

## HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN COUNCIL

### PLANNING COMMITTEE

#### Minutes of the meeting held on Monday, 23 January 2017

D F Dorking (*Chairman*)  
M J Pulfer (*Vice Chairman*)  
R J R Clarke  
Mrs S M Ellis  
C N Laband  
A C McPherson  
H A MUNDIN  
L S Wickremaratchi

\* Absent

\*\* Apologies

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

**96. Apologies**

There were none.

**97. Minutes**

The Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday, 3 January 2017 were taken as read, confirmed as a true record and duly signed by the Chairman.

**98. Substitutes**

There were none.

**99. Members' Declarations of Interest**

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

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 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."

**100. Planning Appeals**

There were none.

**101. Licensing Applications**

There were none.

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

Members made comments and observations on 25 planning applications as per Appendix 1 attached.

**103. DM/16/5648 – Consultation on Planning Application Within the Lindfield Rural Parish**

Members were informed that this application was a resubmission of DM/16/1012, which had been considered by the Planning Committee at the meeting held on 31 May 2016. At that time, Members had objected to the application and MSDC had subsequently refused permission. The applicants had lodged an appeal against this decision and the appeal was currently pending.

Since MSDC's refusal however, there had been two appeal decisions – namely land at Birchen Lane and land at Sunte House – that had had a significant bearing on *this* particular appeal case. In light of this, MSDC had withdrawn its main two reasons for refusal and it seemed likely, therefore, that neither of these reasons would be put forward as objections to this latest application.

Notwithstanding this up to date information, Members **AGREED** to maintain the Town Council's original position regarding the proposal to develop this site, and to reiterate the comments made for application number DM/16/1012 but with the addition that if permission were to be granted, the Town Council would expect a substantial amount of Section 106 monies to be allocated to Haywards Heath for improvements to infrastructure. Therefore:

*'Although this application is not in Haywards Heath, Haywards Heath Town Council thanks Mid Sussex District Council for being given the opportunity to comment on the proposal, bearing in mind its proximity to the town and the impact it may have on infrastructure and services.*

*The Town Council understands that the site does not accord with the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan in that it falls outside the current built-up area boundaries of recognised settlements. From the point of view of Haywards Heath, Members are concerned about the detrimental effect this substantial development would have on the town's services – such as doctors' surgeries – and infrastructure, particularly the road network in Bentswood and Franklands Wards. Unless a proper ('site visited') traffic survey – as opposed to a desktop study – has already been carried out by West Sussex County Council, the Town Council requests that one is done. There needs to be a substantial evaluation of infrastructure requirements and a means by which any improvements can be funded. If permission were to be granted, the Town Council would expect a substantial amount of Section 106 monies to be allocated to Haywards Heath for improvements to infrastructure.*

*In conclusion, and in support of the stance being taken by the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Parish Councils, Haywards Heath Town Council **objects** to this application.'*

**104. MSDC Consultation on the Release of Section 106 Monies Towards the Development of a Community Building at the St. Francis Sports Site**

Members had before them a report giving details of a grant application from the St. Francis Sports and Social Club to MSDC for the release of Section 106 monies towards the development of a new community building at the St. Francis sports site, situated within Franklands Ward. The report included a breakdown of the proposed Section 106 contributions – for community buildings and for formal sport – that MSDC were proposing to allocate towards the project. Some of the smaller allocations related to Section 106 receipts for developments that had taken place in other wards of the town.

Two grant options were up for consideration: option 1 amounted to £1,020,000 whilst option 2 amounted to £1,120,000. The difference between the two was that option 2 included all aspects of option 1 but with the additional provision of new changing rooms for the swimming pool.

The consensus amongst Members was that a new facility, which could be accessed by the whole community, was very much needed, particularly in this part of town. It would be extremely regrettable if long-standing Section 106 receipts were to be lost through inaction and expiry. It was also acknowledged, however, that this grant award would utilize a significant proportion of the Section 106 monies available for community buildings and for formal sport and so for the time being, there would be very little left for other projects should they arise.

After due consideration, the Committee voted unanimously to **SUPPORT** the 'option 2' grant request of **£1,120,000**, made by the St. Francis Sports and Social Club, towards the development of a new community building at the St. Francis sports site. This was with the caveat that the new facility would be available as a public facility that all residents of the town would have access to. Members had very strong views and wished to emphasize that the facility should be run on a 'pay as you go' basis and should not be run as some sort of fee-paying private members' club.

**105. Street Naming – Renaming of Residential Development Currently Addressed in to Franklynn Road**

Members had before them a request to rename the small section of Franklynn Road serving properties numbered 31A, 31B, 31C and 31D. MSDC (Street Naming and Numbering) had agreed to the request from residents living there to change the name, following a degree of confusion that had been caused by the developer when the properties were marketed.

The properties had been built to the rear of number 31 Franklynn Road on the site of an old laundry which, at some point in the past, had been known as the 'White Heather Laundry'. In recognition of the historical use of the site, residents had proposed that the access road to the development – between numbers 31 and 33 Franklynn Road – now be named separately as White Heather Drive.

*cont.*

**105. Street Naming – Renaming of Residential Development Currently Addressed in to Franklynn Road (cont.)**

It was **AGREED** to accept residents' proposal to re-address properties numbered 31A, 31B, 31C and 31D Franklynn Road in to a separate, newly named road of **White Heather Drive**.

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

There were none.

The meeting closed at 9:01pm.