

# HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN COUNCIL

## PLANNING COMMITTEE

### Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 4 May 2020

C N Laband (*Chairman*)  
M J Pulfer (*Vice Chairman*)  
Mrs C Cheney  
C C J Evans  
Mrs S J Inglesfield  
A C McPherson  
H A MUNDIN \*\*  
R A Nicholson

\* Absent  
\*\* Apologies

Also present: Councillor R S Bates

*Prior to the formal start of the meeting, the Town Clerk, Steven Trice, informed Members that it would be recorded.*

#### 138. Apologies

The following apology was received:

Member	Reason for Absence
H A MUNDIN	Work commitments

#### 139. Minutes

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 14 April 2020 were taken as read, confirmed as a true record and duly signed by the Chairman.

#### 140. Substitutes

There were none.

#### 141. Members' Declarations of Interest

Councillor Clive Laband 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) and as an appointed Member of the (MSDC) District Planning Committee. I further reserve the right to alter my views should the applications come before the District Planning Committee, based on contributions from the public, other Members or reports from MSDC Officers."

**cont.**

**141. Members' Declarations of Interest (cont.)**

Councillor Mike Pulfer 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) and as an appointed Member of the (MSDC) Planning Committee. I further reserve the right to alter my views should the applications come before the Planning Committee, based on contributions from the public, other Members or reports from MSDC Officers."

Councillor Richard Bates 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) and as an appointed Member of the (MSDC) District Planning Committee. I further reserve the right to alter my views should the applications come before the District Planning Committee, based on contributions from the public, other Members or reports from MSDC Officers."

Other declarations were made as follows:

<b>Member</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Nature of Interest</b>
Cllr R S Bates Cllr C N Laband Cllr M J Pulfer	DM/19/3619	Beech Hurst Depot, Bolnore Road	Are Members of Mid Sussex District Council, which owns the site

**142. Planning Appeals**

There were none.

**143. Licensing Applications**

There were none.

**144. Comments and Observations on Planning Applications**

Members made comments and observations on 14 planning applications as per Appendix 1 attached.

**145. Items Agreed as Urgent by the Chairman**

There were none.

The meeting closed at 8:38pm.

### Deferred from previous meeting held on 14 April 2020

#### **DM/20/1137 – Central House, 25–27 Perrymount Road**

**Heath**

Outline application to demolish the existing office building and erection of a new office building and a mixed-use building comprising of up to 42 new 1- and 2-bedroom flats together with the formation of a new access and associated car parking. All matters to be reserved except for access.

#### **Issues**

Parking/ relevance to the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP)/Destination Haywards Heath (DHH) and Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031 (MSDP), together with any relevant considerations pertaining to the Haywards Heath Masterplan (HHMP) (not issued).

The application, if approved, would facilitate demolition of the existing commercial/office building, replaced by slightly larger (319m<sup>2</sup>) office accommodation together with a change of use for the site to include 42 units of residential accommodation.

#### **Resident Comments**

Haywards Heath Town Council (HHTC) notes comments made to date by residents, which provide real and relevant feedback to some of the challenges this application presents.

#### **Community Involvement**

The Statement of Community Involvement does not include direct pre-application consultation with HHTC and thus fails to deliver the aspirations or indeed requirements outlined in the localism legislation. For the absence of doubt, any significant potential development within the town should include pre-application discussions with HHTC before detailed discussions with the local planning authority. A file note lodged in the planning application file, directing applicants to engage with HHTC, should ideally be recorded in the application records. We are disappointed that this did not occur.

#### **Haywards Heath Masterplan (HHMP)**

Notwithstanding the lack of consultation, the application for this site potentially delivers many of the aspirations and requirements embedded in the development of a sustainable and growing urban town centre. The strategy to develop a town centre Masterplan for Haywards Heath, which HHTC aims to support, must include opportunities to create, develop and promote economic vitality, including provision of housing, business accommodation and sustainable transport, including adequate parking provision.

Any forthcoming HHMP must provide for increasing urbanisation in our town centre areas, to promote and support more high-density mixed-use development. This may include retail, commercial office space, home working, high-tech enterprise, artist/artisan professional activity, all alongside recreation/leisure facilities and critically residential homes to complete the urban cocktail required to deliver an aspirational town fit for the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

#### **Design**

Design offers congruity with the extant permission granted for 21–23 Perrymount Road (DM/18/2581 refers) and is therefore welcomed.

#### **Landscaping**

If the application is approved, to deliver the requirements in the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document, active measures should be installed to physically prevent pavement parking to protect resident amenity and deliver public road safety responsibilities. **This should be a planning condition.**

*cont.*

### Housing

The application delivers accommodation which complies with some of the HHMP and MSDP requirements, including 30% affordable housing.

### Parking

One of the primary obstacles undermining support for this application is the significant underprovision of parking and any credible detail as to how it will be delivered.

HHTC notes that section 8. of the application refers to parking spaces which are allocated solely for staff parking and therefore the quantum used in the application is misleading.

Even though there is a paucity of commitment in the combined parking plans, the current provisions of 77 = 38 + 39 spaces would undermine and directly conflict with Policy T3 of the HHNP, as evidenced by existing behaviour and underlined by resident comments. It is abundantly clear that parking provision is insufficient and even though the West Sussex County Council (WSSCC) Highways response unfortunately omits quantifying a requirement, it confirms that 'this is lower than the WSSCC guidance level.' Aiming for a quantum that we already know is too low to be sustainable is not an acceptable option. The current building of 3,250m<sup>2</sup> with 69 spaces generates parking excesses which already blight the surrounding residential developments in the neighbourhood. An increase in office accommodation from 3,250m<sup>2</sup> to 3,569m<sup>2</sup> proposes a reduction to just 39 spaces which, even if the present imbalance were maintained, would predicate 76 spaces versus the 39 offered.

### Framework Residential Travel Plan and Framework Staff Travel Plan

Section 1.3.2 of *both* Travel Plans states that 'Parking for some 77 vehicles is proposed at the ground/lower basement level of the development which will be accessed by one single access point from Perrymount Road.'

Section 2.1.2 of *both* Travel Plans states that 'The plan **will have** the following additional objectives:

- (i) To manage car parking demand across the development;'

For the absence of doubt, '**will have**' does *not* deliver the policy integrity or sufficient detail to enable intelligent consideration of the proposal, as it is totally absent from the application.

Section 5.4.1 of the Framework Residential Travel Plan states 'The development provides just 38 spaces for a residential development of 42 units. Not all units will be entitled to a car parking space. This physical restriction on parking and the comprehensive parking controls in the local area encourages a no car lifestyle.' It is therefore implicit that the remaining 39 spaces will be allocated for the 297 employees in the 3,569m<sup>2</sup> office accommodation. The current 3,250m<sup>2</sup> for 271 staff provides 69 spaces. We are also cognisant that extant permission for 21–23 Perrymount Road has not been delivered and critically the current provision is deemed to be commercially unviable.

### Further Engagement

We note the adequacy of the 5 year land supply in Mid Sussex **and thus would prefer to see employment opportunities maximised for this site,** excluding the provision of residential accommodation. Moreover, the initiative should be undertaken to have meaningful dialogue with the owner/developer of 21–23 Perrymount Road to explore the economic and environmental benefits of combining the site to deliver a single larger building, sufficient to provide a headquarters-style building suitable for large corporate occupation.

**cont.**

**HHTC Response**

In light of the comments above, HHTC **OBJECTS** to this application on the grounds of:

1. the significant underprovision of on-site parking facilities and the detrimental knock-on effect this would undoubtedly have on Perrymount Road, neighbouring roads and existing residential developments in the locality. Parking provision must be increased to deliver 1 space per 2.5 staff, i.e. 119 spaces **in addition** to the 38 spaces designated solely for resident use. So, 157 spaces are needed in total;
2. the proposed commercial/residential mixed use of the site. HHTC feels that the introduction of a residential element on to the site would dilute the commercial offer of this particular section of Perrymount Road.

**Section 106 Contributions**

If the application is approved, Section 106 funding should be allocated to the provision and installation of a new cycleway through Clair Park to join with the existing cycleway between Heath/Church Road towards The Orchards/town centre, together with extensive eco-friendly LED lighting to protect resident safety and amenity.

**Relevant HHNP Polices include:**

E6, E8, E9, E10/E11, B2/B3 T1, T2 (see S106 note above) T3 (compromised).

**Week 1**

**DM/20/0934 – 46 Wivelsfield Road**

**Ashenground**

Proposed single storey rear extension.

No comment.

**Week 2**

**DM/20/1070 – 132 Lewes Road**

**Franklands**

Construction of a proposed new four bedroom dwelling, on land to the side of 132 Lewes Road. Removal of 4 no. trees on the site and the part demolition/removal of an existing boundary wall. Proposal to include associated landscaping and alteration to the private roadway providing access from Lewes Road to the proposed site and neighbouring houses.

The proposed development would detract from the established character and appearance of the Lewes Road Conservation Area by subdividing the currently spacious and verdant residential plot associated with 132 Lewes Road, resulting in a materially smaller plot than the general pattern within the Conservation Area. This consolidation of built development on smaller plots would be visible from the rear and from the public frontage from Lewes Road and would therefore harm the more spacious character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP), Policy DP35 of the Mid Sussex District Plan (MSDP) 2014–2031 and Paragraph 134 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The proposal would cause harm to the setting of 132 Lewes Road and the adjacent property, detracting from the spacious, verdant rural character and the increase in density would divorce it from its wider rural setting contrary to Policy E9 of the HHNP and Policy DP34 of the MSDP 2014–2031. Furthermore, it would compromise the privacy of neighbouring properties and would threaten the integrity of the existing leylandii hedge.

**cont.**

**DM/20/1070 – 132 Lewes Road (cont.)****Franklands**

The proposed extension of built development to the rear of 132 Lewes Road and subdivision of the plot would harmfully intrude into the open land detracting from the spacious character, resulting in a harmful urbanising effect, degrading the attractive transition between the intensive urban development of Haywards Heath and the open countryside beyond. The proposal would therefore harm the character and appearance of the local area, contrary to Policy E9 of the HHNP and Policy DP26 of the MSDP 2014–2031.

Haywards Heath Town Council **OBJECTS** to the application based upon:

1. the precedent set by the local planning authority's decision to refuse application DM/18/0440 – North Colwell Barn Lewes Road;
2. further conflict with the HHNP and MSDP as detailed above which would undermine the integrity of this important and much valued Conservation Area.

**DM/20/1287 – 90 Lewes Road****Franklands**

Renovation and extension to include: front extension incorporating new garage with room in roof above; rear extension with living space to ground floor, room in roof above, with gable end and oak framed balcony; conversion of existing garage to living space; insertion of dormer windows into loft; replacement of bi-fold and single door to the rear with french door and windows.

Haywards Heath Town Council does not object to the application in principle, which would support ground floor multi-generational habitation. However, any permission should be benchmarked by the Mid Sussex Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document and specifically, all windows at the frontage should be aligned horizontally, ensuring design congruity to protect visual amenity in this important Conservation Area. Policy E9 of the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan applies.

**DM/20/1316 – Homestead, College Road****Heath**

Demolition of existing rear kitchen extension, proposed single storey rear and side extension and part garage conversion, together with associated internal alterations.

No comment.

**DM/20/1320 – Homestead, College Road****Heath**

Hip to gable loft conversion together with rear dormer and insertion of rooflight to front elevation. 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.

**Week 3****DM/19/3619 – Mid Sussex District Council Beech Hurst Depot, Bolnore Road****Lucastes**

Demolition of existing buildings and redevelopment to provide 18 dwellings comprising 2 no. 1-bed flats, 4 no. 2-bed flats, 5 no. 2-bed houses, 3 no. 3-bed houses, and 4 no. 4-bed houses with associated access, landscaping and car parking. Amended drawings received 23.04.20, changing roof profiles (gable to hipped ends), elevational details including materials and windows/doors and boundary treatment.

The Town Council notes the submission of amended drawings, which seek to improve visual appeal, and requests that all apposite comments from its original representation submitted on 04/11/2019 are applied to these latest proposals. For the avoidance of doubt, the original representation is reiterated below:

**cont.**

**DM/19/3619 – Mid Sussex District Council Beech Hurst Depot, Bolnore Rd (cont.) Lucastes**

'This site is earmarked in the Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan (HHNP), detailed in Policy H5, and thus the principle of development is already established for approximately 15 housing units. The Town Council welcomes the provision of additional affordable housing in excess of policy requirements; however, the Town Council notes ongoing concerns relating to density on the site.

The overriding concern raised by residents is the poor condition of Bolnore Road and the potential for further damage from the construction process. The Town Council critically notes representations from residents and specifically the West Sussex County Council Public Rights of Way (WSSC PROW) requirement for a planning condition as follows:

*'if planning permission is granted for this development a condition should be included for resurfacing of Bolnore Road from the end of the D classified section through to the access road for the development site. This is the request of WSSC PROW to ensure that the future increases in private use of this route does not result in a deteriorating surface of the PROW. WSSC Highways have also been consulted on this application and any comments regarding the section carrying D status will be included by the Highways Officer.'*

The Town Council wishes to reinforce this condition by requesting that the entire western end of Bolnore Road, i.e. from Saddlers Way westwards, is brought up to a WSSC Highways adoptable standard which includes the provision of a footway. The highway is to be constructed using materials of the appropriate grade, i.e. nothing substandard.

**For the absence of doubt, if this planning condition is not delivered, the Town Council OBJECTS to the application.**

In addition to the above condition – which the Town Council considers non-negotiable – any permission granted must also be subject to the following:

- no development shall take place, including any works of demolition, until a Construction Management Plan (CMP) has been submitted to and approved by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC). The CMP shall follow the access and working hours restrictions that applied to the development of Phase 5 of Bolnore Village and shall include but not be limited to the following:
  1. in the spirit of neighbourliness, community engagement and to demonstrate best practice, the developers must consult with local residents and notify them in advance of the key stages of development. They must provide a meaningful liaison forum with and for residents for the duration of the build;
  2. the developers must be required to fund pre-commencement (of works) and post-completion surveys of the condition of Bolnore Road and verges and must be obligated to rectify, on an ongoing basis, any defects that are attributable to construction traffic. A post-completion survey must be approved by WSSC Highways and/or MSDC prior to first residential occupation of the development;
  3. 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;

**cont.**

**DM/19/3619 – Mid Sussex District Council Beech Hurst Depot, Bolnore Rd (cont.) Lucastes**

4. access to the site for HGVs over 7.5 tonnes and for articulated vehicles shall be limited to the following times:

Monday–Friday	09:15–15:30 hours;
Saturday, Sunday and Bank/Public Holidays	No access permitted;

5. access to the site for heavy plant shall be limited to the following times:

Monday–Friday	11:00–15:00 hours;
Saturday, Sunday and Bank/Public Holidays	No access permitted;

6. no construction or supply vehicles shall exceed a speed limit of 10mph along Bolnore Road. Advisory 10mph speed restriction signs shall be erected in Bolnore Road by the developers (subject to approval by WSCC Highways);

7. in order to ensure the safety of all highway users, there shall be no parking of contractors', developers' or visitors' vehicles on the BOAT (byway open to all traffic) section of Bolnore Road. There are no enforceable parking restrictions here and the developers must therefore be required to erect temporary barriers to prevent parking on the verge.

The Town Council urges colleagues within the higher tiers of local government to engage in all steps necessary to get the western end of Bolnore Road brought up to standard and adopted once and for all. This could coincide with the implementation of traffic calming measures, and parking restrictions (say weekdays between 09:00 and 10:00 hours, and 13:00 and 14:00 hours) to prevent commuter parking.

The Town Council requests that developer Section 106 contributions for local community infrastructure are allocated towards the proposed Country Park on land off of Hurstwood Lane.'

**DM/20/1046 – 5 Frankton Avenue**

**Franklands**

To install a dropped kerb. (Revised plan received 24/04/2020.)

No comment.

**DM/20/1103 – 34 Lucastes Lane**

**Lucastes**

Loft conversion, front extension, first floor side extension and external alterations.

No comment.

**DM/20/1282 – 1 Heasewood****Lucastes**

Erection of single storey pitched roof side extension.

**And**

(Amended plans received 21.04.2020.) Erection of single storey pitched roof side extension.

Whilst the Town Council has no comment to make regarding the proposed extension itself, it is requested that any permission is made conditional on the following:

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. in the spirit of neighbourliness, the applicants and their contractors must ensure that highway access to and from Heasewood remains clear at all times and that any vehicles associated with the build are parked considerately and do not inconvenience local residents.

**DM/20/1324 – 7 Wychperry Road****Lucastes**

Proposed double hip to gable extension. Rear loft extension and conversion. 3 no. front facing Velux windows. 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/20/1367 – Lindens House, 15 Birchen Lane****Heath**

Proposed single storey rear extension with replacement balcony over.

No comment.

**DM/20/1391 – 11 Blunts Wood Road****Lucastes**

Single storey rear extension connecting the main dwelling to the detached annexe. First floor rear extension above existing ground floor. New front porch.

No comment.

**DM/20/1413 – 26 The Broadway****Heath**

Change of use from sui generis to A2 usage, alterations to recessed entrance/front door and installation of air conditioning unit to the rear. 3 no. front-facing Velux windows. 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.

Haywards Heath Town Council (HHTC) **SUPPORTS** this application to extend the business appeal for this site. Cognisant that this site is part of the central/emerging mixed used residential/retail/commercial neighbourhood, sustainability is now one of the key tenets of the respective Haywards Heath Neighbourhood Plan, Mid Sussex District Plan 2014–2031 and emerging Haywards Heath Masterplan (HHMP).

Modern sustainable communities require flexible and organic policy solutions to provide an infrastructure template suitable to support a constantly changing residential/leisure/retail/beverage environment.

**cont.**

**Challenges**

- Residential density/Townscape area;
- Environmental Health/noise issues – movement of goods/waste/bottles;
- Air source heat pump/kitchen vents – noise/odour;
- Integration into the emerging HHMP.

Noise associated with plant and machinery incorporated within the development shall be controlled such that the Rating Level, measured or calculated at 1m from the façade of the nearest proposed noise sensitive premises, shall not exceed 5dB below the existing LA90 background noise level. Rating Level and existing background noise levels to be determined as per the guidance provided in BS 4142:2014.

**To underline conditioned HHTC support for this application,** the extraction unit and air handling unit will both need to be conditioned in terms of noise (detailed above) to ensure that they do not significantly impact on nearby residents.

DRAFT