

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 26 May 2009 at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m.

Present: Mr C Snowling (Chairman)
Mr. A. Gomme (Vice Chairman)
Mr W Blunden
Mrs. M. Hersey
Mrs M Nicolle
Mr. S. Willcox

Also Present: 7 members of the public (4 for part of the meeting only)

In Attendance: Mrs. C. Irwin

277. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN

277.1 The Chairman of the Council, Cllr. Blunden, opened the meeting, welcomed those present and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall. Cllr. Blunden called for nominations for the position of Chairman. Councillor Snowling was PROPOSED and SECONDED, and, there being no further nominations, was duly elected as Chairman of the Planning and Traffic Committee.

277.2 Councillor Snowling took the Chair and made a statement explaining that Members of the Planning and Traffic Committee were only able to comment on the applications as they were presented. It was outside their remit to comment on alternatives which might be deemed acceptable.

278. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN

278.1 The Chairman called for nominations for the position of Vice Chairman. Councillor Gomme was PROPOSED and SECONDED and, there being no further nominations, was duly ELECTED as Vice Chairman of the Planning and Traffic Committee.

279. PARISH COUNCIL'S REPRESENTATION ON THE TRAFFIC STUDY JOINT WORKING PARTY

279.1 It was AGREED that Cllrs. Nicolle, Blunden and Snowling should continue to represent the Parish Council on the Traffic Study Joint Working Party.

280. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

280.1 Apologies for Absence were received from Cllrs. Leach and Upton and the reasons accepted.

281. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

281.1 Councillor Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting at meetings of Mid Sussex District Council's Central Area Planning Committee or at any other meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen the officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow members.

282. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 5 MAY 2009.

282.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 5 May 2009. It was AGREED to approve the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

283. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

283.1 For each application, the observations of the members who had specifically studied the plans, and whose names are shown in the heading, were read out before any public comments and discussion by the Committee. It was AGREED, for the benefit of members of the public present at the meeting, to rearrange the order in which the planning applications were to be considered.

283.2 09/00342/FUL - THE RANGE, ALMA ROAD
TWO STAGE EXTENSION AND REFURBISHMENT OF THE EXISTING RIFLE RANGE AND CLUB HOUSE BUILDINGS TO COMPLY WITH CURRENT MOBILITY, HEALTH AND SAFETY AND ENERGY CONSERVATION LEGISLATION. STAGE 1 EXTEND AND REFURBISH THE RIFLE RANGE. STAGE 2 EXTEND AND REFURBISH THE CLUB HOUSE. (Cllrs. Nicolle and Leach).

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) stated that the Society had no objection in principle to the proposal but they too had noted that the colour had not been specified.

Mr. P. Tremlett (Treasurer of the Lindfield Rifle Club) stated that the Rifle Range had been there since 1915 and had fallen into disrepair. The Rifle Club would be happy to use any colour that would be acceptable to others.

Members agreed that the colour could be left to the discretion of the Planning Officers in consultation with representatives of the Rifle Range.

AGREED RESPONSE: " No objection, subject to the colour being approved by Planning Officers after consultation with the applicant. We understand that the chain link fencing would be no higher than the existing fencing."

283.3 09/01072/FUL – 1 COMPTON ROAD
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION. (Cllrs. Blunden and Upton).

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) stated that the Society was concerned that, although the proposal appeared to be sympathetic to its surroundings, there was insufficient detail stated regarding materials, particularly colour which was of importance in the context of the building's location in the Conservation Area.

Mr. P. Ford (Applicant's Representative) stated that the Architectural Surveyor, who dealt mainly with Listed Buildings, was very conscious of the need for the extension to fit in with its surroundings.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection subject to materials matching existing and to be agreed by Planning Officers."

283.4 09/01206/FUL – CAMPION COTTAGE 16 COMPTON ROAD
PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. (Cllrs. Blunden and Upton).

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) expressed the Society's objections on the grounds that the extension would project into the view into and out of the Conservation Area at the entrance to the Tollgate Car Park. The Society recognised that there was a property on the opposite side of Compton Road which had also been extended to the side, but considered that the present proposal was not acceptable.

Mr. N. Kerslake stated that each planning application had to be considered on its own merits and that alleged precedents were not material planning considerations. The current proposal, in Mr. Kerslake's view, breached Mid Sussex Local Plan Policy B12 in that it would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area to which it was totally exposed on three sides.

Mr. Mayhew (Applicant) stated that he was extremely disappointed by the comments made as he had been given to understand from District Council Planning Officers that there would be no reason not to go ahead with the extension as set out in the plans. He did not take the point about the effect on the

appearance of the road at the entrance to the car park and he considered that the proposed extension was balanced and would benefit the housing stock. In response to Members' comments about the blank side wall, Mr. Mayhew commented that the side elevation as it stood at present was plain, although offset by windows. In designing this extension Mr. Mayhew had consciously avoided being too adventurous and had not taken the extension to the full length of the property.

During discussion Members gave careful consideration to the effect of the proposal on the Conservation Area in terms of the design, with the blank wall, and the prominence of the location. It was recognised that blank side walls were common features of this style of house, but it was considered that the proposal would not preserve or enhance the appearance of the Conservation Area.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We have carefully considered this proposal in the context of the Conservation Area, particularly whether it preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the area, and we object to this application on the grounds that the proposed extension would have an adverse effect on the street scene in this part of the Conservation Area. The extension would unbalance the property and the blank wall would be detrimental in this prominent location."

283.5 09/00780/FUL – 31 BACKWOODS LANE
PARTIAL WIDTH REAR EXTENSION, ROOF ALTERATIONS AND GARAGING. (Cllrs. Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection"

283.6 09/01279/TCA – CARRIERS COTTAGE, LEWES ROAD
YEW - REDUCE OVERALL CANOPY BY 25%. (Cllrs. Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection"

283.7 09/01292/FUL – 1 EASTERN COTTAGES, LEWES ROAD
AMENDMENT TO EXTANT PLANNING CONSENT ref 05/01144/FUL TO REPOSITION APPROVED
DORMER DUE TO STRUCTURAL CONSTARINTS IMPOSED BY THE EXISTING BUILDING AND
THE CLARIFICATION OF CONSTRUCTION DETAILS TO CORRECT AMBIGUITIES IN THE
APPROVED DRAWING. (Cllrs. Hersey and Willcox).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection"

283.8 09/01360/TCA – 91 HIGH STREET
FELL ONE CONIFER. (Cllrs. Hersey and Willcox).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection"

283.9 09/01433/TCA – HOLLYCROFT, HICKMANS LANE
FELL EUCALYPTUS. (Cllrs. Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection"

284. REPORT ON SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

284.1 The tabled list was noted without comment.

285. WSCC CONSULTATION ON WAITING RESTRICTIONS

285.1 The Chairman invited comments from members of the public on the plans submitted by WSCC associated with the formal consultation on waiting restrictions.

Mr. N. Kerslake commented that he was disappointed that the issue of parking at the north end of the High Street had not been resolved.

During discussion Members were puzzled by the fact that waiting restrictions were still being proposed for the length of Denmans Lane from the rear boundary of 1 Compton Road to the barrier, despite the Parish Council's comments at the earlier stage in the consultation that this part of the road, where parking would not have an adverse effect on residents of the adjacent properties, should remain available for parking.

It was considered that the Parish Council should express support for the proposed disabled parking space.

AGREED to inform WSCC that the Parish Council did not support the proposal to restrict waiting times for the length of Denmans Lane from the rear boundary of 1 Compton Road to the barrier (as depicted at the top left corner of Tile ref TQ3425SEN sheet issue 5, the top right corner of TQ3425SWN sheet issue 3 and the bottom right corner of TQ3425NWS sheet issue 1. However the Parish Council did support the disabled bay shown on Tile Ref TQ3425SEN sheet issue 5, outside 13 and 15 Denmans Lane.

286. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

286.1 No items of other business were raised.

The meeting concluded at 8.37 p.m.