

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **6 September 2011** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman and Chairman for this meeting)
Mr M Amor
Mr W Blunden
Mrs J Chatfield
Mr L Corp
Mrs M Hersey
Mr S Hodgson
Mrs V Upton

Also Present: WSCC Cllr Mrs C Field, MSDC Cllr Mr C Hersey and 3 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

45. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

46. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

46.1 Apologies were received from Mr Snowling and the reason accepted.

47. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

47.1 Cllr Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, when present at meetings of the Mid Sussex District Council's (MSDC's) Central Area Planning Committee (CAPC) 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.

48. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

48.1 Cllr Mrs Field said that there were a number of highways issues that she was examining with respect to the Primary School, including pot holes. She was endeavouring to get feedback on the standards of work of the new County Council contractor, Balfour Beatty, that had taken over from May Gurney.

48.2 Mr Neil Kerslake said that he had observations to make with respect to planning matters: first, at the micro level with regard to the draft District Local Plan; and second, at the national, macro level.

At the local level, he believed that the Draft Plan did not start with the basic facts. It should be approached by using a 5-year demography to work out the numbers of houses needed with one, two three, four bedrooms, etc. It should spell out the social housing policy, for example, if the DC would continue with the 30% figure or encourage housing associations to build more.

At the macro level, the Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation document should be examined with regard to how it fits in with draft development plans. The 'presumption of sustainable development' he felt would go ahead. Housing was the engine of economic growth: coal mining was the only function which was not sustainable development. He was unsure how the Framework fitted with the Local Plan as the former did not say that brownfield sites were a priority; consequently, there was now a free-for-all. The green belt, AONB and national parks were sacrosanct, but greenfield appeared to be

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

available to exploit. The DC he felt should be concerned about the draft Development Plan and there needed to be cohesion between the two documents.

49. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 16 AUGUST 2011

49.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 16 August 2011. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

50.1 For each application, the observations of the members who had specifically studied the plans were read out before any public comments and discussion by the Committee.

50.2 11/01278/FUL & 11/01279/LBC - RED LION, 60 HIGH STREET
INTERNAL ALTERATIONS (INCLUDING THE RELOCATION OF THE KITCHENS TO THE REAR OF
PROPERTY) AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS (INCLUDING NEW EXTRACTOR FLUE, THE
PROVISION OF A REAR YARD AND EXTERNAL COLDROOM). AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 26
JULY AND 9 AUGUST 2011 SHOWING IN PART CHANGES TO VENTILATION EXTRACTION
ARRANGEMENTS.

Cllr Blunden said that he endorsed the comments of Cllrs Hersey and Chatfield. Cllr Upton supported Cllr Blunden's views. Cllr Gomme said the re-routeing of fumes through the chimney was an improved solution, but he felt the Committee should emphasise in their response the height of the chimney vis-a-vis the rooflines of adjacent properties. The amendment was agreed.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Our comments are the same as made before, at the meeting held on 24 May 2011, except the earlier reference to the small chimney made at Para 2b is removed and text amended and relocated to Para 3, as follows (all changes to our earlier response are in **bold** below):

1. We cannot support these applications because reconfiguration and refurbishment, inside and out, are not in keeping with this historic Listed Building within the Conservation Area and hence we feel are at odds with Local Plan Policies B10 and B12 respectively.

2. In particular, it is unneighbourly that:

a. The increase in the number of covers, both inside and out, from 40 to 74 (an increase of 85%) is too great and leads to a larger kitchen with the need for increased extraction and hence noise, at odds with Policy B23. Further, **we continue to have significant concerns** about the ventilation and extraction resulting in smells over adjacent properties when the proposed vertical vent height, **even when utilising the small chimney**, is compared with the higher roof lines of these properties.

b. **[No longer applicable.]**

c. The Men's toilets would be visible in the upper bay window and, if there were the need for obscured glazing in this window which is specifically referred to in the LB description, it would be a significant change to the external appearance of a feature hung with mathematical tiles in the Conservation Area. Additionally, there are concerns that these public toilets are located on the first floor close to the residents' kitchen which lies between them and the top of the only stairwell exit. Consequently, we believe the matter of providing for a separate, public fire escape needs further examination.

d. Lack of car parking - retaining the same 11 parking spaces on site despite the increase in covers for dining - would increase demands for on-street parking at odds with Policy T4(b).

3. **We are, however, pleased to see that the small but not insignificant chimney at the rear is being retained as part of the solution to the ventilation extraction arrangements by routeing the flue into the chimney.**

4. Finally, there are concerns about Licensing conditions which are not planning matters *per se* and would need to be addressed separately. However, we would urge the DC to consider time restrictions as a Condition on outside activity, in particular in the dining/drinking areas on the south side of the premises, in the interests of amenities for adjacent residents.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

5. Additionally, on this occasion, we have an observation: we wish to make the applicant aware that, in the garden, there is an historic Horse Gin which is the property of the village and was refurbished by the Parish Council.”

- 50.3 11/02289/FUL – LONE OAK, 21 WEST COMMON
ERECTION OF 20 PHOTOVOLTAIC PANELS ON ROOF OF GARAGE INCLINED AT 25 DEGREES TO HORIZONTAL. PANELS IN ROWS OF 2.

Cllr Hersey said that this Government initiative did not normally require planning permission. However, this application proposed that the panels extend above the garage by 200 mm vertically and so permission was needed.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

- 50.4 11/02352/FUL – THE BARN, HICKMANS LANE
CONSTRUCTION OF GARDEN STUDIO/CARER’S ACCOMMODATION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection, but recommend inclusion of the same Conditions given to previous Permission, 05/00841/FUL.”

- 50.5 11/02379/TREE – LITTLECOTE HOUSE, 28 COMPTON ROAD
LINE OF BEECH TREES – TRIM BACK HIGHER CANOPIES BY 2 METRES ON NORTHERN SIDE.

The Deputy Clerk advised that Mr David Saunders had indicated that this application would be determined before the meeting; hence, it was examined ex-committee by Cllrs Hersey and Chatfield and their response was endorsed by the Chairman and Vice Chairman with the Deputy Clerk. The response was sent to the DC on 2 September.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

- 50.6 11/02489/TREE – 9 DUKES ROAD
HAWTHORN - LIFT CANOPY BY 1 METRE. 2 HAZELS – LIFT CANOPY BY UP TO 1.5 METRES.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

51. **TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.**

- 51.1 The list had been circulated. **NOTED:**

- That planning application 11/01848/FUL, for ‘Demolition of existing roof and vertical extension to form two bedrooms’ at Annexe, White Gates, Black Hill - which the PC had supported believing it would enhance the Conservation Area (CA) - had been **REFUSED** by the DC on 12 August 2011. Two reasons were given: first, the proposal, as a result of the design, height and scale of the building, would fail to preserve the character and appearance of the surrounding CA and hence fail to comply with Local Plan Policies B1, B12 and H9; second, as a result of the design, height and scale of the building, it would adversely affect the outlook from the neighbouring property to the east and hence fail to comply with Policies B3 and H9.
- That the Lindfield Cricket Club (LCC) planning applications, 11/01835/FUL & 11/01838/FUL, relating to the Extension and Nets respectively, had both been **APPROVED** by the CAPC on 1 September 2011. Cllr Gomme updated the Committee on the deliberations: he said that both he and the Tennis Club had spoken against the nets. The CAPC voted on one Condition that of hours, a compromise offered by the LCC that the nets would be used only between 0900 and 2030 Mondays to Fridays, and between 0900 and 1300 on Saturdays and Sundays (or 0900 to 2030 if no match were undertaken during the afternoon). The Decision had been promulgated on 5 September, but the full Conditions were not yet available on the website.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

52. TO CONSIDER ACTIVITY ON THE LIMES DEVELOPMENT, ANY DOCUMENTS RELATING THERETO AND AGREE ANY ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING

- 52.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that Barratts, in response to concerns expressed by Members at the last meeting about trees bordering the development site that were protected under TPOs (Minutes Para 43.2), had stated that (email 17 August 2011): "As a duty of care we inform our purchasers about TPOs and therefore what is protected and thus requires permission from MSDC before carrying out any works to the trees."
- 52.2 Cllr Hersey said that when she had visited the site at the official opening she was concerned to discover that the view south from the upstairs windows of the flats was directly into the back gardens of properties in Newton Road. She had sought advice from the DC about the buffer zone there and Michael Martin, the Planning Investigator, had said that (email 2 August 2011): "The trees and shrubs have been provided but they are fairly small. The buffer zone is there to provide a green gap, rather than to act as a screen, but the sapling trees should bush out and provide some screening." She said she felt sympathy for the residents of Newton Road.
- 52.3 The Deputy Clerk said that he had received a report from a resident of Eastern Road that the access gate to the emergency entrance to the site was broken and it was possible for both pedestrians and vehicles to enter the wooded area. He said he had emailed Barratts on 5 September with the PC's concerns but had as yet received no reply. Members urged him to chase the developer on this matter. Finally, he said he had occasional reports of HGV traffic using Luxford/Chaloner Roads and had also reported these to Barratts.

53. TO NOTE THE TIMETABLE FOR THE NEXT STAGE OF CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT DISTRICT PLAN 2011

- 53.1 In the absence of Cllr Snowling, the Deputy Clerk was able to update Members on the progress of the Draft District Plan 2011. The Better Environment Advisory Group (BEAG) would meet on 7 September 2011 to discuss a very considerable report on the Draft Plan developed by both DC Members and Officers. This document would go to the District Council in October, after which it was expected it would be distributed to Town and Parish Councils for consultation. Cllr Snowling had suggested that the matter would be a suitable topic for a Group of P&TC Members to address with the Rural Council and had offered to be a part of that Group himself. The Chairman called for further volunteers for that Group: he offered himself and Cllr Blunden did likewise. Cllr Hersey said that the BEAG meeting was open to the public.

54. TO CONSIDER DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

- 54.1 The link to the Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation Document had been forwarded by The Rt Hon Nicholas Soames, MP in July. This was the document that had proposed *inter alia* a 'presumption in favour of sustainable development'; the closing date for comment was 17 October 2011. The Chairman said that the matter was also suitable to be included in discussions with the Rural PC. Members concurred. The Deputy Clerk was asked to liaise with the Rural Council Clerk to set up a meeting of the Group.

55. TO ADVISE ON THE RE-ORGANISATION OF THE DC PLANNING STAFFS

- 55.1 Following the re-organisation of planning staffs at the DC on 1 August 2011, the Deputy Clerk updated Members on the impact of some of the changes. He said that Mrs Sarah Sheath had asked that the PC responses no longer be sent to her but direct to the planning administration staff. He added that Decision Notices were no longer sent hard copy but rather by email, which was causing some confusion in some parishes because labelling had been inaccurate. Some recipients were also disappointed that they had not been consulted on the changes. However, the PC had recently been asked whether it

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

wished to continue to receive hard copy of Council and CAPC Agendas: the reply had been to continue just with those for the CAPC.

- 55.2 Members were concerned that the DC was not treating the PC responses with sufficient attention. Hence they agreed that the responses should go to planning administration but also be copied to the relevant Planning Officers; this action would accord with the advice by the Development Officer, Nick Rogers, in the penultimate paragraph of his note, C1.NR dated 22 July 2011. Members felt it was premature to voice any criticism of the DC re-organisation unless and until the PC noticed a diminution in service.

56. TO CONSIDER A PROPOSAL AGREED BY LEISTON-CUM-SIZEWELL TC ON 7 JUNE 2011 RELATING TO NEW PLANNING GUIDANCE TO MAJOR DEVELOPERS

- 56.1 Members had examined documents sent by Leiston-cum-Sizewell Town Council (TC) regarding a proposal relating to new planning guidance to major developers which had already been agreed by some 950 local councils. There was some discussion by Members as to what level of government the proposal pertained: it was agreed that it applied at all levels, not just to a council that is a planning authority. For the benefit of the public, Clr Blunden read out the core of the text:

“The proposal was agreed by Leiston-cum-Sizewell on 7 June 2011 and by the Suffolk Coastal Association of Local Councils on 13 June 2011. It seeks new planning guidance to major developers urging them, as a matter of planning procedure, to:

- Attend our meeting to answer questions about their planning application if we so wish; and,
- Provide resources (if we so wish) to enable us to assess their applications – which may be over 1000 pages long – based on a professional critique of their evidence.

May I please emphasise those words above ‘if we so wish’; this means that no council is **required** to do anything. The proposed guidance would **enable** us to do these things if we chose to.

May I please invite your council to formally declare support for this.”

- 56.2 Members agreed to support the proposal and asked the Deputy Clerk to communicate their decision to Leiston-cum-Sizewell TC.

57. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 57.1 There were no items of AOB.

On conclusion of this part of the meeting, a further 15 minutes was set aside to allow members of the public to ask questions/make comments.

With regard to the Leiston-cum-Sizewell TC proposal, Mr Kerlake said that the County and District Councils were lawful Planning Authorities whereas the Parish Council was a statutory consultee. He felt the Committee was getting things out of proportion as the CC/DC would have resources both intellectual and professional to match, for example, Tesco’s. It was inconceivable that a TC would have similar powers and neither the TC nor PC could have the necessary resources. The PC’s task was to canvass the views of local residents. He added that the DC had done something similar before and he did not believe the Government would give such powers.

As for the re-organisation of DC planning staffs, Mr Kerlake felt that the outcome would be a diminution and dilution of planning officer input. There were 52 Listed Buildings (LB) in Lindfield; those planning officers newly assigned to the area would not have sympathy for it.

Regarding the Draft National Planning Policy Framework, he said that the joint WG with the Rural PC should be open to the public to listen if not to take part in deliberations. The subject was of such importance that the public should know what advice was being given to the DC. He believed there would be a presumption by the developer that Site K was sustainable.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Cllr Mr Hersey said that the DC already had one designated LB officer so that issue should not be of concern. Mr Kerslake retorted that *ergo* the DC already recognised the case for continuity by establishing one officer. Cllr Amor said that Mr Kerslake appeared to be contradicting himself: the re-organisation of planning staffs would give greater input at the local level. However, Mr Kerslake finished by stating that they would have no allegiance.

The meeting concluded at 8.54pm.