

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 9 February 2009 at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m. In the absence of the Chairman Cllr. Snowling, the meeting was chaired by the Vice Chairman, Cllr. Gomme.

Present: Mr. M. Leach  
Mr. A. Gomme (Vice Chairman)  
Mr. S. Willcox

Also Present:  
6 members of the public

In Attendance: Mrs. V. Grainger

### 240. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

240.1 Apologies for Absence were received from Cllrs. Blunden, Hersey, Snowling, Upton and Nicolle and the reasons accepted.

### 241. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

241.1 Councillor Gomme declared a personal interest in item 5 vii) 08/03903/LBC as his daughter and son-in-law had been involved in the restoration of the building. The planning application 08/03902/FUL had now been received for the same property and would be considered at the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting to be held on 3<sup>rd</sup> March. As it had not been possible to gain access to view the property it was AGREED that this item would be deferred for consideration until 3<sup>rd</sup> March when both applications would be considered together.

### 242. QUESTIONS AND COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF PUBLIC

There were no questions raised from members of the public.

### 243. MINUTES OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 20 January 2009.

243.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 20 January 2009. It was AGREED to approve the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

### 244. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

244.1 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.

#### 244.2 08/03779/FUL – 11 BACKWOODS LANE TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO EXISTING DETACHED DWELLING. (Cllrs. Nicolle and Leach)

Mr A.MacKintosh (Backwoods Lane) confirmed that it was intended that the extension should be completed whilst maintaining the character of the property and minimising the impact on the neighbours by siting the extension to the South West of the property away from neighbours. He had received some final feed back from Mid Sussex District Council with the suggestion that the extension should be reduced by two metres away from the road and in line with neighbouring properties. Amended plans were being submitted.

Cllr. Gomme noted Mr MacKintosh's comments but advised that the Committee could only consider the plans before them at present and could not take any amendments into account at this stage.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection".

- 244.3 08/03722/FUL – 59 MEADOW LANE  
RETROSPECTIVE CONSENT FOR DECKING AREA TO SIDE AND REAR OF PROPERTY (APPROX 44 m2 IN AREA) (AMENDED BLOCK PLAN AND CERTIFICATE RECEIVED 19/01/2009). (Cllrs. Willcox and Hersey)

Mr R. Smith (Meadow Lane) advised that he had no comments to make but as the applicant was willing to answer any questions.

Mr J Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) commented that he was concerned with the level of the decking as this was quite high above neighbouring gardens and there may be an issue of overlooking but this was not clear from the plans. The plans were incomplete as the levels were not shown and therefore the application could not be properly determined.

Cllr. Willcox confirmed that he and Cllr. Hersey had visited the site and that this issue had been given full consideration in determination of the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection".

- 244.4 08/03983/FUL – 16 PICKERS GREEN  
DEMOLISH EXISTING GLAZED LEAN-TO AND CONSTRUCTION OF UTILITY ROOM. EXTENDING EXISTING DORMER TO FORM EN-SUITE SHOWER ROOM. (Cllrs. Hersey and Willcox).

Mr J Cackett (Pickers Green) commented that the property was a 1960's house in need of some improvement and an architect had been employed to ensure that the proposed extension was in keeping with the building.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection – materials to match existing. "

- 244.5 09/00173/FUL – SUMMERS REACH, SCHOOL LANE  
BRICK, GLASS AND TIMBER REAR ORANGERY. (Cllrs. Blunden and Upton).

Mr D. Parvin (School Lane) confirmed that matching materials would be used in the construction of the orangery.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection, provided materials used match existing".

- 244.6 08/03947/LBC – 53A HIGH STREET  
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT SHOPFRONT. (Cllrs. Upton and Blunden).

The Committee had made objections to the planning application for the proposed replacement shop front (08/03873/FUL) at the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 20<sup>th</sup> January. The objections were that enlarging the window size and the use of large areas of glass were detrimental to the building and street scene within a conservation area.

Mr J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) commented that he was in agreement with the previous comments but for this application concerning Listed Building Consent consideration should be given to the impact on this listed building, previously known as "Durrants". Although the present window was not an original window it had been there for about thirty years or more and before that the building had sash windows. A plain glass window would be damaging to "Durrants" front elevation. There was also an issue of the side window which had been changed apparently without permission being sought. A photograph of the alteration was circulated to members of the Committee for noting.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We cannot support this application as it does not comply with the building conservation and design document for shop front design (leaflet CD2), which clearly states that large areas of glass panes should be avoided. By enlarging the window size it would unbalance the appearance of this listed building and have an adverse effect on the street scene and on the listed structure of the building".

"We are also surprised to note that the side door case has been filled with a single pane fixed window for which we have no knowledge of a planning application or listed building consent and about which we are very concerned".

- 244.7 09/00096/TREE – 235 THE WELKIN  
4 OAKS (WITHIN GROUP G1) – REDUCE LATERAL BRANCHES BACK TO PREVIOUS CUT POINTS  
AND REMOVE EPICORMIC GROWTH. (Cllrs. Hersey and Willcox).

AGREE RESPONSE: "No objection".

- 244.8 09/00092/TREE - LAND PARCEL OPEN COMMON LAND WEST COMMON DRIVE.  
T35 AND T36 – COMMON LIME (TILIA x EUROPA) REMOVE EPICORMIC GROWTH AND REDUCE  
THE CROWNS BY UP TO 20% TO PREVIOUS PRUNING CUTS (Cllrs. Hersey and Willcox)

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection".

- 244.9 09/00005/FUL – TOWNLANDS, 143 HIGH STREET  
DOUBLE GARAGES WITH POOLHOUSE FACILITIES AND SWIMMING POOL. (Cllrs. Blunden and  
Upton)

The comments made by Cllr. Upton were read to members of the Committee which raised concerns about the proximity to neighbouring property.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We have objections to this application, because of the proximity of the proposed new building to neighbouring property. The neighbour's property has windows facing the proposed new building and there is a possible reduction in daylight/sunlight to the neighbouring property."

- 244.10 09/00006/LBC – TOWNLANDS, 143 HIGH STREET  
DOUBLE GARAGES WITH POOLHOUSE FACILITIES AND SWIMMING POOL. (Cllrs. Blunden and  
Upton)

Members of the Committee concluded that the design was sympathetic to and in keeping with the building itself and would support the application if the issues of loss of amenity to neighbouring property could be overcome.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We consider that the design of the proposed new building is sympathetic to the listed building, if the other issues as outlined above (for application 09/00005/FUL regarding the light reduction and proximity to neighbouring property resulting in the loss of amenity, could be resolved we would have no objection."

- 244.11 8/03724/ADV – 70 HIGH STREET  
NEW SHOP FASCIA AND PROJECTING SIGN (AMENDED PLANS) (Cllrs. Upton and Blunden)

The original proposals for this application had been considered at the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> January and Cllrs. Blunden and Upton had made comment on that application. Amended plans had been submitted and the Committee had made the response to MSDC that the planning application should be re-advertised. Due to the delay in Mid Sussex District Council issuing the special site notice a further period of 28 days had been allowed for responses and the Committee was

now able to make comment on the amended plans. Copies of the amended plans were circulated to members of the Committee for consideration.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We object to this application as we consider that the proposed signage is harmful to the visual amenity of the locality and Conservation Area by virtue of its colour, lettering and illumination, and is to the detriment of the character of the Conservation Area and the setting of the Grade II\* Listed Building and Grade II Listed Buildings opposite, contrary to Policy B20 of Mid Sussex Local Plan."

245. LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL APPLICATION

08/03913/FUL SCAMPS HILL, SCAYNES HILL ROAD (Cllr. Gomme)  
CHANGE OF USE FROM PADDOCK TO RESIDENTIAL AND ERECTION OF ONE FOUR BEDROOM CHALET STYLE DWELLING HOUSE

Mr J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) commented that if the recommendations of the Mid Sussex Core Strategy regarding large scale housing allocation are implemented this would fill the gap between Lindfield and Walstead. This paddock would then become the only land gap between Lindfield and Walstead and the proposal was for a change of use from a paddock to residential.

Members of the Committee were in agreement that it was important to retain the strategic gap.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We object to this application as this Paddock is part of an important strategic gap between Lindfield/Walstead/Scaynes Hill and should be maintained"

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

246.1 The tabled list showing the planning decisions had been circulated and it was NOTED that application 08/03835/FUL for a proposed single bay car port at 5 Pickers Green had been refused by MSDC, as the siting and design would be detrimental to the visual amenity of the streetscene and area of Townscape Character, contrary to policies B1, B16 and H9 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

247. THE TOLL HOUSE, HIGH STREET

A copy of the response from MSDC Senior Planning Officer, Alma Howell had been circulated to members of the Committee. Mrs Howell had written to the owner of The Toll House requesting a site visit to assess the building's condition. The Committee welcomed this first step in the process of ensuring that this important listed building does not fall into disrepair.

248. TO NOTE THE TIMETABLE LEADING TO ADOPTION OF MID SUSSEX CORE STRATEGY

248.1 The time table for the adoption of Mid Sussex Core Strategy had been circulated to members of the Committee and was duly noted. Cllr. Gomme mentioned that he and Cllr. Blunden had attended a three Parishes meeting. He confirmed that Parishes were being asked to complete a vision statement setting out how the area should be developed.

249. DIRECTION SIGNS SUMMERHILL LANE/WEST COMMON

249.1 A response to member's queries had been received from West Sussex County Council concerning the proposed direction signs for Tavistock and Summerhill School. The comments were read out to members of the Committee. It was advised that the missing "No Entry" sign at the junction of Summerhill Lane/West Common should be reported to WSCC Area Highways Office. The additional signage at the traffic controlled junction of Summerhill Lane and West Common is illegal and also should be reported to Area Office. The large signs owned by the school are on private land and cannot be repositioned without planning permission. It was AGREED that the Deputy Clerk would advise WSCC Area Highways Office about the missing and illegal signs.

250. TO NOTE TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 2009

A copy of Lindfield No.1 Tree Preservation Order 2009 for 12 Hickmans Lane, 6 The Glebe, 20 Pickers Green and 12 Denmans Close had been circulated to members of the Committee and was duly NOTED. Preservation Orders had been applied to these trees for their protection, following suggestions made by Lindfield Parish Tree Wardens.

251. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other items of business this part of the meeting concluded at 8.50 p.m.

252. QUESTIONS/ COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Mr J Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) commented that he hadn't seen the amended plans for 70 High Street and agreed with the comments made by the Committee that the amended plans should have been re-advertised.

The meeting concluded at 9.00 p.m.