

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Monday, 26 April 2021 at 7.00 pm

Councillors Present:

J Purdy (Chair)

J Hart (Vice-Chair)

L M Ascough, A Belben, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, M Mwangale, M W Pickett, T Rana and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Valerie Cheesman	Principal Planning Officer
Mez Matthews	Democratic Services Officer
Linda Saunders	Planning Solicitor
Clem Smith	Head of Economy and Planning
Jess Tamplin	Democratic Services Support Officer
Hamish Walke	Principal Planning Officer

Also in Attendance:

Councillor R D Burrett

1. Disclosures of Interest

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Disclosure
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing

Councillor Purdy	Planning application CR/2019/0602/ARM – Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 4)	Personal interest – employed by UK Power Networks (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Purdy	Planning application CR/2019/0660/FUL – Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley (Minute 5)	Personal interest – employed by UK Power Networks (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)
Councillor Pickett	Planning application CR/2019/0661/FUL – Railway Footbridge, Station Way/East Park, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal Interest – lives nearby to the application site
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0155/FUL – Easistore, Maidenbower Office Park, Balcombe Road, Maidenbower, Crawley (Minute 7)	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application
Councillor Irvine	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Cabinet Member for Housing
Councillor Hart	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Secretary of Ewhurst Wood Sports and Social Club (a consultee on the application that did not provide a response)

Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – Member of the Crawley Labour Supporters Club (based at a building adjacent to the application site)
Councillor P Smith	Planning application CR/2020/0274/FUL – Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley (Minute 8)	Personal Interest – a member of Crawley Cycle and Walking Forum, a consultee on the application

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:-

Councillors A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith had been lobbied regarding application CR/2019/0602/ARM.

Councillors A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith had been lobbied regarding application CR/2019/0660/FUL.

Councillors A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith had been lobbied regarding application CR/2019/0661/FUL.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 6 April 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2019/0602/ARM - Overline House, Crawley Station and Adjacent Highway, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Approval of reserved matters pursuant to CR/2016/0294/OUT for residential led mixed use redevelopment (multi deck car park removed from scheme) (amended plans received).

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwagale, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the reserved matters application regarding a total of 223 dwellings across three residential blocks. The Officer reminded the Committee of the previously approved outline application and summarised the various amendments that had since been made to the proposals, one of which was that the Overline House element of the application now formed a separate application (CR/2029/0660/FUL).

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, a statement submitted in regard to the application was read to the Committee.

The statement from the applicant – Surinder Arora, Founder and Chief Executive Officer of the Arora Group – related to three applications on the agenda (CR/2019/0602/ARM, CR/2019/0660/FUL, and CR/2019/0661/FUL) and highlighted matters including:

- The applicant's successful negotiations with Network Rail to overcome issues caused by the site's proximity to the railway line, which resulted in amendments to the approved outline scheme. Works to the railway station were to be phase 1 of the development.
- The sustainable location of the development and the contribution it would make to Crawley's housing supply.
- The applicant's history of investment in Crawley and commitment to providing construction jobs that arise from the scheme to local residents.

The Committee then considered the application. The following matters were raised:

- Concerns regarding the proposed number of parking spaces. The Officer confirmed that residents would not be eligible for parking permits in East Park as the site was in a different parking zone, but the provision of car club membership for residents aimed to alleviate parking pressures. Cycle spaces, public transport links, and the sustainable location of the site would also mitigate this.
- Overshadowing on Station Way. A Committee member raised concerns about limited gaps to let light fall between the blocks. The Officer confirmed that the illustrative outline scheme showed two larger gaps (approx. 16 and 18 metres respectively), and the current application proposed three smaller gaps (approx. 5m each) and a significant gap between Overline House and the adjacent Moka development. A ten storey building was shown in the outline application; the nature of a development of this size meant that some overshadowing was inevitable.
- A green wall. This was illustratively shown within the outline application, but was no longer a part of the design. It had been concluded that this was unfeasible on a north-facing wall due to limited sunlight. Artistic perforated panels were instead proposed, as well as low-level planters.
- The size of the studio flats. Clarification was sought and the Officer confirmed that the two smallest flats (40 square metres each) were 10sqm smaller than the standards set out in the Urban Design SPD.
- Access to the ground floor terrace. The Officer suggested that the terrace was likely to be accessible to all residents of building three.
- Solar panels. The Officer confirmed that solar panels were proposed; full details were to be received via an application to discharge the condition.
- The railway station car park, of which the number of parking spaces was to remain at its current number (97).
- Disappointment regarding the lack of affordable housing. The Officer confirmed that two independent assessments concluded that the scheme could not support affordable housing; this was therefore not a consideration as part of the reserved matters application.
- The design and appearance of the proposed scheme, which were agreed to be an improvement upon the existing buildings at the site and create a positive impression of Crawley.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:
None.

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the completion of a Deed of Variation to the previously agreed S106 agreement (as detailed in report PES/362a) and the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

5. Planning Application CR/2019/0660/FUL - Overline House, Station Way, Northgate, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Change of use and 2 storey roof extension to provide 83 residential apartments, remodelled station including projecting canopy and minor extensions, flexible use retail/coffee shop/business centre (amended plans received).

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwangale, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the application, which covered the Overline House site adjacent to application CR/2019/0602/ARM but was put to the Committee as a full, freestanding application.

Committee members noted that the statement submitted by the Arora Group in regard to application CR/2019/0602/ARM also applied to the application before them.

The Committee then considered the application. A Committee member queried the accessibility to the building via the external staircase, which raised security concerns for residents. The Officer noted that the plans did not clarify whether the staircase was gated at ground floor level. A condition could be included requesting further details of any barriers at the bottom of the staircase (subject to fire regulations), and the Officer recommended that this form part of a wider condition covering security and access to the residential element. The Committee raised no objection to the inclusion of the new condition - this formed a new condition 26 and became a part of the substantive recommendation.

A Committee member sought clarification about the party responsible for maintaining the external areas surrounding the building. The Officer confirmed that this was covered by condition 17 of the outline application, which required that details of the long term management of the public realm areas be agreed for up to a 15 year period.

Committee members expressed support for the improved appearance of the building and the provision of upgraded facilities within the railway station.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement (as detailed in report PES/362b) and the conditions and informatives set out in the report, including a new condition 26 as follows:

The flats hereby approved shall not be occupied until details of security and access arrangements for the residential lobby, the adjacent corridor to the west of the lobby, the cycle store and the fire escape staircase to the west have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These arrangements shall remain in force for the lifetime of the development unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: In the interests of amenity and security for future residents in accordance with policy CH3 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

6. Planning Application CR/2019/0661/FUL - Railway Footbridge, Station Way/East Park, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362c](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Proposed re-alignment of pedestrian bridge to include repair & remedial works.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Mwangale, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the application, which was regarding the proposed refurbishment of the footbridge over the railway line (in relation to applications CR/2019/0602/ARM and CR/2019/0660/FUL).

Committee members noted that the statement submitted by the Arora Group in regard to application CR/2019/0602/ARM also applied to the application before them.

The Committee then considered the application. Committee members noted that the removal and repairs were estimated to take approximately 20 weeks. However the developer predicted that there may be no public access via the footbridge for approximately two years due to construction works on the north side of the railway line, which would make public access unsafe. The Committee discussed the plausibility of alternative arrangements during this time. Provision of a temporary bridge was not realistic due to the proximity to the construction site at Overline House, and the bridge could not be repaired in place due to safety concerns related to the

railway line. The Committee welcomed an idea that public access across the railway line be provided via the station footbridge; but this was outside of the remit of the planning application and subject to discussions with Network Rail.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwagale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement (as detailed in report PES/362c) and the conditions and informatives set out in the report.

7. Planning Application CR/2020/0155/FUL - Easistore, Maidenbower Office Park, Balcombe Road, Maidenbower, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362d](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of 4 storey extension.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application, which sought permission for an extension to the southern and eastern sides of the existing Easistore building. The Planning Officer explained that comments from the Drainage Officer were yet to be received, so the decision before the Committee was to delegate the decision to the Head of Economy and Planning with a view to granting permission, based on the comments received by the Drainage Officer and to include a specific drainage condition if required.

The Committee then considered the application. Following a query from a Committee member, the Planning Officer confirmed that the proposal did not provide further car parking spaces at the site; this was deemed acceptable given the specific occupier and the nature of their business. . Parking and the outside storage areas were covered by a condition that required provision to be in line with the agreed plans. The Officer also explained that the expansion of the site would contribute to the local economy and was therefore in line with the Council's economic growth policies.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:
None.

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Delegate the decision with a view to granting planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in report PES/362d, and with the inclusion of a suitable drainage condition if deemed necessary.

8. Planning Application CR/2020/0274/FUL - Ambulance Station, Ifield Avenue, West Green, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362e](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Demolition of existing ambulance centre and erection of 39 flats with associated parking and amenity space.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Purdy, and P Smith declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the application, which consisted of one block of flats and 22 car parking spaces with amenity space in the form of a central courtyard and roof terraces. The Officer updated the Committee that further discussions with the applicant had led to amendments to the recommendation, which sought to delegate authority to the Planning Officer for amendments to noise conditions and to agree the final refuse and recycling store layout, as well as elevation detailing. There had also been minor amendments to the wording of condition 13 and informative 2 since the publication of the report.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, two statements submitted in regard to the application were read to the Committee.

A statement from the applicant, Tkei Homes, highlighted matters in support of the application including:

- The ecological elements of the building's design; including an internal courtyard/green space, green walls, and roof terrace. The existing woodland to the north east of the site was to be retained.
- The provision of 12 affordable housing units, which had been proposed following appraisals and discussion with the Local Planning Authority.
- The building had been designed to take into consideration noise, ecology, and arboriculture issues, and for its appearance to complement the local streetscene.

A statement from Ian Harrison, a neighbour of the site, highlighted matters in objection to the application including:

- Objections not to the building itself, but to the proposed number of car parking spaces. The provision of 22 spaces for 39 flats was insufficient as each flat occupier could own at least one car.
- Possible crowding caused by future occupiers parking on nearby streets.
- A suggestion that the existing pedestrian crossing be moved and traffic lights be installed at the site's exit on to Ifield Avenue – further traffic joining an already busy road system could be dangerous.

The Committee then considered the application. General support was expressed for the design and appearance of the building, the proposed amenity space, and the inclusion of solar panels. In response to a question about the possibility of unauthorised access to the bicycle storage area via the perforated walls, the Planning Officer suggested that further details could be sought from the applicant to confirm that the design did not allow for this.

Committee members discussed the development's proposed access. It was recognised that a balance needed to be sought between retaining a safe pedestrian crossing, ensuring efficient access to the site, and preventing further traffic on busy surrounding roads. WSCC as the Highways authority had no objection to the site and had not requested changes to the road system or pedestrian crossings. Concerns were also raised about the provision of parking spaces, which was lower than required by the Local Planning Authority's parking standards. This was alleviated, however, by the site's sustainable location.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwangale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:

None.

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to a Section 106 agreement as detailed in report PES/362e, and the conditions and informatives set out in the report including amended condition 13 and amended informative 2 as follows:

Condition 13: *The Bird Hazard Management Plan dated April 2021 shall be implemented as approved, upon completion of the roofs and shall remain in force for the life of the buildings. No subsequent alterations to the plan are to take place unless first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.*

REASON: It is necessary to manage the roofs in order to minimise its attractiveness to birds which could endanger the safe movement of aircraft and the operation of Gatwick Airport in accordance with Policy IN1 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030.

Informative 2: *Given the nature of the proposed development it is possible that a crane may be required during its construction. We would, therefore, draw the*

applicant's attention to the requirement within the British Standard Code of Practice for the safe use of Cranes, for crane operators to consult the aerodrome before erecting a crane in close proximity to an aerodrome. Gatwick Airport requires a minimum of four weeks' notice. For crane queries/applications please email: lqwcranes@gatwickairport.com. For further details please refer to CAP 1096 'Guidance to Crane Operators on Aviation Lighting and Notification' available at www.caa.co.uk.

and delegate authority to Planning Officers to finalise the wording of the conditions relating to noise and to agree the scheme's detailing of the refuse and recycling store and related elevation detailing.

9. Planning Application CR/2020/0313/FUL - T and N MOTs Ltd, Ground Floor, 9 Reynolds Road, West Green, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/362f](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Increase in head height of new garage/workshop following partial demolition of existing workshop (amended description).

Councillors A Belben and Purdy declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application, which related to an increase in head height to one of the workshop areas of the motor garage, to make possible the installation of a lift or ramp to facilitate vehicle repairs. The application had initially sought changes to the opening hours of the premises, but this element had been removed and therefore no longer formed part of the application before the Committee.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, a statement submitted in regard to the application was read to the Committee.

The statement, from James Wells (a neighbour of the site), highlighted matters in objection including:

- The proposals could lead the applicant to take on more work at the site, increasing the already high noise levels caused by the garage's operations.
- The potential for increased traffic and cars parked along Reynolds Road caused by visitors to the garage. This could lead to more hazardous parking, traffic accidents, higher pollution levels, and more potholes in the road.
- Overshadowing and loss of views, privacy, and sunlight from neighbours' gardens due to the proposed increase in the height of the building.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a query from a committee member, the Planning Officer confirmed that the relevant bodies had been made aware of concerns regarding the storage of tyres at the site.

A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation in accordance with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules. The names of the councillors voting for and against the recommendation, along with any abstentions, were recorded as follows:

For the recommendation:

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Mwagale, Pickett, Purdy, Rana, and P Smith (10).

Against the recommendation:
None.

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conditions and informatives set out in report PES/362f.

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 11.10 pm

J Purdy (Chair)