

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 18 August 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: WSCC Cllr C Field
MSDC Cllr C Hersey
8 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

311. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

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

312. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

312.1 Apologies were received from Cllr Willcox and the reason accepted.

313. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

313.1 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.

Cllr Gomme said that he would absent himself from the meeting during discussion of Item 6(i) - 09/02095/FUL, 38 Finches Park Road - as the applicant was a neighbour.

314. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

314.1 Mr Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, noted that the issue of the roundabout at the junction of Lewes Road and High Street was not on the agenda and he enquired when the Committee would address it. The Chairman said it would be considered at the next Full Meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee on 20 October when the pros and cons of the case would be examined and recommendations would then be made to the next Full Council meeting thereafter, on 12 November.

314.2 Mr Jesson stated that the risk of Site K being included in the District's Core Strategy was causing considerable concern in the Parish. Emails from Mrs Karin Milne, Clerk to Lindfield Rural Parish Council, had suggested collaboration to include the Preservation Society. This was an important initiative and he felt that it was necessary to get an indication of the position of the Parish Council to assist the residents of the village to make their views known to Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) and to inform the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Cllr M Hersey and Cllr Snowling are members for both the Rural and Urban Councils, whilst Cllr C Hersey is a member for Rural. Cllr Snowling was concerned lest Haywards Heath Town Council (HHTC) came to the conclusion that future housing development sites should be in the Villages around Haywards Heath rather than in the Town itself. Mr Jesson believed that Lindfield should adhere to the previous published ideas which affected it.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

There needed to be a tripartite arrangement of Preservation Society/Rural/Urban Parishes to address the matter calmly and forcefully. It would be some time before MSDC considered specific sites and the Chairman of Lindfield Parish Council should select representatives as it would be impracticable to have 9 and 12 cllrs respectively plus the Preservation Society to examine the issues.

314.3 Mr Kerslake said that the topic of red tarmac on roads for route speed management - West Sussex County Council having recently spent £100K locally - needed to be evaluated for its impact.

315. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 28 JULY 2009

315.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 28 July 2009. It was AGREED to APPROVE the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

316.1 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.

316.2 09/01747/FUL AND 09/02165/CON – STABLE LODGE, LEWES ROAD
PROPOSAL TO DEMOLISH OLD LODGE BUILDING AND CONSTRUCT TWO NEW SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS OVER 4 FLOORS INCLUDING AN “ECO BASEMENT” LEVEL AND ROOM IN THE ROOF (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach)

Mr Jesson stated that there had previously been an LBC application and it had been suggested then that both FUL and CON applications were more appropriate. These had now been received but their content could be regarded as so little different from the LBC application that precisely the same objections as had been raised before should now apply. Additionally the roof ridge was excessively high whilst the dormers would overlook the Common. There would be an adverse effect on Pelham House contrary to Policy B10. Further, the development would impact on access. He was concerned that the earlier (LBC) application had been with MSDC from the end of May and it had taken two months to validate. There had been no correspondence between MSDC and the applicant posted on the website and the late processing meant that objections had had to be repeated. Not many respondents would be aware that planning officers expected them to resubmit their comments. He felt the Parish Council's response should have been sent (by MSDC) to the previous objectors.

Mrs Batten wished to reiterate the comments she had made on the earlier application, which had appeared in the Minutes of the Committee meeting of 7 July.

Mr Robinson said that he had written to MSDC to object to the previous application but his letter had not appeared on the website. He said that the development would create a building 2 metres higher than Somerset Cottages and the height/width ratio was different from all adjacent properties. In the design description, the dormers gave the advantage of fine views to the south; conversely, the large windows would be visible from the Common.

Cllr Nicolle said that the Council's response should include mention of the height of the roof ridge and the dominance of the dormers, plus the setting. The Chairman took note of all the comments particularly with respect to the Listed Building and Policy B10.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We object on the following grounds:

- i. The access proposed would involve cutting through a wall which we understand is listed.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- ii. The impact of the proposed building would undoubtedly be adverse to the amenities of the neighbouring properties and to the enjoyment of users of the Common, not the least because of the height of the roof ridge and the dominance of the dormers which would overlook the Common.
- iii. The intensification of use of the private access would be detrimental to the amenities of the neighbouring properties.
- iv. The intensification of use of the access to the Common would be detrimental to the amenities of the properties abutting it.
- v. The intensification of use of the access to the Common would adversely affect the enjoyment of users of the Common.
- vi. The proposed development would be contrary to Policies B1, B12 and B13 in that it would neither enhance nor preserve the character of the Conservation Area.
- vii. The proposed development would be contrary to Policy B10 in that it would have an adverse affect on the Listed Building, Pelham House, in which curtilage it falls.

We note that the original 'Horse Gate' constructed of close-boarding has been replaced by a wrought-iron gate. Apparently planning permission has not been sought for the change."

316.3 09/02328/TREE – 24 FINCHES PARK ROAD
HORNBEAM (T5) – FELL (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

Mr Jesson said that there had been correspondence from MSDC. He accepted that the tree was diseased and would need to be felled in due course. However, he stated that it was not the view of the MSDC Tree Officer, Mr David Saunders, to cut it down. Mr Jesson felt that felling should be deferred until it was totally appropriate. Cllr Nicolle said that the decay was obvious and Cllr Leach agreed. The Chairman noted Mr Jesson's comments but the unanimous view of the Committee was for felling.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

316.4 09/02095/FUL – 38 FINCHES PARK ROAD
ERECTION OF A TIMBER PERGOLA (RETROSPECTIVE) (Cllrs Snowling and Leach).

Cllr Gomme absented himself from the Meeting for this item.

Cllrs Snowling and Leach stated that they could not have determined from the application that there would be likely to have been an inconvenience to the neighbours, Mr and Mrs Barker (at 63 Savill Road). Cllr Leach said that the Pergola could not be seen from 63 Savill Road because of a large hedge. However, it did have an effect which had created a problem for the neighbours in that it had caused reception of TV signals to deteriorate to the extent that the aerial had to be re-sited. The application was retrospective as it had been a surprise to the applicant that he needed planning permission at all. However, it was nearer to the boundary than he had thought. The conclusion of the Committee was that, on planning grounds, there would be no objection.

Mr Barker said that he had no problem with the Pergola at present but it had cost him money to change the position of his aerial.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We consider that if we had considered this application before the section of the Pergola nearest the boundary with 63 Savill Road was erected, we would have seen no objection to it. After it had been erected, the neighbours at 63 Savill Road found that the signals to their Sky Dish were interfered with to the extent that the dish had to be re-sited. The signals are now adequate. Thus, the Pergola does not now have an adverse effect on the signals to the Sky Dish. Accordingly, we cannot see any objection to the Pergola on planning grounds."

Cllr Gomme rejoined the meeting.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 316.5 09/02193/FUL – 14 OAK BANK
PROPOSED DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE (Cllrs Snowling and Leach).

Cllrs Snowling and Leach had been invited into the lounge of the neighbour at No 12 to view the proposed site out of their windows, from which the impact of the application was most apparent.

AGREED RESPONSE: "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."

- 316.6 09/02268/TREE – 8 DUKES ROAD
ASH (T1) – LIFT CANOPY BY 2 METRES. LIME (T2) – REDUCE LATERAL BRANCHES ON WESTERN SIDE BY UP TO 1.5 METRES. LIME (T3) – FELL (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 316.7 09/02322/TCA – REAR GARDEN OF 97 HIGH STREET
SILVER BIRCH – REDUCE BY 25% (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 316.8 09/02345/TREE – 41 COMPTON ROAD
BEECH (T13) – REDUCE OVERALL CANOPY BY 1 METRE AND THIN BY 20% (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 316.9 09/02387/TCA – 127 HIGH STREET
FELL ONE CONIFER (Cllrs Snowling and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "We support this application in that the tree acutely overhangs the neighbouring garden and appears to us to present the danger of collapse."

- 317 TO NOTE TREE PRESERVATION ORDER (TPO) 2009 (LINDFIELD No 2) IN SAVILL ROAD

The Committee raised no objections to the TPO. Accordingly, a response to MSDC was not required.

- 318 REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE

- 318.1 The list had been circulated. NOTED:

- 09/01761/FUL – 107 High Street: the Parish Council had objected to this application, which MSDC had now refused.

- 319 WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL – CONSULTATION ON PROPOSALS FOR WAITING RESTRICTIONS IN DENMANS LANE

The Deputy Clerk outlined the amended proposals for Denmans Lane: a section of the road on the south side, at the eastern end outside the cottages opposite the Parish office, had been proposed to be unrestricted at all times, replacing an earlier proposal that there be controlled timing restrictions and one disabled bay. The consultation period would close on 3 September.

Cllr Mrs Field (WSCC) and Cllr Blunden stated that this proposal was at odds with their understanding of the discussion at the County Local Committee.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

In an attempt to clarify the County Council position, the Chairman read extracts from an email from Mr Miles Davy, WSCC Infrastructure.

Cllr Blunden said it was a matter of road safety if vehicles parked at this point. Members of the Committee said that they were strongly opposed to the removal of the lines outside the cottages. Additionally, there remained some confusion as to the status of proposals west of the junction with Compton Road, up to the barrier in Denmans Lane.

Cllr Mrs Field agreed to pursue the issue with WSCC and report back to the Parish Council. The Chairman would then make a recommendation to the Full Council at the meeting on 27 August.

320 TO CONSIDER PLANNING TRAINING REQUIREMENTS FOR COUNCILLORS

Cllr Blunden had spoken to Cllr Dumbleton, Chairman of the Rural Parish Council, about the utility of having training. He felt it would be valuable to have training with members of both the Rural and Ardingly Parish Councils. Both he and Cllr Gomme had undertaken training in 2008 and felt such would be a benefit for all. The Chairman said he would ask for this to be arranged.

321 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

321.1 School Safety Zones.

The Chairman read out a letter which had been addressed to Cllr Mrs Field (WSCC) relating to School Safety Zones which were intended to improve safety for every school in the County. A speed of 20 mph would be advisory when lights were flashing. The WSCC sought a response by 9 September.

The Chairman thought that the WSCC would have been in touch with Parish Councils. The matter could not be discussed at this meeting but would be addressed at the next Planning & Traffic meeting on 7 September. In the interim, Mrs Field agreed to pursue the matter with the County Officer concerned and report back to the Committee.

321.2 TPOs. The Committee NOTED two further TPOs that had been received from MSDC: Lindfield No 3 in Brookway, Fieldway and Sunte Avenue, which had been issued on 6 August with a closing date for comments of 7 September; and Lindfield No 4 relating to 97 High Street, issued on 14 August with a closing date of 11 September.

This part of the meeting ended at 8.58pm

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

322 QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

Curtilage of Listed Buildings. Mr Jesson said that recently applications had proposed building on ground in the curtilage of a Listed Building. He was not aware of any formal process by which the curtilage of a Listed Building could be divided, although it could be put to a different use if divided. The matter was of interest to Lindfield given a number of large plots in this category. It would be an initiative for the Council and this Committee to pursue with a view to getting a policy agreed.

Curtilage: Definition. Mr Kerslake said that case law with planning inspectors had determined that the curtilage is what was the grounds of a Listed Building. It followed that it did not allow you to sub-divide in planning terms, but legally, for example, you could sell. The subject needed clarity.

The meeting concluded at 9.02pm.