

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 16 June 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. Nicolle (part of the meeting)
Mrs. V. Upton

Also Present: 4 members of the public

In Attendance: Mrs. C. Irwin

287. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

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

287.2 The Chairman formally welcomed Councillor Mrs. Christine Field, the new County Councillor for Lindfield, to this Committee meeting, her first attendance at a meeting of Lindfield Parish Council.

288. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

288.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Willcox and Hersey and the reasons accepted. Councillor Nicolle had sent her apologies for her anticipated late arrival.

289. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

289.1 Councillor Upton declared a personal interest in Agenda item 9 as her husband was a Royal Mail employee.

290. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

290.1 Core Strategy. Mr. N. Kerlake stated that the Core Strategy was being considered by MSDC's Better Environment Committee that same evening and the Officers' recommendations were to go to the Full Council, although it was not clear whether this would be July, September or October. As MSDC had decided not to challenge the South East Regional Plan housing number of 17,000 for Mid Sussex and the Officers' draft gave a figure below that, Mr. Kerlake enquired as to when the public would be told how the shortfall would be met.

290.2 Ducks. Mr. N. Kerlake commented that it was common for wild birds to fall victim to various things. The Pond had been netted and as much as could be done had been done to prevent wildlife getting out. The suggestion from a member of the public that there should be duck warning signs in the vicinity of the Pond would add to the clutter and would not be effective as drivers did not see signs properly anyway. With reference to the further suggestion of reducing the speed limit to 20 mph, Mr. Kerlake remarked that with the line of parked cars outside the King Edward Hall and beyond, he would defy anyone to drive at a greater speed.

Mrs. S. Perry stated that her suggestions for signs and a reduced speed limit had not only been made on account of the ducks, although ducks had been killed in the road outside the White Horse Public House, but traffic calming measures were also needed for the sake of children and elderly people. She stated that residents were aware of the situation but that non residents driving through the Village did not.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

291. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 26 MAY 2009.

291.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 26 May 2009. It was AGREED to APPROVE the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

Councillor Nicolle joined the meeting during the course of this item.

292.1 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.

292.2 09/01621/FUL – 33 DUKES ROAD
SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS. (Cllrs. Snowling and Leach).

Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, stated that it was surprising that Dukes Road had not been designated an Area of Townscape Character: this cul-de-sac in particular was very pleasant. The Society had no objections in principle to the proposals and the materials were quite well specified, but it would have been helpful if the application had stated that the colours would match those of the existing building as well.

Mr. Wood, the Applicant, confirmed that the colour of the materials would match the original house exactly.

Members were satisfied that the work to be carried out would match the existing building.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection.

292.3 09/01490/TCA – ROSINGS, BLACK HILL
PINE - RAISE CANOPY TO 4M ABOVE GROUND AND CUT BACK BY 1.5M TO CLEAR BUILDING.
CONIFER - FELL. PEAR - REDUCE BY UP TO 2M. (Cllrs. Leach and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection.

292.4 09/01528/TREE - 5 DENMANS CLOSE
OAKS (T9, T10, T11) - REDUCE/RESHAPE BY 25% . (Cllrs. Leach and Snowling).

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) stated that this remarkable line of trees at the periphery of the playing field was a visual amenity. The reason for the proposed work appeared to be a fear that there might be loss of limbs due to the size of the trees, in which case the proposal was justifiable, however it had not been phrased thus in the application. There did not seem to be any loss of light and the trees did not appear to require reduction or thinning otherwise. Mr. Jesson recommended that no work should be undertaken before an arboricultural assessment of the health of the trees had been carried out to determine the risk.

Mr. N. Kerslake stated that these trees had been given statutory protection some years previously when the felling of some other trees in the vicinity could not be stopped and the remaining trees in the arc which were at risk. The proposal would seem to be a drastic reduction and would change the vista. Mr. Kerslake stated that the trees should not be touched without independent arboricultural advice.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Members noted the points made. Cllrs. Leach and Snowling stated that there was a great deal of foliage which was likely to block the light to the property, although safety did not appear to be the reason for the proposal.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection. We would suggest that the Trees and Landscape Officer be informed immediately prior to the work commencing.

292.5 09/01533/TREE - OAK TREES, ROUNDWOOD LANE
THREE OAK TREES. T1 AND T2 - REMOVE EPICORMIC GROWTH. T3 - REDUCE BACK CANOPY
ON SOUTHERN SIDE BY 2M TO BALANCE. (Cllrs. Leach and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: "We agree with the observations of the Trees and Landscape Officer and have no objections to the proposal.

292.6 09/01534/TCA - CHURCH CLOSE FRANCIS ROAD
SYCAMORE - REMOVE SECONDARY STEM. LIFT CANOPY TO 5-6M ABOVE GROUND. THIN
CANOPY BY 15% 19.06.09. (Cllrs. Leach and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: "We agree with the observations of the Trees and Landscape Officer and have no objections to the proposal.

292.7 09/01410/FUL – 54 SUNTE AVENUE
EXTENSION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (IN POSITION CURRENTLY OCCUPIED BY
GARAGE AND UTILITY ROOM). (Cllrs. Snowling and Leach).

Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, stated that although the application was fairly well specified, it did not state that the extension would match the existing building.

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

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

293. The list had been circulated. NOTED:

- 09/00775/LBC -the report regarding the side window at Mansell McTaggart was still awaited
- 09/01118/LBC - the District Council had approved the application for repainting Froyls, 125 High Street and had clearly specified the paint to be used.

294. PROPOSAL BY WSCC, IN RESPONSE TO A REQUEST FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC, FOR 2 DUCK WARNING SIGNS (600MM HIGH, USING EXISTING POSTS OR LAMP COLUMNS WHERE POSSIBLE) BEING PLACED ON THE B2028 CLOSE TO EACH END OF THE POND. SUGGESTION TO REDUCE SPEED LIMIT TO 20 MPH IN THE VICINITY OF THE POND.

294.1 The proposal to put up signs warning drivers that ducks might be in the road had come from WSCC following representations from Mrs. Perry of the White Horse. Mrs. Perry had also asked for the speed limit in this location to be reduced to 20 mph.

During discussion the following points were made:

- it was fairly rare for ducks to be run over and the ducks were more likely to be harmed by each other during the mating season.
- the previous year, 15 ducks had been drowned by drakes, causing remaining ducks to fly away.
- the Pond was maintained as a natural pond and unfortunately nature could be cruel
- netting had been put round the Pond where it was adjacent to the road to prevent wildlife getting out

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- there had been warning signs before the netting was put in and they had eventually been removed as being unnecessary and to reduce the clutter
- Noted: the petition signed by 60 people, requesting a 20 mph speed limit
- the few reported accidents did not justify reducing the speed limit to 20 mph, with the extra signage that would come with it
- parked cars outside King Edward Hall and The White Horse acted as natural traffic calming, however cones placed outside The White Horse had reduced the number of parked cars
- the School Crossing Patrol enabled children to cross the road safely at peak times
- a reduction of the speed limit generally would be welcome, but WSCC had on previous occasions indicated that introducing a 20 mph speed limit in Lindfield would not be feasible so it was unlikely to be implemented, particularly for short stretches of road, as it would require enforcement
- it was noted that the parked cars outside The White Horse made exiting the car park more difficult.

Whilst appreciating the concern for the safety of the ducks, Members AGREED not to support the proposal for warning signs. It was further AGREED that the matter of reducing the speed limit to 20 mph should be referred to the Traffic Study Joint Working Party.

295. ROYAL MAIL POLICY TO REPLACE THE BICYCLES USED BY POST DELIVERY PERSONNEL WITH VANS.

295. It was NOTED that Royal Mail's post delivery personnel would soon have to use vans instead of bicycles and it had been pointed out that vans would cause obstruction on roads such as Black Hill, as staff would leave the van and walk down the long driveways which previously they would have cycled along. Members considered this to be an unusual move at a time when walking and cycling was being encouraged and details of what was intended were needed before comments could be made.

296. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

296.1 Planning Application 09/00877/FUL – 13 The Glebe. The Chairman reported that an amended block plan had been received for this application which had been considered by the Committee on 14 April and for which no objections had been made, on the recommendations of Cllrs. Snowling and Hersey. The amended block plan showed additions to the neighbouring house at 32 Denmans Lane which came very close to the boundary and the proposed extension at 13 The Glebe would be very close, possibly resulting in overlooking and loss of amenity. Had the correct block plan been available when Cllrs. Hersey and Snowling had viewed the site, they would have visited the neighbour at 32 Denmans Lane. AGREED that the District Council should be informed that if the amended block plan had been available when this application was first considered, the Committee would have commented on the adverse impact of the proposal on the amenity of 32 Denmans Lane.

This part of the meeting ended at 8.45.

There followed a second period for questions / comments from members of the public.

Section 106 Agreements. Mr. J. Jesson encouraged the Parish Council to take an interest in what benefits were available to the Community through Section 106 agreements between the District Council and developers. Mr. Kerslake suggested that members of the public and the Parish Council should be able to obtain copies of such agreements under the Freedom of Information Act and that the Parish Council should endeavour to ensure that any projects funded by Section 106 agreements were of benefit to the Village and the implementation monitored

Ducks. Mr. Jesson commented that the low level netting might act as a barrier to prevent wildlife returning to the Pond, having escaped onto the footpath or road.

The meeting concluded at 8.53 p.m.