



BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL

MINUTES of the **PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**
held in the Council Chamber
on **MONDAY, 7 JANUARY 2008**

Present:

Tony Balsdon - Chairman
Ian Simpson Vice-Chairman

Simon Hicks
Denis Jones
Mrs Sue Knight
Mrs Jacqui Landriani
Ronnie Paulsen

* *Denotes non-attendance.*

(19.00)

183. OPEN FORUM

Roger Dale, 102 Mill Road, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03714.FUL. Mr Dale stated that he did not object in principle to development on this site but he did object to the current application. Figures for Mid Sussex showed that 33% of homes had 2 cars, 43% had 1 and just 14% had none. As a rule of thumb there should be 1 car parking space per bedroom but only 6 had been allocated for 15 bedrooms in this application which would result in on-street parking. To illustrate the existing car parking congestion in the area Mr Dale produced photographs showing on street parking in Mill Road (from Mill Close) and Millers Way. Mill Road is a busy road and 1 of 3 North/South routes through the town. It is a main route for emergency service vehicles, buses and heavy goods vehicles and this development would add to the existing congestion on the road and should be refused.

Anne Miles, 2 Mill Cottages, 104B Mill Road addressed the meeting on BH.07.03714.FUL. She was aware of only 2 people receiving notification letters, there was no site notice and inadequate time had been made available to comment. She felt that the application should be postponed until

notification letters had been sent to Millers Way. The development would be one storey higher than the surrounding properties and would be out of keeping. It would be an invasion of privacy for numbers 100-106 Mill Road and there would be overlooking. The density of the development would be too high. Insufficient car parking spaces would lead to displacement on road parking. Existing cars parked in Millers Way were from Spanish Court. Further on street parking would affect the through flow of traffic on this North/South route through the town. Mill Road had a history of flooding as the existing drains were not efficient. The Core Strategy encouraged sustainable development yet there were no features such as solar panels in this application. Concern was expressed about access for emergency service vehicles at the back of the property where only a metre either side had been allowed. The loss of a house built in 1886 and a family home would deprive the whole community of a building of character.

Paul Noble, 93 Cants Lane, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03895.FUL. He stated that he was dismayed and distressed by this application as a similar application had been turned down at appeal in April 2006. He strongly objected to the application as it would affect 22 households. He felt that the uncertainty over this site may have devalued his property. If the application were allowed there would be 14 houses where once 3 bungalows had stood. All the previous reasons for refusal applied.

Ron Glover, 5 The Vineries, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03895.FUL. He showed a copy of a local newspaper when 18 months ago the previous application was front page news. Mr Glover stated that he had not been informed about this application. The previous application had been rejected by the Town Council, District Council and the Planning Inspectorate. This proposal was very similar and it was upsetting for the residents in the area to go through all this again. The application states that the plans are within density guidelines but he estimated that the road took up 25% of the site and pushed the housing to the edge maximising the disruption to surrounding properties.

Diane Bourke, 22 The Kiln, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03895.FUL. She stated that she would be writing to Mid Sussex District Council about their consultation procedures. A notification letter dated 29 December had not been received until 4 January 2008. The application was not available on the website. The consultation period had therefore been reduced. When visiting Mid Sussex District Council to view the plans on 7 January she had not been advised that Burgess Hill Town Council would be meeting that evening. She was concerned about the density of the development, traffic congestion, and the loss of privacy to properties in The Kiln. There were existing problems in The Kiln with surface water run off damaging gardens and fences and drainage had not been addressed in the application. The development would be about 9 foot from her property and noise levels would increase and wildlife would be disadvantaged. This application had not addressed previous concerns and should be refused.

Simon Hancock, 31 The Martlets, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03868.COU as the applicant and explained that the screens were just to replace those that were there at the moment.

Mrs Verrell, 3 Millers Way, addressed the meeting on BH.07.03714.FUL and expressed concern that whilst the the application had mentioned that doors had been widened to meet the DDA, it did not address how the disabled would access the top floor without lifts.

184. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were none.

185. **SUBSTITUTES**

There were none.

186. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Mrs Jacqui Landriani declared a personal interest in every planning application on the agenda in her capacity as a District Councillor and as a potential substitute member of the South Area Planning Committee. She stated that any views she expressed were purely preliminary comments.

Tony Balsdon and Sue Knight declared a personal interest in BH.07.03627.FUL as their General Practitioner worked at the surgery.

187. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

There were none.

188. **MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Transport Committee held on Monday, 17 December 2007, having been previously circulated, were **AGREED** and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

189. **TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Applications (as set out in the accompanying schedule) under the Town & Country Planning Act 1990, received by Mid Sussex District Council and forwarded for observations since Monday, 17 December 2007 were considered.

190. **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - SECTION 78 APPEAL DECISION**

Notification had been received from the Planning Inspectorate that the Appeal in respect of the following application had been **DISMISSED** as set out in Agenda Item 8 dated 7 January 2008.

BH.07.00634.FUL

Appeal by: (B Rogers)

Land at: **Gloucester Motors, 201 - 205 Lower Church Road**

Proposed Development: Removal of main building and all outbuildings and erection of 3 storey block of 6 flats.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/07/2048498/NWF

RESOLVED that:

The contents of the reports be noted.

191. Meeting terminated at 19.56 hours.

OBSERVATIONS

BH.07.03714.FUL

(LW)

LEYLANDS WARD

98 Mill Road

(Mr A Sykes)

Demolition of existing detached dwelling and erection of 7 no. two bedroom apartments and 1 no. one bedroom apartment in one block, with 6 no. parking bays, 16 no. bicycle stores and associated bin storage area, utilising existing highway accesses.

OBSERVATIONS: Strongly Recommend Refusal – the application was contrary to policy H9 in the local plan. It was out of keeping with the surrounding dwellings which were predominately bungalows. It was overdevelopment of the site, overbearing and detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring properties. Whilst parking provision met planning criteria it was insufficient for this site which was on a corner in an area where on street parking was already a problem and people had difficulty accessing Millers Way. Mill Road was one of the North – South routes through Burgess Hill and displacement parking from the development would add to the congestion on this road. The application did not mention drainage and flooding yet the drainage system was overloaded in this area.

Concern was expressed that people had been unable to access plans until the 4 January 2008 and Mid Sussex District Council are asked to extend the deadline to allow the public to comment.

BH.07.03895.FUL

(SK)

ST ANDREWS WARD

Land at 75A-75B Cants Lane

(Court Royal)

Demolition of 3 no. bungalows and erection of 14 no. houses together with garaging and parking areas.

OBSERVATIONS: Strongly Recommend Refusal – It was noted that there was very little difference between this application and the previous one that had been dismissed on appeal. It was felt that the density of the proposed development was too great and would be out of keeping in a locality that had a “distinct urban grain” (Appeal Decision dated 28 June 2006). The height of site and the proposed development would result in serious overlooking problems. The site was being filled up to its boundary lines with a loss of natural habitat and it was felt that Tree Preservation Orders should be considered for significant trees.

Traffic conditions would become more dangerous when exiting onto Cants Lane as visibility was restricted to the west by a telegraph pole. A number of developments were planned for this area in the near future which should be considered as a whole in relation to their impact on the surrounding area and quality of life for people already living there. This was acknowledged in the Inspector's Report on Small Scale Housing Allocations when, in relation to the Manor Road and Keymer Tile Works sites, he mentioned that consideration would need to be given in a Transport Assessment to the cumulative impact of the development of this and other proposed allocations in eastern Burgess Hill. This development would be opposite a possible entrance to the Keymer Tile Works site which had been allocated for 475 houses. It was felt that this was a premature application which should be considered as part of the development for the whole of Burgess Hill.

The current sewage and surface water infrastructure was unable to cope with existing levels, The Vineries in particular. The geology of the site should be considered in relation to new and existing buildings should this development go ahead. The application stated that it was not known where the sewer connections were and Mid Sussex District Council may wish to see detailed plans for sewage and drainage before reaching a decision on this application.

The considerable strength of local feeling against this development should also be considered. It was requested that Mid Sussex District Council be asked whether parking provision is adequate.

Concern was expressed that people had not received notification letters until 4 January and that plans had not been available to view on the Mid Sussex District Council website.

BH.07.03868.COU

(HM)

MEEDS WARD

Area Outside Pulse, 31 The Martlets

(Mr Simon Hancock)

Portable screens to enclose eating area.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval providing a thoroughfare is maintained that will allow people and double buggies to get through as space is at a premium in this area, especially on market days.

BH.07.03627.FUL

(LW)

VICTORIA WARD

The Avenue Surgery, 283 London Road

(Mr Peter Lyle)

Single story extension of doctor's surgery to rear elevation and alteration of existing surgery car parking.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03747.FUL

(TM)

MEEDS WARD

241 Chanctonbury Road

(Mr & Mrs A Brown)

Porch.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03756.TCA

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

Mill Park, Park Road

(Marishal Thompson)

Fell Ash.

OBSERVATIONS: Objection – there is insufficient evidence that the tree is at fault.

BH.07.03768.FUL

(TM)

LEYLANDS WARD

Chapel Farmhouse, 52 London Road

(M S Pullen)

Double garage.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03772.TREE

(DS)

FRANKLANDS WARD

Land Parcel Known As Sunset Lane, Oakhall Park

(Sunley Homes)

1 Ash (within Group G20) – Fell.

OBSERVATIONS: No Objection

BH.07.03811.FUL

(CB)

DUNSTALL WARD

25 The Gilligans

(Mr & Mrs D Grant)

Proposed first floor side extension over existing garage and playroom.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03692.FUL

(AW)

MEEDS WARD

45 Crescent Road

(Mr & Mrs Clifford)

First floor extension over existing garage.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03741.FUL

(CB)

ST ANDREWS WARD

13 Janes Lane

(Mr A Conner)

Two storey side extension.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03815.FUL

(CB)

VICTORIA WARD

7 Henry Burt Way

(Mr & Mrs B Proctor)

Conversion of existing single garage to habitable use with new single storey link with existing house. Additional parking bay to west side of house and new access gate in boundary wall.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval

BH.07.03865.FUL

(SK)

DUNSTALL WARD

67 Coulstock Road

(Mr & Mrs M Crouch)

Conversion of rear part of garage to form utility room. Extension of garage length by 2700mm to compensate. Construction of two storey rear extension with pitched roof and gable end.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Refusal – the application remains unneighbourly to number 65 which would be overlooked.

BH.07.03884.COU

(AW)

MEEDS WARD

7B Mill Road

(A Gibbs)

Change of use from A1 and A3 to A1, A3 and D1.

OBSERVATIONS: Recommend Approval
