

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 21 NOVEMBER 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at **20.00**

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. C. Snowling (Vice Chairman)
Mr. W Blunden
Mrs. S. Richmond
Mrs V. Upton
Mrs M. Hersey
Mr. M. Damsell

Also present:

Two Members of the Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Three Members of the public (one member of the public left after the conclusion of 396.2 (xi) and one arrived shortly before the meeting concluded)

In attendance:

Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

Not present:

Mr. S. Hodgson (Chairman)
Mr. R. Plass

In the Committee Chairman's absence the Vice Chairman, Councillor Snowling, chaired the meeting. Accordingly, the Vice Chairman will be referred to as the Chairman for the purpose of these minutes.

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

392 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

392.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hodgson and Councillor Plass, and the reasons accepted.

393 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

393.1 Councillor Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, when present at meetings of Mid Sussex District Council's Planning Committee A, the District wide Planning Committee, or at any meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow Members. Councillor Hersey also advised that she wouldn't vote in respect of item 395.2 (vi) (Lindfield Motors) as she knew the proprietors through servicing her car and more general discussions

393.2 Councillor Snowling advised that he would leave the room for item 395.2 (vi) (Lindfield Motors) as he and his wife knew the proprietors through servicing his car and he had held planning discussions with them in the past.

393.4 Councillor Snowling also declared an interest in item 395.2 (ix) (Tamasha), in as much as he is a Trustee of the adjoining King Edward Hall.

393.5 Councillor Blunden declared an interest in item 395.2 (ix) (Tamasha), in as much as he is the Chairman of the King Edward Hall Management Committee.

394 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 31 OCTOBER 2017.

394.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 31 October 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

395 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL (MSDC) FOR CONSIDERATION.

- 395.1 For each application, the observations of the members who had specifically studied the plans were read out before any public comments and discussion by the Committee.
- 395.2 The committee agreed that agenda item xi (Land Opposite 1 Grahams Cottages) should be considered first as the applicant was attending the meeting.

xi. DM/17/4431 - LAND OPPOSITE 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES

CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE/ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION TO A SELF-CONTAINED STUDIO FLAT

Councillor Blunden stated that he was unhappy with the proposal, noting that a number of issues addressed by the Planning Inspector in January 2017 remained unsatisfied and consequently he and Councillor Upton considered that this application required full Committee review.

The Chairman shared the plans and the Planning Inspector's Report with the Committee to allow members to familiarise themselves and invited Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), followed by Mr Jeff Kirkham, the applicant, to comment on the proposal.

LPS noted that the site had been the subject of a number of Planning Applications and a subsequent appeal which was dismissed. LPS considered that the latest application fell short in a number of areas concerning the Built Environment; the 2004 Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents including *inter alia* Dwelling Place Standards, Sustainable Construction requirements and Village Design Statements (Lindfield Local Plan Clause 4.7). LPS considered that the proposal harmed the Conservation Area, contrary to Policy B1 (a) and (b) relating to high standards of design, construction and layout, as well as B12 (good and sympathetic design). LPS felt that whilst the existing Timber Frame garage structure was acceptable in its current format, it was not suitable for a dwelling house and that the proposed development would be harmful to the existing setting of nearby properties and that the window at 4.3% of the floor area was not enough to meet Dwelling Place Standards. Further, that the application misquoted parts of the Lindfield Village Plan. LPS provided to the Deputy Clerk a copy of Letter which it had sent to MidSussex District Council detailing its objections.

The applicant advised that the proposal complied with all Dwelling Place standards and noted that Planning Permission already existed for development subservient to the existing dwelling house. In essence, all that was being proposed was the installation of a shower which would no longer leave the proposed development subservient. Consequently, the applicant stated that he would implement the existing planning permission if the latest proposal was refused. Further, that if the proposal were approved more would be spent on the property including replacing PVC windows with slim line aluminium frames and replacing the existing white wall with a finish more suited to the location; this would not be undertaken if the application was refused. The applicant explained that the development was to enable a younger person to stay in the village and therefore was in support of wider government policy to encourage suitable housing for first time buyers. Further that, whilst in due course the property would no doubt be sold on, its legacy would be a property to attract further young first time buyers to the village.

Councillors discussed the application and, whilst recognising that each application should be considered on its merits, concluded that the proposal fell short of properly addressing all aspects raised by the Planning Inspector. Further that, as a wooden storage construction, the existing use was appropriate however it was not suitable as a residential domicile. On a majority decision the Committee concluded that the application could not be supported.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) cannot support this application recognising that it does not satisfactorily address a number of issues raised in the Planning Inspectors Appeal Decision dated 17th January 2017; in particular Main Issue #5 and Reason #12.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

i. DM/17/4221 - 21 PICKERS GREEN

DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BRICKWORK CHIMNEY AND ERECTION OF A NEW BRICKWORK CHIMNEY TO SIDE ELEVATION. NEW SOLID WOOD FRONT DOOR WITH SIDE GLAZING. NEW SLIDING DOORS TO REAR ELEVATION.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections subject to the materials used matching the existing

ii. DM/17/4248 - 226 THE WELKIN

OAK (T1) REMOVE LOWEST BRANCH OVERHANGING THE GARDEN OF 226 THE WELKIN AND REDUCE TWO LOWEST BRANCHES OVERHANGING THE FOOTPATH BY 3M

NOTE **AGREED RESPONSE (under delegated authority):** Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application. (submitted to MSDC on 10.11.17)

iii. DM/17/4029 - UPWEY 101 HIGH STREET

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE MEZZANINE FLOOR WITHIN ROOF SPACE AND REPLACEMENT FIRST FLOOR BEDROOM WINDOW ON FRONT ELEVATION.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections.

iv. DM/17/4389 -14 FINCHES GARDENS

T1 SYCAMORE - FELL

NOTE **AGREED RESPONSE (under delegated authority):** "Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application." (submitted to MSDC on 16.11.17)

v. DM/17/4388 - 1 EASTERN COTTAGES LEWES ROAD

LEYLANDII (T1) REDUCE HEIGHT BY 6M.

NOTE **AGREED RESPONSE (under delegated authority):** "Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application" (submitted to MSDC on 16.11.17)

vi. DM/17/3621 - LINDFIELD MOTORS LINDFIELD MOTORS LEWES ROAD

VARIATION OF CONDITION 2 RELATING TO PLANNING APPLICATION DM/16/2971, TO CHANGE THE PROPOSED EXTERNAL WALL FINISH FROM BRICKWORK TO ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE PANEL.

Councillor Blunden took the Chair and Councillor Snowling left the room for this item.

A member of the public, Mr Kerslake, voiced strong opposition to the application, citing that the original application in brickwork was fine but that the proposed dark grey aluminium panelling now proposed was starkly different and pays no respect to Lindfield Local Plan and in particular B1 (a) and (b), noting further that no other property in Lewes Road utilised a similar material. Further that under Policy B12 developments abutting a conservation area required special attention; in this case there would be a dramatic affect on the outlook from property within the Grade 2 Listed Old Junior School. Finally that policy B15 seeks such developments to preserve/enhance the area whereas the proposal was contrary to this requirement as it damaged the setting of the nearby listed buildings.

Lindfield Preservation Society stated that they had no comments in respect of the application.

The Committee noted that they had insufficient information on the proposed material and questioned why a change from the originally proposed brick wall to an industrial material was required

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) is unable to comment on the proposed variation as insufficient information has been supplied to it (neither drawings nor detail of the proposed external wall finish).

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- vii. DM/17/4426 - HIGH STREET
3 YOUNG LIME TREES (T10006, T10015 AND T10022) CROWN LIFT TO 5.2M OVER ROAD AND 2.2M OVER PATH. 34 LIME TREES (SEE MAP) RE-POLLARD TO PREVIOUS POINTS.

NOTE AGREED RESPONSE (under delegated authority): "Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application." (submitted to MSDC on 16.11.17)

- viii. DM/17/4323 - CLEVELEYS 49 HICKMANS LANE
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections.

- ix. DM/17/4338 - TAMASHA LINDFIELD 22 HIGH STREET
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF NEW AIR CONDITIONING UNITS. ONE ON THE WESTERN ELEVATION AND ONE ON THE NORTHERN SIDE OF THE BUILDING

Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) noted that the appearance of the units was very prominent and clearly visible when looking at the site from the front and out of keeping with adjoining properties. Further that the noise generated by the units was inappropriate in the village setting. LPS noted the roof valleys in the construction and suggested that these could accommodate the air conditioning units and address both the visual and noise aspects of their concerns.

The Committee noted the comments of the Contaminated Land and Environmental Protection Officer, of 3rd November 2017, and agreed that it was not possible to assess whether the units met the required standard.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) notes the comments of the Contaminated Land and Environmental Protection Officer, of 3rd November 2017, and agrees that it is not possible to assess whether the units meet the required standard. LPC also notes the comments of Lindfield Preservation Society questioning whether the air conditioning units could be placed in the roof valley at the rear of the building, to minimise impact in terms of both appearance and noise.

- x. DM/17/2578 - Old Dairy Cottage 1B Backwoods Close
(T1) SYCAMORE – FELL

Councillors did not consider that 'shading' was a sufficient reason to fell a healthy tree. The Council's Tree Warden had reported "The owner was at home yesterday and agreed that the branch reaching over the house needs to be removed and top of tree reduced." The Deputy Clerk advised that there seemed to be some confusion over whether the request to fell a Sycamore was being replaced by a request to reduce an Ash. Based on the request before it Councillors did not consider a case had been made to fell the Sycamore

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council does not consider that a case has been made for felling the tree referred to in the application and therefore objects to this application.

Subsequent to the P&TC Meeting it was identified that MSDC's Planning Portal records the application as relating to "T1) Ash - Remove 2 lowest limbs to South and Crown Reduce by 2 metres." as opposed to felling the Sycamore detailed in the Application Form as supplied to LPC by MSDC and held on MSDC's Planning Portal, which was the request considered at the P&TC meeting. MSDC have subsequently advised that the Planning Officer identified that the species was wrongly stated and negotiated the reduction detailed as opposed to felling. Further, that the Tree Application would not be re-advertised as this is not MSDC's Policy when a reduction has been negotiated.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- xii. DM/17/4560 - 45 FINCHES GARDENS
T1 APPLE - CROWN LIFT TO 1.8M FROM GROUND LEVEL, THIN BY 10%, REMOVAL OF WATERSHOOTS, MAJOR CROSSING/RUBBING BRANCHES AND DEAD WOOD. REDUCE HEIGHT AND LATERAL GROWTH BY UP TO 1.5M

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections.

396 TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS OR ISSUES MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

- 396.1 Councillor Blunden reported that at the recent meeting of MSALC he and Councillor Snowling had attended, there was a strong feeling that all the other Towns and Parishes wanted to see the MSDC District Plan 'made' as soon as practical and not to be slowed down by minor issues.
- 396.2 The Deputy Clerk reported that the Council had responded formally to the MSDC District Plan Main Modifications Consultation and that this had previously been circulated to Councillors accordingly.
- 396.3 The Deputy Clerk advised Councillors that in respect of Planning Application DM/17/3629 which related to a proposed Oak Framed Garage, that MSDC had REFUSED the application as having a detrimental impact on the street scene. Councillors commented that they would need to bear this approach in mind when similar applications came up.
- 396.4 The Deputy Clerk read out the Council's response to DM/17/3311 relating to 130 proposed dwellings to the east of Gravelye Lane:

"In Lindfield Parish Council's response to planning Application DM/17/5648, reference was made to the grounds of refusal in a previous application, which pointed to the fact that any development of the site would be bound to have an adverse effect on the setting of Lindfield Common, and the nearby Conservation Area. A previous appeal for that application was dismissed by a Planning Inspector, who accepted that such adverse effects would be the likely result. However, in granting consent for the recent outline application, it was stated that such matters would have to be satisfied on submission of the detailed planning application. The Parish Council cannot comment on the design or lay out of the estate, but does wish to support the detailed research and work of the Lindfield Preservation Society, which conclusively shows that at the highest point of the site, some of the proposed building will be visible and intrusive from Lindfield Common, thus adding to the creeping urbanisation of the area, and detracting from the rural feel of Lindfield Village. The applicant appears to rely on tree screening and foliage in order to mitigate against these effects, but the Parish Council is of the view that no part of the buildings should be visible from Lindfield Common, even without such screening. The position is supported by provisions in the NPPF, which states "that the planning system should enhance the natural and local environment, by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes....." and that "development should address the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment." The Parish Council submits that given the significance of the issue, the application should not therefore be approved until the point is satisfactorily addressed beyond doubt, rather than in hope or expectation. It may be that the Planning Authority should consider commissioning an independent, expert assessment of the position. As a separate point, it is noted that drainage and flooding concerns are to be addressed by the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. Lindfield Parish Council requests a condition to ensure that the developer (or successors) has an ongoing and binding obligation to ensure the viability and effectiveness of such solutions, not just now, but in the future. This is to ensure that third parties are not left to pick up the consequences of any such system failures."

397 ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 397.1 No other items were raised

The meeting concluded at **20.45**.