

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 28 July 2009 at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00p.m.

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

Also Present: MSDC Cllr C Hersey
10 members of the public

In Attendance: Mrs C Irwin, Mr P Hemsley

304. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

304.1 In the absence of the Chairman, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Gomme took the Chair. He welcomed those present and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

305. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

305.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Snowling and Willcox and the reasons accepted.

306. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

306.1 Councillor 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.

Councillor Hersey said that she would abstain from Item 5(i).- (09/01400/FUL, 36 High Street)

307. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 JULY 2009

307.1 The Chairman advised that Mr Jesson had pointed out that his comment at Minute 301.2 had been misinterpreted in the Minutes. After consideration, it was AGREED that this should be amended to read: "Mr. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, stated that Mr. Freeman was overseas and unable to attend. This did not indicate a lack of interest in this application. Mr. Jesson also requested the Committee take into account the conclusions of its discussion of the previous application, considering 104 High Street." The Minutes as amended were APPROVED and SIGNED by the Chairman as a true record of that meeting.

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

308.1 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.

308.2 09/01400/FUL – 36 HIGH STREET
3 BED SINGLE STOREY DWELLING (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 26.06.09) (Cllrs Nicolle, Leach, Blunden and Snowling).

Mr Wooden, acting on behalf of Masters & Son of Lewes Road, said that the Design and Access Statement stated that the development did not overlook any other property. However, this was not the case as the proposed building on its south side was within one metre of the windows of Masters. This should be the first reason for refusal. He said that there was no access to the site and it was for the Parish Council to decide if there would be a strain caused by off site parking. The front door of the proposed dwelling would be 40 metres from Lewes Road and there would be the need to consider highway safety. The property would be difficult to locate and access by the emergency services. The Design and Access Statement referred to a redundant plot and therefore assumed to be a brownfield site, yet the site was the rear garden of 36 High Street; therefore, the Statement was incorrect. Infill should be carefully controlled and new development should enhance the area; where it lay in the curtilage of an existing property, the existing character should be protected. It was also in a Conservation Area and should not compromise its special character. The proposed dwelling would have no rear garden and no site frontage. The building formed 60 to 70% of the plot and the boundaries would lie within one metre of it in places. There would be a need to service the site during construction.

Mr Kerslake referred to the proposal in relation to the Grade II Listed Buildings at 36 and 38 High Street. The site was in the curtilage of a Listed Building inasmuch as it was the former garden of that Listed Building. The proposal would lead to an extreme tightness of the site except for a small courtyard garden. There would be a reduction in the amenity outlook for 38, 36 and 34 High Street and a huge impact on 46 High Street. A Grade II Listed Building would look down on a modern bungalow. The proposal breached Policy B1 that seeks to demonstrate a sensitive approach by respecting the character of the locality and contributing to a sense of place. It was a tight site with no consideration to space. B10 was also breached as there was no regard to protecting the setting of a Listed Building. Finally, it would breach B12 as no attempt had been made to protect or enhance the special character of a Conservation Area or to safeguard the setting of Listed Buildings at 36 and 38. Recommend refusal.

Mr Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, added that the proposal was a gross overdevelopment of the site. To cite density as 37 dwellings per hectare was misleading and not the whole story, which is that, this bungalow would have a large footprint in relation to the site. The proposal failed policy B1, as it would not provide amenity for its own residents let alone the amenity of neighbouring properties. If approved, there would need to be a construction management plan for Lewes Road because, as there was no vehicular access, loads would have to be transported by crane.

Councillors Nicolle and Leach stated that no parking provision had been made for the cottages converted from the former bank building and that this had been relevant at the time, and yet that application had been approved. Councillors Nicolle and Leach had therefore doubted whether that alone was sufficient reason to reject the application; nevertheless there remained concern about parking and access. Councillor Leach had also visited the resident at 46 High Street. Councillors Nicolle and Leach had asked two other councillors to examine the site.

Councillor Gomme said that omissions in the drawings appeared to avoid some details. He stated that the application failed on a number of policies: B1 and B10, the latter as regards being in the curtilage of a Listed Building.

Councillor Blunden objected as it was a gross overdevelopment of the site. The access way to the site was only 4 feet wide and emergency vehicles would never get to it. He felt that nearby properties in Chaloner Road would be adversely affected.

Councillor Upton objected on similar grounds.

Councillor Snowling, in a note provided to Councillors, stated that inter alia it failed policy B12.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "We object strongly as this application is a gross overdevelopment of the site. Our objections focus on the following policies:

- i. B1: the proposal for a bungalow fails to demonstrate a sensitive approach to urban design and respect the character of the locality; it disregards the sense of place. Moreover, the size of the proposed dwelling would lead to overdevelopment, resulting in a very restricted site with a small courtyard garden.
- ii. B10: there is no regard to protecting the setting of a Listed Building, the site being within the former garden and hence curtilage of the Listed Building at 36 High Street.
- iii. B12: there appears to have been no regard to protecting the special character of the Conservation Area, nor to safeguarding the setting of the Grade II Listed Buildings at No 36 and 38. Moreover, the Design and Access Statement states 'existing hedgerows retained where practical'. This suggests that the existing hedge may be removed, in conflict with the policy of retention and this could adversely affect the amenities of residents at 46 High Street.
- iv. We would not agree with the statement in the Design and Access Statement that 'the proposed dwelling does not overlook any other property. It does not cause any loss of amenity to any adjoining owners'. Viewed from 46 High Street that would not appear to be the case.
- v. T5: access to the site is limited and will not permit motor vehicles to gain entry; hence, there would be greater pressure on on-street parking.

We have additional concerns: if the application were to be approved, there are significant issues of access, including for emergency vehicles, and we would expect a full construction and management plan to be submitted in due course as there could be considerable disruption to traffic flow on Lewes Road/High Street during construction."

308.3 09/01971/TREE – 24 FINCHES PARK ROAD
HORNBEAM (T10) – LIFT CANOPY BY 2 METRES (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

308.4 09/01996/TCA - THE BARN, HICKMANS LANE
SILVER BIRCH – REDUCE BY ONE THIRD (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

Mr. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, stated that he understood that this application was not being proceeded with.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Some pruning of the tree is necessary as there are some low branches and some branches causing loss of light to the house. However, one third reduction is too severe. Any work should be carefully supervised as the tree is of amenity value to the street scene. We understand that this application may have been withdrawn."

308.5 09/01790/FUL – 44 EASTERN ROAD
LOFT CONVERSION AND GABLE END ROOF EXTENSION (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objections, as long as matching materials are used."

308.6 09/01856/FUL – 52 NOAHS ARK LANE
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING FLAT ROOF PORCH AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW WITH PITCHED
ROOF (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

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

308.7 09/02071/FUL – 70 MEADOW LANE
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO PROVIDE IMPROVED KITCHEN AND DINING AREA AND
ADDITIONAL BEDROOM WITH FIRST FLOOR BATHROOM. TWO NEW SOLAR PANELS TO SOUTH

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

WEST ROOF. NEW FLAT ROOF OVER GARAGE/STORE WITH NEW ROOFLIGHT OVER (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objections, as long as matching materials used."

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

309.1 The list had been circulated. NOTED:

- 08/03520/FUL – 7 French Gardens: the Chairman was pleased to report that the Planning Inspector had supported the views of the Parish Council and had dismissed the appeal against a refusal to grant planning permission for the erection of a single storey extension to the side of the existing garage, alterations (including conversion of that garage to habitable accommodation). Appeal Decision Reference APP/D3830/A/09/2099633.

310. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

310.1 There was no further business.

The meeting concluded at 8.35pm.