

Crawley Borough Council

Minutes of Planning Committee

Monday, 29 June 2020 at 7.30 pm

Councillors Present:

S Malik (Chair)

T McAleney (Vice-Chair)

L M Ascough, A Belben, J Hart, I T Irvine, K L Jaggard, G S Jhans, M Mwangale, J Purdy and P C Smith

Officers Present:

Jean McPherson Group Manager (Development Management)

Valerie Cheesman Principal Planning Officer

Hamish Walke Principal Planning Officer

Mez Matthews Democratic Services Officer

Jess Tamplin Democratic Services Support Officer

Also in Attendance:

Councillors B J Burgess, C J Mullins, and R Sharma

1. Disclosure of Interests

The following disclosures of interests were made:

Councillor	Item and Minute	Type and Nature of Interest
Councillor A Belben	Agenda Item 7 – Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal interest – was lobbied by people known to him
Councillor Purdy	Agenda Item 7 – Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley (Minute 6)	Personal interest – member of Hazelwick Road Conservation Area Advisory Committee

2. Lobbying Declarations

The following lobbying declarations were made by Councillors:-

Councillors Ascough, Irvine, and Malik had been lobbied regarding application CR/2020/0020/FUL – 6 Lundy Close, Broadfield, Crawley.

Councillors A Belben and Purdy had been lobbied regarding application CR/2020/0054/FUL – 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley.

3. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 27 April 2020 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4. Planning Application CR/2019/0589/FUL - Sullivan Drive, Bewbush, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/352a](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Construction of a bus gate to enable buses to pass between the residential neighbourhoods of Bewbush and Kilnwood Vale along with associated pedestrian walkway, drainage and landscaping (amended plans received).

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

The Group Manager (Development Management) provided a verbal summation of the application. The Committee was reminded that the application had been granted planning permission in January 2020 (report [PES/328a](#)), subject to the completion of a Section 106 agreement which was required to mitigate for a shortfall in replacement trees at the application site. The applicant had since worked with Crawley Borough Council on amended plans for 59 trees to be planted within the CBC boundary at the site, and the revised level of planting was 6 more than required by policy CH6 of the Crawley Borough Local Plan 2015-2030. The tree mitigation could now be accommodated on the site and therefore the Section 106 agreement was no longer needed.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, a statement submitted in support of the application by Mr J Beavan, the planning agent on behalf of the applicant, was read to the Committee. Details of the proposed scheme were presented such as the species mix of the trees and the intended appearance of the landscaping.

The Committee then considered the application. In response to a query from a Committee member regarding the density of the proposed trees, it was clarified that the proposed distance between the trees was in line with arboricultural standards.

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, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Mwagale, Purdy, and P Smith. (11)

Against the recommendation to permit:
None.

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to conditions set out in report [PES/352a](#).

5. Planning Application CR/2020/0020/FUL - 6 Lundy Close, Broadfield, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/352b](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Demolition of existing single storey garage & timber garden room & erection of 1x two bedroom dwelling & new detached garage for 6 Lundy Close.

Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Irvine, Jaggard, and Malik declared they had visited the site.

The Principal Planning Officer (HW) provided a verbal summation of the application.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, five statements submitted by members of the public in regard to the application were read to the Committee.

Three statements from objectors (Mr D Howard, Mrs B Taylor-Ginman and Mr C Ginman, and Mrs G Mallet) highlighted matters including:

- The potential for the placement of the proposed development to create a lack of privacy and a loss of light to neighbouring houses, impacting mental health
- A loss of light to the nearby footpath causing concerns of an increase in crime.

One statement from the applicants (Mr and Mrs Wise) highlighted matters including:

- Clarification of the proximity of the proposed two bedroom dwelling to neighbouring houses, at 10.9 metres
- The inclusion of obscured glass on one window of the dwelling to mitigate loss of privacy of neighbouring houses.

One statement from a Ward Councillor for Gossops Green and North East Broadfield (Councillor C Mullins) highlighted matters including:

- The proposed development causing a high-density feeling to the area
- A concern that neighbouring dwellings could be negatively affected by the proposed 10.9 metre separation distance due to the non-standard layout of the properties on Lundy Close.

The Committee then considered the application. Committee members sought clarification on the compliance of the driveway in terms of road safety, and it was noted that West Sussex County Council's Highways department had made no objection to the design of the shared driveway. Concerns were raised regarding the effects on neighbouring properties such as a potential loss of light and privacy. The Committee heard that these matters were deemed acceptable as the plans for the proposed dwelling were policy-compliant. Upon receiving a query regarding the owners of the site, it was confirmed that the land had not been previously owned nor sold by Crawley Borough Council.

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, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:

Councillors A Belben, Hart, Irvine, Jaggard, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, Mwangale, Purdy, and P Smith. (10)

Against the recommendation to permit:

Councillor Ascough. (1)

Abstentions:

None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to the conclusion of a Section 106 agreement to secure an off-site affordable housing contribution of £8,178, and subject to the conditions set out in report [PES/352b](#).

6. Planning Application CR/2020/0054/FUL - 9 Mill Road, Three Bridges, Crawley

The Committee considered report [PES/352c](#) of the Head of Economy and Planning which proposed as follows:

Erection of two storey side and rear extension and single storey rear extension.

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

The Principal Planning Officer (VC) provided a verbal summation of the application. The Committee was informed that a previous application for planning permission for a separate dwelling at the site had been received and refused, partly due to its classification within Flood Zone 3a and that the applicant had failed to satisfy the flood risk tests. The current application was for an extension to the existing dwelling at the same site. The Environment Agency had advised that the site was now classified as being within Flood Zone 2, and so the application did not require those specific flood risk tests to be carried out. The application was thus to be judged against the Environment Agency's standing advice and the flood resilient measures proposed were considered to be acceptable.

In line with the Council's Virtual Committee Procedure Rules, five statements submitted by members of the public in regard to the application were read to the Committee.

Two statements from objectors (Mr A Bayne and Ms N Edwards) highlighted matters including:

- Existing difficulties with car parking in the area and access limitations due to the narrowness of Mill Road
- A potential for the proposed development to cause a loss of historical value to the Crawley Conservation Area.

One statement from the planning agent (Architecture for London) highlighted matters including:

- That issues with the previously submitted application had been addressed
- The sustainable location of the proposed development.

Two statements from Ward Councillors for Three Bridges (Councillors B Burgess and R Burgess) highlighted matters including:

- The scale of the proposed extension in relation to the existing property
- The previous refusal of a planning application at the site and the similarities between that application and the current application.

The Committee then considered the application. Members of the Committee expressed concerns that the proposed development may not be in keeping with the size and style of properties on Mill Road due to its scale and thus would have a detrimental effect on the character of the Conservation Area. It was noted that conditions four and five of the recommendation required that details of the materials and windows to be used in the construction of the extension be submitted for approval. The Committee also considered car parking availability on Mill Road, and noted that West Sussex County Council's Highways department had no objections on highway safety grounds. It was also clarified that whilst there would be a loss of two to three off-road spaces arising from the construction of the extension, it was considered that there was sufficient capacity in terms of on-street parking.

In response to a query from a Committee member as to whether a condition could be applied to prevent the property being split into two dwellings at a later date, it was explained that such a condition would not meet the relevant tests for a domestic extension, but if the unit was subdivided, this would constitute a breach of planning control and the Council could enforce against the development.

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, are recorded as set out below:

For the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Hart, Irvine, Jhans, Malik, McAleney, and P Smith. (6)

Against the recommendation to permit:
Councillors Ascough, A Belben, Jaggard, Mwangale, and Purdy. (5)

Abstentions:
None.

RESOLVED

Permit subject to conditions set out in report [PES/352c](#).

Closure of Meeting

With the business of the Planning Committee concluded, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 9.36 pm

S Malik (Chair)