

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 8 February 2010 at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman and Chairman for this meeting)
Mr W Blunden
Mrs M Hersey
Mr M Leach
Mrs V Upton
Mr S Willcox

Also Present: MSDC Cllr A Lea
Cllr J Dumbleton, Chairman Lindfield Rural Parish Council
4 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

383. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

384. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

384.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Nicolle and Snowling and the reasons accepted.

385. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

385.1 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.

386. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

386.1 Mr Neil Kerslake raised a number of points:

- § He reiterated the point he had made before relating to Mr Roger Harper's letter (WSCC) and the Route Speed Management Scheme on the B2111/B2028 and repeated the need for analyses as a great deal of money had been spent.
- § He stressed that the signage poles in the Conservation Area should be black; there was no dispute as the Parish Council (PC) had had a commitment from Mr Harper's predecessor.
- § Regarding the mini roundabout at Post Office corner, he said that when the PC withdrew its support, WSCC indicated that such a decision was too late and the project would proceed, as it formed part of the Newton Road development; but there would not be a zebra crossing. However, when MSDC approved the revised Newton Road development (LF/08/02903/FUL), a zebra was shown and that feature was in no doubt. Although Mr Harper had said that Lindfield cannot have a zebra, when Barratts settle this with MSDC, he believed neither WSCC nor the PC should pay. WSCC Highways must consult with the PC to ensure the softest option for the Conservation Area, for example, black poles and York stone.
- § He said that the continued siting of a temporary classroom at Blackthorns County Primary School had been slipped in without the Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) being aware; they could not therefore offer a view. WSCC should follow process as MSDC were obliged to and the application should be advertised through the PC.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

386.2 Mr John Jesson, LPS, adding to Mr Kerslake's comments, confirmed that Lewes Road was included within the Conservation Area with respect to signage. He also confirmed that he was unaware of the Blackthorns School application. He congratulated the PC on the robust email sent to MSDC/WSCC relating to the incident of abuse by a contractor serving the Newton Road site on 3 February.

387 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 19 JANUARY 2010

387.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 19 January 2010. It was AGREED to APPROVE the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

388.1 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.

388.2 10/00078/FUL – 7 EASTERN ROAD
PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND SINGLE REAR EXTENSION (Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

Mr Jesson, LPS, said that this was an example of an imaginatively designed extension, an application that he found commendable.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection with the stipulation that matching materials are used."

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

389.1 The list had been circulated. NOTED:

§ That the applications 09/02926/FUL and 09/02927/LBC relating to replacement of the front window at 53a High Street (Mansell McTaggart), to which the PC had had no objections, had been approved; the Appeal against refusal of an earlier application, 09/00774/FUL, was ongoing. The issue of the plate-glass window in the right hand flank remained outstanding and the Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to follow this matter up with MSDC.

§ Re 09/03618/LBC and 09/03678/FUL: on 22 December the PC had supported the FUL application for external works to the shop at 99 High Street but had been unable to support the element of the LBC relating to internal alterations. MSDC had now granted consent for both applications with a proviso about the internal timbers.

§ Re 09/03662/FUL: on 22 December, the PC had objected to this proposal for an extension at 32 Denmans Lane; MSDC had since refused the application.

§ Re 09/03753/LBC: on 19 January, the PC had raised no objections to the application at Froyls, 125 High Street. However, amended plans received by MSDC on 11 January and not copied to the PC had removed external works on a Crittall window in toto. The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to write to MSDC to determine why the PC had not received the amended plans for examination.

§ Re 09/03763/TCA: on 19 January, the Committee had been concerned that the application to fell a silver birch had already been determined on 15 January and had asked the Deputy Clerk to write to Mr David Saunders, the MSDC Tree and Landscape Officer, to find out why. In his reply of 1 February, Mr Saunders had indicated that the period for determining a Notice of Intent was only 6 weeks and that deadline occurred on 20 January, which did not allow sufficient time for him to take action had he awaited the PC's response.

§ The Council had been notified of an Appeal (APP/D3830/A/10/2121264/WF), with a start date of 27 January 2010, against the refusal by MSDC to approve 09/01761/FUL, application for a 2-bedroom, single-storey house at 107 High Street, being a resubmission of 08/02665/FUL. The PC had

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

objected to the application. The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to write to the Planning Inspector with a copy of the PC's response to the 2009 application.

- § The PC had received a copy of a new Tree Preservation Order, MSDC (Lindfield No 1) 2010, relating to four trees at The Witch public house, the period of consultation for which would end on 18 February.

390. WSCC/009/10/LF: PLANNING APPLICATION FOR THE CONTINUED SITING AND USE OF A TEMPORARY CLASSROOM UNIT AT BLACKTHORNS COUNTY PRIMARY SCHOOL

390.1 The Chairman said that the Council had received a consultation paper from Mr Mike Vine at WSCC and he believed that the classroom was in good repair and noted that it would be retained only as long as there was the need. Cllr Blunden said that he had no objection to retention and all Members agreed.

390.2 AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection to retention."

391. NEWTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT

391.1 The Deputy Clerk updated the Committee on activity relating to the Newton Road development:

§ After the last Committee meeting on 19 January, he had written to MSDC to voice the concerns of the PC and the Lindfield community about the need for the developer, Barratts, to abide by the Conditions.

§ MSDC had served a Temporary Stop Notice on the developer on 3 February, which would last 28 days.

§ The PC awaited a revised consultation Construction Management Plan which would address the routing of construction traffic to the site.

§ Barratts had written to the Chief Executive of MSDC, Mr John Jory, to ask him to facilitate a meeting between the DC and the developer. The meeting was expected to be held within two weeks.

§ In the meantime, on 12 February, the Deputy Clerk would attend a meeting hosted by the Lindfield Action Group at which Mr Steve Ashdown, MSDC Officer responsible for oversight of the development, the LPS and two representatives of Barratts would be present.

§ The Deputy Clerk advised that a planning application, 10/00235/FUL, had been received proposing the re-profiling of Beggars Grove Field through use of spoil from the site. He said that retaining such spoil on site could reduce the number of lorry movements to and from the site by up to 2000. This matter would be dealt with at the next Planning and Traffic meeting on 2 March.

391.2 Members had the following comments:

Cllr Blunden said that the Parish Office should continue to keep a diary of incidents relating to the development; he had a particular concern about the early arrival of vehicles on site.

Cllr M Hersey said that she and Cllr Snowling had been on the phone repeatedly to get the Temporary Stop Notice (TSN) drafted but it needed to be correct in every respect otherwise Barratts lawyers could have had it thrown out. Her husband, Cllr C Hersey, had signed the TSN. She said that she had spoken to Mr Jory and it was likely that Mr Nick Rogers, Head of Planning, would set up a meeting with Barratts which would include the three MSDC Councillors and WSCC Cllr Mrs Field. She said that they did not wish a recurrence of the situation at the Barratts development at Mackie Avenue in Hassocks. Cllr Blunden concurred.

392. APPLICATION FOR INERT LANDFILL AT FRESHFIELD LANE BRICKWORKS

392.1 The Freshfield Action Group (FAG) had issued a flyer asking residents to support their objections to the recent inclusion of Freshfield Lane Brickworks (FLB) in a list of possible WSCC landfill sites. As such use could have an impact on Lindfield, the Chairman had invited the Chairman of the Lindfield Rural Parish Council, Cllr John Dumbleton, and Mrs Elaine Seear, who was active in the FAG, to address the meeting.

392.2 Mrs Seear said that the current proposal was for the possible use of FLB for inert waste. WSCC would not be responsible for collecting such waste and would, therefore, have no control over its routing. Such

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

waste could include demolition and construction rubbish and, for economy, contractors would be likely to take the shortest route, not necessarily the A275/Freshfield Lane. Shortcuts might include roads past Walstead School, and from Scaynes Hill, and via the Stones Cross junction; she was most concerned about the traffic issues. She said that the County Council might say that they would impose restrictions on routing, but the reality was that drivers could come from anywhere in the country. The FLB site was on a long list of sites but nevertheless it was on the list. She urged the Parish Council and as many residents as possible to write in with their objections.

392.3 Mr Jesson, LPS, noted that the capacity of the site was potentially 16 hectares, ten times the area within the red border described by Mrs Seear. FLB had permission to excavate more clay; once a waste licence had been obtained for inert then they could apply for non-inert later, when a traffic pattern had been established.

392.4 Cllr Dumbleton said that, as the deadline for comment was 12 February responses needed to reach WSCC very soon. Cllr Lea asked whether there were any other uses for the site; Mrs Seear indicated that the Planning Inspector felt that it should be restored, for example, as lakes in the AONB. Cllr Dumbleton said that there were also issues in the Conservation Area, for example, because of the war memorial at Danehill, large vehicles could not get around the corner there.

392.5 A discussion among Members then ensued:
Cllr Blunden said that the PC should send a letter to WSCC on similar lines to the last time. The Chairman read the letter which had been sent in 2001 (attached). Cllr Hersey said the Planning Inspector had spoken of low level restoration. At this point, Mrs Seear said that road safety had been the most important issue. Cllr Willcox asked whether there would be a difference in the volume of traffic, inert versus non-inert; Mrs Seear said there would be none and currently there were 50 movements per day for the brickworks. Cllr Willcox asked that in our response we should make more of the issue of deliveries from many directions and include the specific points made by the Planning Inspector. He was concerned at the real risk to children, walkers and horse riders on the surrounding roads. The Chairman said that the site was not fit to use and our response should reflect that. He had agreement from the Members for the Deputy Clerk to write to WSCC using the 2001 letter as a starting point. He asked that the draft be agreed with him before despatch.

393. TO CONSIDER A LETTER FROM COUNCILLOR NICOLLE REGARDING THE TSJWP

393.1 The matter relating to whether the Traffic Study Joint Working Party should be wound up had been deferred from the meeting held on 19 January as Cllr Nicolle had been absent. She was again unable to attend the meeting and the Deputy Clerk advised Members that she had spoken to him and indicated that she was willing to remain chair of the Working Party, but wished the Committee to give a rationale for the WP to continue its work now that the core issue of the mini roundabout at the Post Office corner had been resolved.

393.2 Cllr Blunden said that the WP had run its course after the mini roundabout decision: the Planning and Traffic Committee could in future address any traffic issues. All Members agreed. The Chairman thanked Cllr Nicolle for chairing the WP and asked that she formally wind it up.

393.3 Cllr Dumbleton and one member of the public left at this point; Cllr Lea and three members of the public remained.

394. RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE PLANNING & TRAFFIC COMMITTEE

394.1 Members examined the risk assessment dated 14 April 2009 and noted that there had been no changes from the previous year. They AGREED to endorse the document without amendment for a further 12 months.

395. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

395.1 There was no other business.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

This part of the meeting concluded at 8.52pm.

396. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

396.1 Mr Kerslake made a number of points:

- § With respect to the forecast meeting between Barratts and MSDC (to which the LPC were expected to be invited), he said that he was disappointed that Mr Jory had passed the matter to Mr Nick Rogers, since the developer would be used to dealing with district and county councils and would be very robust when dealing with parish councils. It would be wrong in his view to accept an open agenda and he believed that the P&T Chairman and Vice-Chairman should agree objectives for the meeting. Furthermore, it was important to decide who from the LPC would attend; the meeting could become unwieldy if too many came and it needed a few with clarity of thought and a strong personality. Indeed, he questioned why MSDC needed to attend and said that the MSDC Councillors, Mr and Mrs Hersey, should suffice, along with the P&T Chairman, Cllr Snowling, the Vice-Chairman, Cllr Gomme, and the Chairman of Council, Cllr Blunden, plus the Clerk.
- § Mr Kerslake said that the problem of the timing of TPO applications was not solved; he suggested that the P&T Committee or the Full Council gave the Chairman and/or the Vice-Chairman and/or one other Member of the P&T the authority to determine TCA applications.
- § With respect to 53a High Street, he said that it was now more than 6 months since the matter of the plate-glass window at the side had been an issue. MSDC had tried to include it within the last application and failed. MSDC had now approved that application but it was still necessary to take a firm line with Mansell McTaggart on this window.

396.2 Mr Jesson said that he agreed with the Committee's wish to thank Cllr Nicolle formally for her contributions to the TSJWP. He would also wish the Committee to acknowledge the contributions of the lay members.

396.3 Cllr Lea said that the Council should invite Barratts to the P&T Committee. He believed it was a good idea to keep a diary of incidents. Regarding the MSDC meeting with Barratts, he felt it was important to have a number of parish councillors present to show solidarity and that they should be orchestrated in what they said.

The meeting concluded at 9.01pm.