

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee held on 29 September 2009 at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr C Snowling (Chairman)
Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman)
Mrs V Upton

Also Present: 6 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

330. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS.

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

331. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

331.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Blunden, Hersey, Leach and Willcox and the reasons accepted. Councillor Nicolle had advised that she would arrive late.

332. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

332.1 There were no declarations of interest expressed.

333. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 SEPTEMBER 2009

333.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 7 September 2009. It was AGREED to APPROVE the Minutes and the Chairman SIGNED the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

334.1 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.

334.2 09/02581/FUL – 102 THE WELKIN
SINGLE STOREY REAR AND FLANK EXTENSION (Cllrs Hersey and Upton).

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

334.3 09/02299/FUL – 59 MEADOW LANE
RETENTION OF DECKING TO REAR OF PROPERTY. (ADDITIONAL REAR ELEVATION RECEIVED
ON 02.09.09) (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

Mr J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, said that the last scheme in February had been refused by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) when there were concerns regarding the floor level (of the decking) and a lack of boundary privacy. The essence of the refusal was that the applicant could overlook the patio in the neighbour's garden at No 58 and also overlook their living room. Mr Jesson offered three photographs to assist the Committee in their examination. He urged the Committee to note that he could not see any satisfactory improvement over the previous application. The standard of the drawings by the applicant was poor and therefore it was not a satisfactory application. Mr Jesson said that the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

photographs underscored his concerns about the site and he felt that the comments from MSDC last time should stand.

Mr G S Dick, 58 Meadow Lane, asked how the Parish Council worked, as the Councillors who visited in February had offered 'no objection'. The Chairman said that that was a previous application and the Committee were examining the one on the table now. In conclusion, Mr Dick said that he supported all that Mr Jesson had said.

Mr N Kerslake said that anyone on the decking of average height would be head and shoulders above the fence. He believed that the applicant should have regard to their neighbours and that this application was grossly unneighbourly, that it decimated the neighbour's amenity and was awful with regard to privacy.

The Committee noted the previous refusal by MSDC, the reasons for refusal and comments on this occasion from the public and Councillors and would support a further refusal.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The proposal, by virtue of the floor level of the decking and the lack of suitable boundary/privacy screening, will result in an unacceptable loss of privacy and overlooking to the living/dining room accommodation and private patio area at the rear of No 58 Meadow Lane. This will have a significant impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent occupier so the application conflicts with Policies H9 and B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan and Policy DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan and we cannot support it."

334.4 09/02759/FUL – LINDFIELD CRICKET GROUND, BACKWOODS LANE
FORMATION OF 2 ALL WEATHER CRICKET NETS, REMOVABLE SECURITY FENCE AND
PLANTING. REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING 2 CONCRETE NET SURFACES WITH MODERN ALL
WEATHER SURFACES (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

Mr N Kerslake said that the application was a gross infringement of Policy B12 and it would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area. The permanent steel structure would be 3.2 metres high with steel mesh panels painted green. We would see a continuous ribbon of development as viewed from Old School Court. There was currently a natural break between the cricket pavilion and the tennis courts, except for the small tennis pavilion.

Mr J Jesson had some concerns. He was sympathetic to enhancing the facilities for young people but these should be set against erecting a structure on the Common. Whilst there might be a need for the nets, he questioned whether there was a need for the proposed structure. The previous application aired a security need for the surface to be protected from vandalism. Since then the extant area of artificial surface on the existing nets had shown no sign of vandalism. It would be interesting to hear from the Cricket Club whether a steel structure was really necessary. When the nets were not in use, the panels would be.

Mr Malcolm Page, the applicant on behalf of Lindfield Cricket Club, said that the original application (07/02553) had been approved (by MSDC) in 2008. He had been involved with Lindfield Cricket Club for 30 years and did not want to see anything significant in the boundary area. The Club was seeking an all weather surface that grass would not grow through. He was passionate about providing for the 200 children in the Cricket Club as there was no other current facility. The Club would not wish to spend an hour putting up temporary facilities.

Councillor Gomme said that there was permission for an extension on the side of the pavilion and that would not leave much room between the proposed nets and the extension, and the nets and the tennis club building on the other side. There would be a complete blanket on that side with high structures. Councillor Upton agreed with Councillor Gomme. The Committee agreed to accept the comments of its colleagues.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "We support the removal of the concrete areas, but cannot support the permanent structure of the nets as it would change the appearance of the Common area. The proposed structure would not preserve or enhance the character and appearance of Lindfield Common and would adversely affect the views of the Conservation Area, contrary to Policies B12 and B15."

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

335.1 The list had been circulated. NOTED:

- 09/02193/FUL – 14 Oak Bank. MSDC had REFUSED the application for a detached double garage on the grounds that its height would have had an adverse impact on the street scene including the area of Townscape Character, conflicting with Policies B1, B16 and H9. The Parish Council had not supported the application.

336. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

336.1 There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 8.23pm.