Condition 3 relating to planning application 14/2484/FUL for the foul drainage (in the form of a pumping station) to be implemented and retained in accordance with submitted drawings. Landscaping is to be planned around the base of the pumping station.

No comment.

DM/18/0655 – Southside, Hurstwood Lane

Franklands

Single storey rear kitchen extension.

No comment.

DM/18/0663 – 15 Syresham Gardens

Bentswood

Proposed three bedroom dwelling adjacent to existing house.

No comment.

DM/18/0889 – Unit 3, 30 Bridge Road

Heath

Proposed additional A1 and B8 use. Currently B1 use with offices and showroom.

No comment.

DM/18/0890 – Nationwide Building Society, 19 South Road

Ashenground

Proposed new illuminated fascia sign with new ATM illuminated collar (amendment to planning ref: DM/17/4796).

The Town Council notes that this application represents an amendment to the plans approved under DM/17/4796 and has no comment to make.

DM/18/0900 – 41–43 Kents Road

Ashenground

Construction of 2 no. two-bedroomed semi-detached chalet bungalows.

The Town Council **objects** to this application for the following reasons:

1. the proposal represents an opportunistic attempt at backland development;
2. taking into account the relationship of the site to existing properties, the proposal would give rise to an unneighbourly and overbearing form of development, which would be detrimental to the amenities of neighbouring residents, particularly those living at numbers 1 and 2 Berry Mews. The new dwellings would be too close to these existing properties, i.e. within 10 metres, resulting in an increased sense of enclosure. This would be contrary to elements of Policies H8 and E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan;
3. the proposal would give rise to an overdevelopment of the site with inadequate provision for garden/amenity space, which would be contrary to Policy E13 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan;
4. the construction of another two dwellings in Kents Road would lead to an increase in the number of vehicles using the road. This would have a negative impact on traffic flow in an already severely congested road and would be detrimental to resident amenity and highway safety;

cont.

DM/18/0900 – 41–43 Kents Road (cont.)

Ashenground

5. the increased use of the existing vehicular access to the public highway would adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of neighbouring properties.

DM/18/0923 – 1 Sergison Close

Lucastes

Proposed first floor rear extension over approved kitchen extension (application DM/17/1201). This is an application to establish whether the development is lawful. This will be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed use cannot be taken into account.

As this is an application for a Lawful Development Certificate and is therefore a legal matter, the Town Council defers the decision to Mid Sussex District Council.

DM/18/0964 – 24 Willow Park

Franklands

Oak (T1) – reduce back by 3–4 metres.

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.

DM/17/4190 – Rookery Farm, Rocky Lane

Ansty & Staplefield

Reserved Matters approval pursuant to Condition 1 of Outline Approval DM/16/4496 for the scale, layout, appearance and landscaping of 320 new dwellings (including 30% affordable housing), including the provision of public open space, drainage swales and detention ponds. Amended plans received 6th March showing layout and design alterations, along with an ecology response.

The Town Council notes the amended plans and ecology response received by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) on 6/3/18 and requests that the following comments are added to those made when this application was considered by the Town Council's Planning Committee on 4/12/17 (received by MSDC on 11/12/17):

Under the section named '**Layout**' of the document described as '**Carlton Design Response**' (received by MSDC on 13/3/18) it is stated that

1. *'Unfortunately, as discussed at the meeting at MSDC in early February, a connection with Sandrocks is not achievable as the residents strongly object. Footpath link had been added in the south-west corner.'* and
2. *'All areas with frontage parking have been reviewed and additional landscaping has been added to break up the parking. In total 25 trees have been added.'*

First of all, the Town Council does not accept that a connection with the Sandrocks development is not achievable. Frankly, to expect those involved in the determination of this application to believe that nothing can be done is disingenuous. With the expertise the developers have at their disposal, an issue such as this should not be insurmountable. As the local population continues to grow, with more residential development being built away from town and village centres, the Town Council believes it is vital to build and maintain connectivity between existing, new and potential development sites. Residents of new(er) developments must accept that 'inter-development' links need to be established in order to create safe, accessible and convenient routes to and from schools, leisure facilities, shopping facilities, places of work, etc.

Secondly, the additional landscaping (to break up the parking) in the form of 25 trees is woefully inadequate. This number needs to be upped substantially.

cont.

For the avoidance of doubt, the comments that the Town Council submitted in December 2017 are reiterated below.

In keeping with its stance during the outline application for this site – subsequently approved under DM/16/4496 – the Town Council **supports**, in principle for this reserved matters application, for development of 320 new dwellings. It should be reiterated that a significant part of the site has already been allocated for housing under Policy H2 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan.

Members of the Town Council's Planning Committee have scrutinized the reserved matters application, and this has highlighted a number of concerns which must be addressed if the proposals are to progress satisfactorily.

These concerns are as follows:

- the apartment blocks will have communal bins for landfill and recycling. These are large commercial bins which are not collected by Mid Sussex District Council; therefore, to prevent Environmental Health issues developing, movement of waste will not be permitted before 7:00am or after 10:00pm daily. This would accord with Policy B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan (2004), Policy DP24 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031 Submission Version and Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan, to safeguard the amenities of residents in terms of noise and disturbance. This is a condition requirement, **NOT** an informative;
- whilst the site overall has some significant 'green' areas by virtue of retained ancient woodland (and buffer zone), detention basins, playspaces, etc., the proposed planting scheme for the developable (built) area requires more trees;
- the Town Council remains extremely disappointed that vehicles leaving the development will not benefit from a left turn only junction. The Town Council views this as essential since it would encourage westbound traffic to use the Haywards Heath relief road instead of going through the town centre. Furthermore, it is understood that right at the outset of proposals for this site, the developer had agreed to fund the reconfiguration of the road layout to make this happen, and at no cost to the taxpayer. Looking ahead, it is inevitable that the volume of traffic using the relief road will increase and this will make it more difficult and hazardous for those vehicles making a right turn out of the development. This will have a negative effect on the integrity of the relief road itself. It is requested that adequate provision be made now to 'future-proof' the junction so that it could be reconfigured to left turn only should the need arise;
- exterior designs of the dwellings are profoundly disappointing and are reminiscent of a dark, 1960s housing estate. The development has no variation in architectural theme and offers no contemporary design suited to the aspirations of modern-day living. In short, the town and its residents deserve better;
- hard landscape plans show that the roads are asphalt or blockwork surfaces. Irrespective of whether they will be adopted by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) Highways, they must be constructed to a highways adoptable standard specification, to ensure they can withstand use by refuse lorries, emergency services vehicles and other HGVs. If the roads are not to be built to the required standard, the Town Council would like to know what measures the developer will put in place to protect residents' interests;
- considering the sloping nature of the site from north to south, the developer should provide the installation of salt/grit bins at strategic locations within the development. This supports the town's winter weather management plan;

cont.

- the size/dimensions (particularly the width) of the garages for the proposed dwellings must be sufficient to comfortably accommodate a modern vehicle;
- to safeguard the street scene, each dwelling must be provided with adequate facilities for the (discreet) storage of refuse bins, to ensure they are not visible externally;
- the Town Council is disappointed that the playspace provision is insufficient for the number of dwellings planned.

Finally, some of the comments made by the Town Council in respect of (outline) application DM/16/4496 are considered relevant for this application as well and are therefore reiterated below:

- the Town Council supports the scattered or 'pepper pot' distribution of affordable housing within the development as opposed to it being grouped together;
- the Town Council supports the proposed layout of the development which largely follows existing land forms and hedgerows, and includes green buffer zones to protect the areas of ancient woodland;
- the Town Council supports the intention that all landscape buffer zones, especially those round the perimeter of the site, would be readily accessible for carrying out periodic maintenance works;
- the Town Council requests that an effective means of 'junction protection' be incorporated into the development. The purpose of this would be:
 - a) to prevent the indiscriminate parking of vehicles on or near points where one road meets another,
 - b) to maintain visibility splays and facilitate the safe flow of traffic within the development;
- acknowledging that there is an element of flood risk at the bottom (southern) end of the site, the Town Council supports the provision of green buffer zones to keep the housing away from the risk area;
- the Town Council supports the plan that the width of the 'arterial' roads within the development would be more than adequate to easily accommodate refuse lorries, emergency services vehicles, etc. and potentially buses at some point in the future. All roads should be of a WSCC Highways adoptable standard;
- the Town Council supports the retention of the public right of way through the site and regards this as a valuable means by which connectivity with other existing, new and potential development sites in the area could be enhanced/established; the absence of a designated cycle path, which is desirable, is noted;
- the retained ancient woodland areas; the Town Council supports the proposal that they would be edged with green buffer zones and that there would be no houses backing on to the zones, thereby discouraging the tipping of residents' garden refuse and other rubbish;
- the Town Council requests that right from the outset, a robust management plan be established for the woodland areas. This could be in the form of a management company or woodland trust but must include sufficient start-up and ongoing maintenance funding for the longer term, say ten to fifteen years. Mandatory householder contributions may be an option to ensure the financial viability of any management arrangements;

cont.

DM/17/4190 – Rookery Farm, Rocky Lane (cont.)

Ansty & Staplefield

- the Town Council requires that an all-encompassing construction management plan be drawn up and implemented. This should incorporate:
 - a)** a wheel washing facility of the highest standard to ensure that roads are kept 'surgically' clean;
 - b)** a requirement for all site-related lorries carrying loose materials to cover their cargoes with tarpaulins. This would prevent the materials from being accidentally jettisoned whilst in transit;
- whilst recognising that the site falls within the parish of Ansty and Staplefield, residents from the development will have their services and facilities provided by the town of Haywards Heath. It is requested, therefore, that the Town Council be consulted upon and involved in the allocation of Section 106 monies;
- the Town Council expects those involved in the development proposals to have due adherence to all relevant policies and objectives contained within the made Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan.

DM/18/0733 – Tavistock and Summerhill School, Summerhill Lane

Lindfield

Proposed erection of 48 residential dwellings comprising of 6 houses and 42 flats with associated internal access, basement and surface-level car parking, landscaping with other infrastructure.

Although this application relates to a site that falls just outside of Haywards Heath in the neighbouring parish of Lindfield, it is right on the town's boundary and undoubtedly has an impact on those residents of the town who live in this locality. Haywards Heath Town Council therefore welcomes the opportunity to make representation in respect of this proposal.

In line with Lindfield Parish Council, Haywards Heath Town Council **objects** to the development as proposed and fully endorses the reasons given by the Parish Council in its submission to Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) dated 16 March 2018. In summary, these are as follows:

- the current proposal would be out of keeping with the local environment, surrounded as it is by Areas of Townscape Character;
- concern about the impact that the proposed blocks of apartments would have on the residential amenities of neighbouring properties – overbearing, loss of outlook, loss of sunlight;
- inadequate screening to protect the privacy of existing residents from users of the proposed apartment balconies;
- the adequacy of the proposed number of parking spaces is questionable;
- the provision for recreational facilities is questionable;
- the current proposal conflicts with the Lindfield Village Design Statement, the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, and Policies B1, B3 and B16 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan (2004).

Furthermore, the Town Council requests that the following objections, comments and observations are considered by MSDC:

1. the proposal represents an opportunistic attempt to overdevelop the site;

cont.

2. it is disingenuous and unacceptable that the proposal does not deliver a 30% affordable housing element. This deficit is contrary to both the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural, and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plans, and the newly adopted MSDC District Plan. The Committee notes the very strong resistance by MSDC applied to more sustainable sites elsewhere in Haywards Heath that do not deliver the 30% affordable housing requirement. It is even more important that it is applied on the Tavistock site without deviation from this policy;
3. the siting of the two blocks of three-storey apartments, to the front (western side) of the site and at its highest point, would give rise to an obtrusive and overbearing form of development, which would be out of keeping with the present character of the area and contrary to elements of Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan;
4. the construction of 42 apartments within two, three-storey blocks would constitute an undesirable intensification of residential development at a density which would be out of keeping with and would detract from the bordering Townscape Area, contrary to both the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural, and Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plans;
5. there are four (BS5837) Category B trees – two oaks and two limes – that have been recommended for removal '*due to their proximity to the proposed development*'. The trees are an integral part of the natural heritage of the site and, by extension, of Lindfield itself and **must** be preserved. Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan Policy E9 6.30 requires 'in the townscape character areas, Haywards Heath Town Council expects developers to demonstrate how their proposals for development or redevelopment will reinforce the local character and thus meet Objective 6F of this Plan.

In particular, proposals should:

- retain trees, frontage hedgerows and walls which contribute to the character and appearance of the area;
- retain areas of open space, (including private gardens) which are open to public view and contribute to the character and appearance of the area; and
- avoid the demolition of existing buildings which contribute to the character and appearance of the area.

The Committee agrees with and supports the MSDC Tree Officer objection.

6. the Town Council challenges the credibility of the Viability Report and does not accept the Report's conclusion that the Residual Site Value '*cannot support contributions to planning obligations or affordable housing*'. It is not the responsibility of the local planning authority to underwrite the profit objectives of the developer;
7. Members feel that the developer/applicant has not provided anything which delivers Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan Policies E8, E9 or E10 – listed below:

Policy E8 Critically the application does not demonstrate how it will contribute to the improvement of the health and well-being of the community.

Policy E9 Developers must demonstrate how their proposal will protect and reinforce the local character within the locality of the site. This will include having regard to the following design elements:

- height, scale, spacing, layout, orientation, design and materials of buildings or makes best use of the site to accommodate development;

cont.

- car parking is designed and located so that it fits in with the character of the proposed development.

Policy E10 Development proposals in an Area of Townscape Character will be required to pay particular attention to retaining the special character and to demonstrate how they support and enhance the character of the area in question.

This site in Lindfield abuts areas of significant and important Townscape Character; however, notwithstanding that the site itself was not identified within the extant Neighbourhood Plan, the Town Council feels its proximity and prominent location requires that effectively it be treated as if it were.

8. in terms of the implications for the local highway network, West Sussex County Council – through its local Members – should consider any potential development of this site in conjunction with other developments in the wider area, i.e. a holistic approach is required in order to assess the effect of development on the flow of traffic in roads such as Summerhill Lane, Portsmouth Lane and Gander Hill. Specifically, Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan Rural Setting Objective 6C applies in this area, together with Objective 6F with the location identified in section 6.29.

In the unwelcome event that permission is granted despite the Town Council's objections, it is requested that developer Section 106 contributions for local community infrastructure – approximately £27,600 – are allocated towards developing and improving the streetscape on the route between the development and the Haywards Heath Station Quarter.

In common with Lindfield Parish Council and the Friends of Summerhill Lane Area of Townscape Character, the Town Council is open to the principle of development on this newly created brownfield site. However, to have any prospect of gaining support, a scheme would have to consist of houses starting with two bedrooms upwards and **not** flats, and therefore be of a lower density than that currently proposed and would be expected to be in keeping with the surrounding Townscape Character environment of the area.

Lastly, residents referred to The Rt Hon. Sir Nicholas Soames MP – his recent speech in Parliament provides very strong support for our Neighbourhood Plans.

Week 2

DM/18/0176 – 23 Gander Hill

Heath

Ground/first floor extensions and loft conversion (amended plans received 08/03/2018).

The Town Council notes the amended plans received by Mid Sussex District Council on 8/3/18 and has no comment to make.

DM/18/0308 – 17B Blunts Wood Road

Lucastes

Erection of detached garage and carport. Block plan received 22.02.2018 showing proposed siting of garage building in relation to neighbouring properties. Please note amended address 13.03.2018, application relates to 17B and not no.17 as previously advertised.

It would appear that because of the submission of insufficient and inaccurate information, this is now the **third** time that this application has come forward for consideration. The Town Council wonders how much valuable Officer time has been wasted throughout all of this and trusts that the information to hand is at last correct. That said, the Town Council maintains its objection on the grounds that the proposed garage and carport would result in an overbearing and unneighbourly form of development, out of keeping with the character of the area and detrimental to the amenities of adjoining properties. This conflicts with elements of Policies E9 and H8 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan.

DM/18/0420 – 108 Barnmead**Heath**

First floor rear extension, amended plans received 12.03.2018.

The Town Council notes the amended plans received by Mid Sussex District Council on 12/3/18 and reiterates the comments made when this application was considered the first time round, i.e.

The Town Council acknowledges the concerns raised by the resident of 106 Barnmead and requests that if permission is granted for this application, the following conditions are imposed:

1. in order to protect the amenity of local residents, works of construction (including the use of plant and machinery, and deliveries or collection of plant, equipment or materials) shall be limited to the following times:

Monday–Friday	08:00–18:00 hours;
Saturday	09:00–13:00 hours;
Sunday and Bank/Public Holidays	No work permitted;

2. given the close proximity of residential properties at this particular location and the relative narrowness of the highway, a Construction Management Plan shall be submitted for approval by Mid Sussex District Council. The Plan shall include:
 - a. details regarding any requirement for on-street parking of contractors' vehicles and on-street siting of building materials;
 - b. measures that will be taken to mitigate the impact on local residents, to include unhindered access to their properties and no obstruction to the public pavement.'

DM/18/0667 – St. Pauls on the Green**Bentswood**

T0814 – crown reduction by 2–3m.

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.

DM/18/0878 – Pennington House, Franklands Village**Franklands**

Remove x2 hornbeams (T1) and T2 down to ground level.

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.

DM/18/0924 – 11 Pembury Close**Franklands**

Single storey rear extension – alteration to previous approval ref DM/17/2993. Rear wall is now 330mm longer than previous approval due to clay pipe being excavated while on site.

No comment.

DM/18/0969 – 55 Lincoln Wood**Lucastes**

Loft Conversion. Alterations to roof to include hip to gable and insertion of 2 no. pitched roof dormers and 1 no. side rooflight to create further habitable accommodation and associated internal and external alterations.

No comment.

DM/18/0972 – Scrases, Fox Hill**Franklands**

Proposed two storey rear extension.

No comment.

DM/18/1021 – 51 Farlington Avenue

Holly x4 – reduce by up to 3m.

Bentswood

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.

DM/18/1030 – 50 Lewes Road

Provision of detached double garage and workshop/storage.

Franklands

No comment.

Week 3

DM/18/1077 – 17 Cheney Crescent

Loft conversion and provision of new stairs to loft space.

Franklands

No comment.

DM/18/1107 – Land Parcel along Birchen Lane

T6 lime reduce by 3–4 metres, T10 lime reduce by 5–6 metres.

Heath

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.

DM/18/1115 – 5 Drummond Close

Proposed tree works as per attached schedule.

Ashenground

The Town Council defers this decision to Mid Sussex District Council's Tree Officer.