

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **3 July 2012** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

**Present:** Mr A Gomme (Chairman)  
Mr M Amor  
Mr W Blunden  
Mrs J Chatfield  
Mr S Hodgson  
Mr C Snowling

**Also Present:** Councillor Mr. R. Plass  
Approximately 18 members of the public (*some for part of the meeting only*).

**In Attendance:** Mrs C Irwin

**Absent:** Councillors Hersey and Upton

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

### 183. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

183.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hersey and Upton and the reasons were accepted.

### 184. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

184.1 There were no such declarations

### 185. QUESTIONS / COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

185.1 There were no questions or comments from members of the public under this item. According to usual practice, members of the public were given an opportunity to comment on individual planning applications as they came up on the agenda.

### 186.1 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 14 JUNE 2012

186.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 14 June 2012. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

187.1 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. 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.

187.2 12/02086/FUL - LAND ADJACENT TO THE WITCH INN, SUNTE AVENUE  
ERECTION OF 4 DWELLINGS WITH ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING AND OFF-STREET PARKING.

Mr. D. Macmillan spoke against the proposal in terms of design and appearance: the proposed new dwellings being unsympathetic and overbearing in the context of the style of existing properties and as

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Sunte Avenue was an Area of Townscape Character. Furthermore the new buildings would be forward of the existing building line.

Mr. G Taylor expressed objections to the proposal on the grounds of the history of flooding in the area.

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) spoke against the application on the grounds of proximity to properties in Oakfield Close, overlooking, scant regard to the Village Design Statement and the effect of the bulky terrace of four houses on the amenity of Sunte Avenue.

Members considered that the reasons for refusal of a previous application were still applicable. It was **AGREED** that the Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman, should compose a suitable response, with reference to relevant policies, objecting to the proposals under the headings of flood risk, design / visual impact and overdevelopment / unneighbourliness.

187.3 12/01833/FUL – I OLD SCHOOL COURT, LEWES ROAD  
PROPOSED PORCH CANOPY TO REAR EXTERNAL DOOR OPENING

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection”

187.4 12/01834/FUL – CHURCH COTTAGES, 126 HIGH STREET  
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING GARAGE. AMENDED SCHEME FOLLOWING PERMISSION 06/01976/FUL

Mr. J. Jesson stated that the Lindfield Preservation Society welcomed the proposal to replace the existing tumbledown garage. However the ridge to the left over the car port was considered to be overly dominant and a hipped or half-hipped ridge would reduce this effect.

Members agreed that the proposal as designed would be dominant feature in this prominent position in the context of the Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “This application is made to supersede 06/01976/FUL and involves a larger garage block than that approved in 2006. The applicant indicates that the site of the present garage will be lowered to allow the proposed building to sit more sympathetically in its setting.

We do consider, however, that the proposed building would dominate that part of the Conservation Area to an unacceptable degree, both in relation to nearby Listed Buildings and in regard to the street scene.

We believe, therefore, that as proposed, the building would not conform with Policy B12 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan in that it would fail to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area; nor would it safeguard the setting of neighbouring Listed Buildings. It should be noted that photos 1 and 3 were taken before part of the existing building was demolished.”

187.5 12/01844/FUL – WALNUT COTTAGE, 1c BACKWOODS LANE  
RETROSPECTIVE LOFT CONVERSION INCLUDING 3 VELUX WINDOWS

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection.”

187.6 12/01859/TREE – MARLOW HOUSE, 107 HIGH STREET  
T17 – JUDICIOUSLY REDUCE CROWN ON THE GARDEN SIDE OF NO. 107 HIGH STREET BY UP TO 3 METRES, PRUNING BACK TO SUITABLE SECONDARY GROWTH POINTS TO IMPROVE SHAPE, SELECTIVELY THIN OVERALL CROWN BY 20%.

To meet the deadline, a response to this application had been made ex-committee according to agreed procedure and the Deputy Parish Clerk had written to MSDC to state that the Parish Council had no objections to the proposed work. It was **AGREED** to endorse the action taken.

**LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL**

187.7 12/01874/FUL – OLD PLACE, HIGH STREET  
SINGLE STOREY TIMBER OUTBUILDING

Mr. J. Jesson commented on the potential impact of the proposal on the ancient mulberry tree and stated that the Lindfield Preservation Society regarded the proposed outbuilding as a temporary structure which was considered unlikely to be a risk to the Listed Building.

The applicant stated that the outbuilding would be of a high standard; the structure would not be visible from the public road and there had been no adverse comments from the neighbours.

Members considered the application in terms of Local Plan Policy B12 and the location of the proposed structure in the garden of a Listed Building within the Conservation Area.

**AGREED RESPONSE** (by 5 votes to 1): “This proposal is for the erection of a single storey timber outbuilding in the garden of Archway, Old Place. Although it would be a modest erection, we consider that it would be visible both from the roadway and from other buildings in this area of Listed Buildings. We consider therefore, that it would not meet the requirements of Policy B12 in that it would not preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area, nor would it safeguard the setting of neighbouring Listed Buildings. However should the District Council be minded to approve this application, we would draw attention to a nearby ancient Mulberry tree and request that there will be suitable conditions to ensure that no damage to this tree results from the construction of this outbuilding”

In response to a question from the applicant as to whether this decision indicated that the Parish Council would veto any building proposal on this plot, the Chairman stated that the Parish Council did not have any right of veto. Members always considered each application on its merits against national and local planning policies and Mid Sussex District Council was advised accordingly.

187.8 12/01968/FUL– 236 THE WELKIN  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND CONSTRUCTION OF PART TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH SIDE AND REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO CREATE FURTHER HABITABLE ROOM ACCOMMODATION AND ASSOCIATED INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

Mr. J. Jesson commented on the potential impact of the proposal on a number of significant trees (oaks) at the rear boundary.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “We have no objection to the proposal, however we would ask that the potential impact of the proposed work on a number of significant trees at the rear boundary be taken fully into account. We would therefore request that appropriate conditions be imposed to ensure that they do not suffer harm.”

187.9 12/01970/LDC– 236 THE WELKIN  
CONSTRUCTION OF REAR DORMER, TIMBER FRAME, TILE HANGING. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT IS LAWFUL: THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS OF THE PROPOSED USE CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “As far as we are aware, there are no reasons for objection to this request for a certificate of lawfulness for the construction of a rear dormer as proposed.”

187.10 12/02008/FUL – 12 HIGH STREET  
REMOVAL OF CHIMNEY STACK, FROM ROOF TO GROUND FLOOR TO THE REAR ELEVATION. REMOVAL OF WINDOW TO REAR ELEVATION – TO BE BRICK FILLED TO MATCH. REPLACEMENT OF BACK DOOR.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “.No objection”

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 188. 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

- 188.1 Appeal decision: 11/01848/FUL Annexe to White Gates, Black Hill - demolition of the existing roof and a vertical extension to form two bedrooms. **NOTED:** the appeal to the Planning Inspector following refusal of planning permission for this development had been dismissed. Members were encouraged to read the Inspector's report which demonstrated the significance of Local Plan Policy B12.

### 189. 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

- 189.1 The Clerk was asked to find out from MSDC's Solicitor, Tom Clerk, whether the Wilderness Field had yet been transferred to MSDC.

### 190. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN JOINT WORKING PARTY

- 190.1 Councillor Gomme reported that progress was being made with the questionnaire and this would be printed and distributed to every household in both parishes at the end of August / beginning of September. The best estimate was that the feedback would be analysed by the end of 2012 and reported back to the community by March 2013.

- 190.2 Councillor Snowling reported that the Draft Mid Sussex District Plan had been presented to the Full Council on 27 June 2012 but he emphasised that this was not for approval but to update members on progress and to seek endorsement continuation of the work being undertaken by the Member Policy Working Group and the Better Environment Advisory Group. MSDC had resolved to continue to work with Town and Parish Councils on their Neighbourhood Plans.

### 191. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 191.1 **NOTED:** that the newly appointed Deputy Parish Clerk had a regular commitment on the first Tuesday of the month which would on occasions coincide with meetings of the Planning and Traffic Committee. It was **AGREED** that the Clerk should liaise with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee to re-arrange meetings when necessary and that the following year's meetings should be arranged accordingly.

The meeting concluded at 8.55pm.