

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr C Snowling (Chairman)
Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman)
Mr W Blunden
Mrs M Hersey
Mr M Leach
Mrs M Nicolle
Mrs V Upton

Also Present: 61 members of the public

In Attendance: Mrs C Irwin
Mr P Hemsley

349. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

349.1 The Chairman welcomed those present and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

350. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

350.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Willcox and the reason accepted.

351. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

351.1 Cllr 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 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.

352. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 20 OCTOBER 2009

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

353. WSCC/063/09/HH - OATHALL COMMUNITY COLLEGE, APPLIEDORE GARDENS: CONSTRUCTION OF A FLOODLIT SYNTHETIC TURF PITCH, WITH ASSOCIATED GROUND WORKS AND LANDSCAPING

353.1 The Chairman stated that there had been previous applications on these lines made by Oathall Community College itself and dealt with as normal planning applications. However, the current application was presented by West Sussex County Council (WSCC) and as such they did not have to apply to Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) for permission. The application would be determined by WSCC as Planning Authority according to statutory provision under REG 3 of the Town and Country Planning General Regulations 1992. The irony was that the Community College (CC) was not in Lindfield; however development in that location was likely to affect residents of this Parish.

353.2 It was normal to invite two speakers for and two against proposals, plus the Lindfield Preservation society (LPS); however, in view of the great interest aroused on this matter, the Chairman agreed to waive the normal limit and allow more speakers.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 353.3 Mr Goodger, Mrs Elford and Mr Sinclair were to speak against the application; additionally, Mr Kerslake and Mrs Warner would speak against only if necessary should the others have not covered their points. Mr Haw and Mrs Wilson would speak in favour.
- 353.4 The Chairman gave an overview of the proposals: the orientation differed (from previous applications) with the lights along the long sides. West Sussex County Councillor Mrs Christine Field was unable to attend as she had a previous engagement in London. The Chairman explained what procedure would follow: Mrs Field was on the County Council Planning Committee which would address this application on 12 Jan 2010. Members of the public and the Parish Council could register to speak at County Hall for up to 5 minutes each. Mrs Field would be pleased to receive comments from anyone by email or through the Parish Office.
- 353.5 Mr David Goodger, 59 Appledore Gardens, began by saying that he fully supported the Oathall CC. However, he felt that the village did not need a floodlit sports pitch and he expressed objections for the following reasons:
- This was the third such application in 10 years; those of 1999/2000 and 2001/2002 had both gone to appeal, with the first appeal of March 2000 clearly establishing that the proposal was inappropriate.
 - The pitch area was dark at night, it was an amenity of significant value and the objective lay in reaching a balance in any light pollution. Even an unlit pitch would be unacceptable for use all day Sundays and Bank Holidays. Most believed that the decision taken in 2002 was reasonable.
 - It was disappointing that this application was not going to proceed to MSDC as before; WSCC did not have adequate local knowledge and there had been confusion between these two bodies as to the need to alert residents to the application.
 - Additionally, he stated that this application would adversely affect the Scrase Valley, a nationally designated area of wildlife, including bats, and an area of woodland on the Natural England inventory.
 - The floodlighting of 8 stands, 50 feet high, would be clearly visible to many in Appledore Gardens and in particular in Pelham Road where the residents overlook the site directly; and also at the other end of the fields in Oathall Avenue and Penn Crescent. The proposal was unlike others in West Sussex, such as at The Triangle and St Paul's College in Burgess Hill and Downland in Hassocks, which lay on the urban fringes and impacted on few. Here in Oathall letters had been sent to 475 households so the difference in scale was significant.
 - Five mature oaks would need to be felled and the replanting would take 20 years to mature. There would be little screening in winter.
 - There would be local traffic congestion and inadequate access for emergency vehicles.
 - The use of the pitch 70 hours a week throughout the year would be intolerable. It had been suggested that it would be unlikely for spectators to attend for football and hockey and yet there was to be an area provided for up to 100.
 - There were concerns that vandalism, which had been suffered in the Pelham Road garage block, would increase.

In sum, the vast majority objected very strongly and he asked the committee to support their position and make appropriate representations to WSCC.

- 353.6 Mrs Susan Elford, of 27A Pelham Road, said that she had been resident for 19 years in the road. She stated that there was an issue of noise and she was concerned that the report was not accurate in this regard as it was based on 6 players shouting at one time leading to a maximum figure of 43 decibels (dB); the report identified moderate annoyance at a level of 50dB and serious annoyance at 55dB, leading to the conclusion that there would be no noise disruption to residents on match days. However, this took no account of spectator noise when 20 or 30 might be shouting and a more realistic noise report should be made. She was concerned as to what measures would be available to ensure the noise was not unreasonable. Such facility would be better placed in Haywards Heath away from properties.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

There were adult education classes in the CC already and it was not fair or acceptable (to have football) every evening.

- 353.7 Mr Ian Sinclair, resident of Oathall Avenue, declared that the starting point must be 'tranquillity'. His concerns were that:
- § Constant noise would destroy the peace; individual voices could already be heard through double-glazed windows.
 - § The proposal would destroy the uninterrupted, park-like views of trees which were to be felled. There was no screening proposed at the Oathall Avenue end whilst that proposed for the Scrase Valley would take 15 to 20 years to mature.
 - § Twilight/dark conditions were needed for birds and bats; the (pitch) noise would drown out birdsong. The proposal would destroy the habitat of the Nature Reserve.
 - § The report had ignored the allotment holders who sought to tend in peace.
 - § At least 25 homes were directly impacted, including elderly in Penn Crescent.
- In short, if Oathall were a community college, it should put the immediate community first.
- 353.8 Mr Neil Kerslake, resident of Old School Court, added that planning applications must be decided according to planning policies: floodlighting breaches Policies B3, B24, R1 and R5. The impact on darkness and quiet enjoyment would be a straight breach of PPG17. There would also be a breach on noise. Clearly planning policies were all that mattered and the need for clubs or the generation of revenue were not planning considerations. People needed to understand the legal aspect, as objections on grounds other than planning considerations were likely to be disregarded by the Planning Inspector in the event of the application going to appeal.
- 353.9 Mrs Kim Blumberg added that noise and light in the evenings would interfere with the sleep of small children: to have activities 5 days per week until 9.30 pm would be just too much.
- 353.10 Mr Rod Haw, first speaker for the application, had been a resident for 40 years and was a governor of Oathall CC. He said that the community had been invited to the school (to see the proposals) and a number of surveys had been conducted, specifically on floodlighting, noise and bats. There had been a very thorough examination. The pitch was now nearer to the school and turned around. There would be a one metre bund around two-thirds of it, surrounded by trees 15 to 20 feet high when planted, which would mean that they would mature in far less than 15 to 20 years. The survey had been conducted at the Authority's expense. The very latest floodlighting would be used, down directed onto the pitch and from which light spillage would be minimal. In response to Mr Kerslake's points, he said that they had been guided by the WSCC planners and made aware of the regulations and would comply.
- 353.11 Mrs Jill Wilson, Head Teacher at Oathall CC, said she must speak for the needs of young people. She made the following points:
- § The provision of an all weather pitch would meet the students' needs as they were disadvantaged by the current, poor facilities, assessed as barely satisfactory by Ofsted.
 - § The PE staff did their best despite the poor facilities which compared unfavourably with other schools.
 - § The current clay pitches were waterlogged in winter and there were limited indoor facilities.
 - § There was huge enthusiasm by parents and the new facility would make a huge difference to the curriculum.
 - § Full funding would be provided by WSCC, an offer that might not be repeated.
 - § Currently, there was a requirement for 2 hours per week of PE for all students, which the staff were struggling to achieve because of the limited facilities.
 - § By 2012, every child should have access to 5 hours per week, in part to address the issue of obesity; 2 hours should be in school and 3 on site or in the community.
 - § The new facility would be one of which young people and parents could be proud. It would provide out-of-hours training, as well as supporting the community and healthy living and providing enjoyment.
 - § The application would help prevent the 'we have nothing to do' syndrome.
- In sum, Mrs Wilson urged the Council to support the application.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

353.12 Members then gave their views:

- § Cllr Gomme declared a slight personal interest because he was Honorary Chairman of the Scrase Valley monitoring group. He was concerned about bats; they were probably better protected than any other species in the country. He was astounded that floodlighting was proposed adjacent to a known habitat. He said that the Council had had great difficulty in getting the plans, hence these deliberations were late. He felt that the County Council, being based in Chichester, was not well informed (about issues local to Lindfield) and he was disappointed that no one from WSCC was present to explain the proposals. He felt he could not support the application.
- § Cllr Blunden felt that it was a very difficult decision as he had a lot of sympathy for Oathall CC, which was a first-class school with a record to be proud of in looking after the young, our future. He supported the College in acquiring an all-weather pitch, but could not support the lighting imposition on neighbours.
- § Cllr Upton also had sympathy with the school, but could not support the application because of the lighting.
- § Cllr Hersey said that this was a good idea in the wrong place. She had sympathy with Oathall CC, but it was located right in the middle of a residential area. There was a policy on light pollution and additionally there were the matters of noise and car parking. It was in the wrong place and she could not support it.
- § Cllr Nicolle said she had all sympathy with the school and its education, but she was regretfully aware that the policies conflicted with what WSCC was proposing. Mr Kerslake had pointed out where the conflicts lay. Whilst there had been advances in the lighting in the past ten years, it was the noise factor that concerned her.
- § Cllr. Leach stated that he could not support the application.
- § As Chair of the Healthy Mid Sussex Partnership, Cllr Snowling said he was particularly moved by the points of Mrs Wilson, on the needs for young people and for more exercise. He said the difficulty lay in reconciling the two separate causes when dealing with the plan. The plan does not meet the doubts he had. He had to accept that, although there is a need, the case had not been made for this particular position; it had not been shown that there would not be problems. There was the further issue, as before, of traffic, which he doubted would be lessened in any way. The traffic had not been inconsiderable in the past; it was an old problem. If it adversely affected many, the application must show that it would ameliorate the situation; it does not.
- § The Chairman proposed that the Committee advise WSCC that the Council was unable to support this application because of its likely impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents with regard to: light pollution; noise; and increased traffic on the narrow residential roads. The motion was seconded by Cllr Hersey and SUPPORTED unanimously. It was AGREED that the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the P&T Committee should liaise with the Deputy Parish Clerk to compile a detailed response.

RESPONSE AS SUBMITTED: "The application generated a great deal of interest and concern from Lindfield residents, in particular those in Pelham Road and Appledore Gardens which lie to the east and in the immediate vicinity of Oathall Community College. Residents from Haywards Heath also expressed concern for the impact of the proposals on people living in Penn Crescent and Oathall Avenue to the south.

The Parish Council Planning and Traffic Committee were unanimous in voicing very strong objections to this application. In detail, their concerns are as follows:

- a. There was recognition of the high quality of education provided by Oathall Community College, but they had no support for this application which, with its floodlighting, would have attendant issues of noise, light pollution and traffic congestion for neighbouring properties at unsocial times of weekdays and at weekends.
- b. There was concern for the potential loss of tranquillity in the heart of a residential area; the application would breach advice and principles relating to, for example, nature conservation, light pollution and noise as expressed in PPG17. Additionally, disbelief was expressed at the unrealistic noise report which was based on only 6 players shouting during matches and no account was taken of spectator noise.
- c. Floodlighting breaches Mid Sussex Local Plan Policies B3, B24, R1 and R5; such light pollution could have a significant impact not only on residents, but also on wildlife, including birds and bats in the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

abutting Scrase Valley Nature Reserve. The Committee were not convinced that advances in floodlighting since 2002 would ameliorate their concerns about such pollution.

d. There would be the loss of visual amenity currently afforded by mature trees in a park-like setting which would need felling to accommodate these proposals.

e. This is the third very similar application, on this occasion the pitch being re-orientated, but this change does not address the concerns expressed on previous occasions. In particular, the appeal of March 2000, against the refusal by MSDC of application HH/248/98, clearly established that such a development would be inappropriate. Whilst it would provide a recreational facility of benefit to the area, the Inspector did not consider that this would outweigh the harm it would cause to the living conditions of residents. The second application, HH/01/0095/FUL, sought to introduce a pitch but without floodlighting; this was also rejected by the Parish Council on grounds of noise. Nothing in the latest application has dissuaded the Parish Council that the issues of noise and light pollution have been adequately addressed or their impact ameliorated.

f. The merits of the application could be realised better at another site where there might be marginal impact on residents. Indeed, other sites in Haywards Heath and Burgess Hill already exist or are proposed.

In sum, the Lindfield Parish Council objects most strongly to this application for a floodlit, synthetic turf pitch at Oathall Community College on the grounds of noise, light pollution and traffic congestion."

353.13 43 members of the public left at this point; 18 remained.

354. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION

354.1 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.

354.2 09/3000/FUL – OAKWOOD, ROUNDWOOD LANE
INSTALLATION OF (UP TO) 3 METRE HIGH ACOUSTIC FENCING. THIS TO BE INSTALLED
BEHIND/ATTACHED TO EXISTING 1.8 METRE FEATHERBOARD FENCING ON THE NORTH AND
EAST BOUNDARIES, AND TO ADDITIONAL 1.8 METRE FEATHERBOARD FENCING TO THE
SOUTH. AMENDED BLOCK PLAN RECEIVED 19.10.09 SHOWING REVISED LOCATION OF
FENCING AND AMENDED ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ALSO RECEIVED (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

Mr Derrick Caswell, of 31 Portsmouth Wood Close which lies opposite the applicant's property, said that the application was complicated by a number of emails between the applicant, MSDC and himself and he sought clarification as to whether the acoustic fencing was to be affixed inside or outside the existing fencing, on 3 and a half sides or also on the western boundary. What was clear to him was that it would be 63 metres long and 3 metres high on High Beech Lane. He said that traffic noise affects all residents on this road; why should a precedent be set for one. Indeed, use of this acoustic fencing may increase the noise levels for neighbours due to reflection back.

Mr Derek Aitken, the applicant, said that the Council should support this application because it is better than the alternative. He said that he could fix acoustic panelling to the existing fencing. The effect sought could be achieved in two ways: through additional height; or through thickness of the panelling. It would be very expensive to fix on the inside because of the restricted space and the fence posts. He said that he did not want to breach any planning rules and the plan to have a fence slightly higher did not mean 3 metres but up to 3 metres.

Cllrs Blunden and Upton said that it was inappropriate in that part of the village, in an area of Townscape Character.

At this point, the Deputy Clerk, who had that day spoken to the Planning Officer, offered to clarify the position. He said that no planning permission was required if the applicant sought to attach acoustic fencing to the existing fence, either on the inside or the outside, provided it did not exceed 1.8 metres,

ie, the existing height of the fence. However, if he sought to increase the height, he needed planning permission; hence the current application.

Cllr Snowling said that the objections could be dealt with by way of an amendment, but this was not for the Parish Council to suggest: if so minded, the Applicant would have to refer any amendments to MSDC.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We feel we cannot support this application as we feel a 3-metre high fence would have a detrimental effect on the street scene. It is in an area of Townscape Character and is one of the gateways into the village. It is contrary to Policy B16 which states proposals should 'retain trees, frontage hedgerows and walls which contribute to the character appearance of the area'."

354.3 09/03083/FUL - 14 OAK BANK
PROPOSED DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE (AMENDED PLAN) (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

Mrs Tugwell, speaking on behalf of the immediate neighbour of the applicant at 12 Oak Bank and other residents, had written to complain that the double garage and fuel store would be clearly visible from their property and in front of the building line. She called upon the Committee to reject it.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, urged caution on behalf of the community in deploying forces against the application; he had been surprised at the response on the last occasion. The individual design is very appropriate and quite concealed behind a hedge and had been improved since the last application.

Cllr Gomme said that it had been reduced in height and moved one metre further from the property boundary. Cllr Upton said that it would be visible from No 12, whilst Cllr Blunden said that there was insufficient difference from the last application for him to change his views.

AGREED RESPONSE: "When we considered 09/2193/FUL, our view was: 'Whilst we sympathise with the applicant's wish to provide this garaging accommodation, we cannot support this application, in that it would have an overpowering effect on the visual amenities of No 12. The whole of the new garage would be well in front of the front of No 12 and would create a closed-in effect on that side of the front garden of No 12.' We feel that there is insufficient difference in this application to the last and therefore cannot support it for the same reasons. Additionally, it would have a detrimental effect on the street scene with its Turner style houses."

354.4 09/03236/FUL – 5 PORTSMOUTH WOOD CLOSE
ANTENNA INSTALLATION: ROOF TOP INSTALLATION OF A THREE ELEMENT STEEPIR YAGI
ANTENNA FOR THE TRANSMISSION AND RECEPTION OF LICENSED AMATEUR RADIO SIGNALS
(Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

Mrs Viv Hodgson, 3 Portsmouth Wood Close, was the immediate neighbour of the applicant; she offered the Committee photographs to view and made the following points:

- § Her house lay very close to the applicant's, particularly at the front where they shared a driveway.
- § PPG guidance indicated that visual intrusion was an important consideration and this proposal would result in such intrusion to her property as the equipment would be clearly visible from her garden, driveway and house, as well as from the streets at the front and to the rear; and hence it would be detrimental to family life.
- § The applicant's statement about the effect on property values was an admission that the visual amenity of the neighbourhood would be severely affected; the public interest should be protected.
- § PPG8 was aimed at the communications industry as a whole: she felt the applicant should provide evidence for the need for the development as he seemed to have adequate equipment already.
- § There were a number of fundamental errors in the application: one of the plans omitted a property altogether (No 7); two of the plans failed to show the shared driveway; and the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

applicant had failed to show, in the Design Statement, the height of the mast on which the transmitter would be mounted, a crucial feature.

- § As a result, the MSDC Planning Officer who visited the property in April would not have understood the full visual impact of the proposals.
- § The applicant had ignored the advice of this Officer, and the guidance in PPG8, to consult neighbours and other interested parties such as English Nature, English Heritage and the Highways Authority. PPG8 also strongly encouraged authorities to undertake additional publicity to give residents and businesses an opportunity to comment.
- § Because of preserved trees, there was a lot of wildlife, including bats, and the Bat Conservation Trust had suggested the Local Authority should be asked to undertake a bat survey.
- § The proposed equipment was extremely powerful with a rating of 3000 watts, although the applicant indicated that the transmission limit in the UK was currently 400 watts. The overall dimensions would be 10.97 metres long and 4.87 metres wide, with a turning circle that would result in an overhang from the roof of 2 metres beyond the gutterings and towards her shared drive. The proposal was unsuitable for a residential area.
- § There would be issues of noise when the motor was running which could be at any time, day or night, as the applicant sought to communicate worldwide. Such noise could impact directly on her son whose bedroom was at the front of the house.
- § The manufacturer of the equipment indicated that the aerial could have problems interfering with other antennas, power lines and household wiring.
- § Ofcom regulate radio transmissions not least because there may be risk to life if interference were caused to communication systems of the emergency services. She said that Ofcom had confirmed that, were the equipment to be used at full power, it would affect electrical equipment in neighbouring properties and could interfere with Air Traffic Control. She said that she already experienced problems with TV reception and adequate broadband.

In sum, Mrs Hodgson urged the Committee to make the strongest possible recommendation to Mid Sussex District Council to reject the application.

Mr Damsell, of 1 Portsmouth Wood Close whose property faces that of the applicant, made points similar to those expressed by Mrs Hodgson. For example, he said that this was no ordinary aerial; the antenna was 16 by 6 ft, ie, a maximum overall of 32 ft which could be rotated 360 degrees by a motor. All properties were detached but in close proximity. He said that the applicant claimed that trees would screen the equipment but he offered a photograph to show that that was not the case. He had consulted estate agents who confirmed that granting permission for this aerial would devalue all properties in the Close. In a high wind there would be issues of safety; noise and Health & Safety with respect to electromagnetic signals on public health. He said that amateur radio masts are a public nuisance which could affect the internet, radio reception and central locking on cars. There would be no going back if the application were allowed.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that he would support all that had been said. In his view, the key point was that the aerial would in no way be concealed and would be particularly visible on the skyline with the street scene adversely affected. A plan view in the application with shadowing gave a false impression of the footprint of the equipment. When the aerial was at right angles to the roofline there would be a substantial overhang. Should MSDC grant permission, there should be conditions placed as regards height and the equipment should be parked parallel to the roof ridge when not in use. In accordance with PPG8, it should be removed when operation ceased. And to allay fears of neighbours, conditions should be placed on the limits of power usage. He accepted Mrs Hodgson's points about flaws in the plans and said that the application should therefore be rejected.

Members then gave their views:

- § Cllr Snowling said that he was unsure as to how conditions could be enforced. This was the intrusion of an alien device into the neighbourhood which would affect properties and the street scene. The Committee were unable to comment on the technical issues but were nevertheless concerned about usage. He said that it was intriguing why the applicant had applied for something that he was not going to use, the power potential; this was worrying.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- § Cllr Gomme said that the Committee should consider the LPS point that, should approval be given, conditions should be placed upon its use, eg, time limits, maximum power, removal when not in use.
- § Cllr Nicolle said that she would prefer the Committee's comments to be much stronger on the visual impact of the equipment and she was opposed to the application.
- § Cllr Blunden stated that the response should not imply that the Council was prepared to concede that permission could be granted with conditions, as there were strong objections to the proposal.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We object to this application on the grounds of its obtrusive nature. We note that the applicant has apparently not followed either the advice of the District Council Officer given in April 2009 or the guidance contained in PPG8, to consult the neighbours and the Parish Council, and interest groups such as English Nature.

We have specific, legitimate concerns relating to:

- a. The impact of the antenna on the visual amenity of the street scene as its height and dimensions would dominate, with considerable overhang when the aerial is rotated at right angles to the roof line. There is little if any screening provided by the deciduous trees on the property and in the street.
- b. The size of the aerial would not be appropriate in a domestic setting and at odds with the philosophy of PPG8, which is aimed at the telecommunications industry.
- c. The properties in Portsmouth Wood Close are detached and open plan at the front, but there would be a particular impact on adjacent houses because of their proximity; by way of example, there is a shared driveway with No 3.
- d. The equipment proposed has a power rating of 3000 watts and yet in the UK transmission power is limited to 400 watts. We therefore consider there is a potential for interference by the operation of the antenna with neighbours' electronic equipment, including domestic broadband reception and in parked vehicles.
- e. The impact of noise expected on neighbours when the antenna motor is in operation.
- f. The impact on wildlife in the immediate vicinity, including bats.

Additionally, we believe there are a number of errors in some plan drawings: for example, the omission of the shared driveway with No 3; and, in the Design Statement, the failure to show the height of the mast on which the applicant proposes to mount the antenna is crucial. In sum, we cannot support this application."

- 354.5 09/03077/TREE – LAND AT THE WELKIN
SWEET CHESTNUT (T149) - LIFT CANOPY BY 1.5 METRES AND REDUCE LOWER LATERALS BY
UP TO 3 METRES. GROUP OF 6 BEECH (G147) - LIFT CANOPIES BY UP TO 2 METRES.
AMENDED DESCRIPTION (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 354.6 08/00796/FUL – CROWHURST, 23 HIGH STREET
TWO-STOREY EXTENSION, KITCHEN AND BEDROOM. IDENTICAL TO EXTENSION APPROVED IN
AUGUST 2001, REFERENCE LF/01/1381/FUL (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection, subject to materials matching existing."

- 354.7 09/03062/FUL – 17 BY SUNTE
TWO-STOREY EXTENSION OVER GARAGE (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection as long as matching materials used, that exist."

- 354.8 09/3133/TCA – 141 & 143 HIGH STREET
CONIFERS (A AND B) - REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2 METRES. CONIFER (C) - TRIM BACK ON
SOUTHERN SIDE BY 0.5 METRES. BEECH - TRIM BACK CANOPY ON SOUTHERN SIDE BY 1
METRE (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

354.9 09/03203/LDC – 21 BACKWOODS LANE
FORMATION OF ROOM IN ROOF SPACE WITH REAR DORMER AND ROOF ALTERATION. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS LAWFUL: THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS OF THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT (Cllrs Snowling and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: "‘No comment’ as this is a request for a certificate of lawfulness for the proposed development. There are no reasons for legal valid objections."

354.10 09/03226/TCA – SUMMERS REACH, SCHOOL LANE
PLANE – LIFT CANOPY BY APPROXIMATELY 1.5 METRES. SYCAMORE – FELL (Cllrs Snowling and Gomme)

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

354.11 09/03281/TREE – 3 PORTSMOUTH WOOD CLOSE
OAK (T20) – REDUCE HIGHER LATERAL BRANCHES BY UP TO 3 METRES. SYCAMORE (T19) – FELL (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

355. REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

355.1 The list had been circulated. NOTED:

- 09/02926/FUL and 09/02927/LBC - 53A High Street. The Deputy Clerk advised that the MSDC Planning Officer, Mrs Sarah Guess, had written to the applicant to invite them to add the side window to the current application; that application would therefore be on hold pending such action.
- 09/02299/FUL - 59 Meadow Lane. The Parish Council had objected to this application for retention of decking to the rear of the property, but MSDC had granted permission with three conditions.
- 09/02477/FUL - 9 Francis Road. The Parish Council had objected to this application for a new ground floor extension/porch and new roof, but MSDC had approved it with two conditions.
- 09/02759/FUL - Lindfield Cricket Ground. The Parish Council had objected to this application for two all weather cricket nets et al on the Common, but MSDC had granted, at the Central Area Planning Committee meeting held on 29 October, permission with four conditions.

356. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

356.1 There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 9.29pm.