

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **4 May 2010** 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  
Mr S Willcox

**Also Present:** MSDC Cllr C Hersey and 26 members of the public

**In Attendance:** Mr P Hemsley

### 422. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 423. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

423.1 There were no apologies from Councillors as all attended.

### 424. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

424.1 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 (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.

Cllr Snowling stated that if he were called upon to substitute in the CAPC, he reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, at any 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 stated that he had a personal interest in Item 5(ii), Planning Application 10/00981/FUL at 9 Finches Park Road as he was a neighbour and he would not vote on that matter.

Additionally, Cllr Snowling stated that, although he knew the applicant for Item 5(iii), 10/00923/FUL at 43 Compton Road, Mr C Kinnear, as both served on the Board of Downland Housing Association Ltd, he did not declare a personal interest as he did not know Mr Kinnear in a personal capacity.

### 425. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 13 APRIL 2010

425.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 13 April 2010. It was **AGREED to APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

426.1 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.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 426.2 10/00981/FUL – 9 FINCHES PARK ROAD REDEVELOPMENT OF ONE DETACHED HOUSE TO PROVIDE TWO x 4 AND ONE x 3 BEDROOMED DETACHED HOUSES WITH ON PLOT PARKING (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society, said that what we had was one detached house being replaced by two 4-bed and one 3-bed houses. This description was supported by the Design & Access Statement (DAS) but did not agree with the drawings. There was therefore a mismatch between the two, which was intolerable. He said that the MSDC Planning Officer had advised that there would be new plans. Presupposing the discrepancies were sorted out, Mr Jesson said that there appeared to be two smaller 3-bed and one larger 3 bed houses which he considered a gross overdevelopment. The current site equated to 13 dwellings per hectare whereas the proposal would increase the density to 39. The character of the site would be greatly altered and there were very real concerns about traffic considerations. The access point would correspond with exiting, but around the corner, it would be hard when reversing out to see anyone travelling from Hickmans Lane, creating a highly dangerous situation. Additionally, he had concerns about the internal staircase to the now redundant second floor; he felt there might be an ulterior motive for rooms in the roof and he argued that the DC should set a Condition that no rooms be permitted in the roof, where dormers would be needed for headroom. In sum, there were many issues and he felt the proposals should be rejected outright.

The Chairman said that there appeared to be two applications rolled into one but he suggested that, in view of the importance of the matter, the Committee should not await revised plans.

Mr Michael Jones, resident of 5 Finches Park Road, said that he had no background in planning or building regulations. However, he wished to speak because he was concerned that someone with no feelings for Finches Park Road was making an application which would severely affect the neighbourhood. There were Health and Safety issues and he concurred with the many points raised by Mr Jesson. It was not a quiet road but a rat run and he said that he would be affected. There were also privacy issues for neighbours at Nos 7 and 3 as he did not trust the plan with respect to the rear of the proposed properties which he felt would overlook the gardens. He reiterated the 300% increase in the footprint which the application would lead to. He had issues with the DAS: there were referential houses at the other end of Finches Park Road which alarmed him. Moreover, there would be an impact on property values; the applicant would profiteer at others' cost. Finally, there were noise concerns.

The Chairman said that it was likely that the corner in front of this property had been left for a sound reason. Finches Park Road had been developed in two or three separate phases: initially to the island, then linked to By Sunte.

The Deputy Clerk said that he also had consulted the MSDC Planning Officer and had advised him that the details shown on the MSDC web were at odds with the documents which had been sent to the Parish Council. The Chairman said that the Committee had to consider what was before them.

Members then discussed the application. There was unanimous support for the observations of Cllrs Nicolle and Leach who had examined the plans and specifically visited the site. Cllr Hersey said that she and Cllr Willcox had also visited the site and she confirmed what the others had said, that it would be an overdevelopment that was unneighbourly; there were issues regarding highways, flooding and privacy. The Chairman said that the response to MSDC should include a recommendation for a Condition or withdrawal of Permitted Development Rights with respect to the roof space. Finally, Cllr Gomme was concerned about a tree at No 7 whose root run he believed entered the garden of No 9; this tree was a prominent feature in the street scene.

In summing up, The Chairman said that there was unanimity against the proposals which he put to a vote: 7 Members against, with one abstention, Cllr Gomme.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "We object strongly to this application for the following reasons:

1. It contravenes Local Plan Policy B1, Sections (a), (b) and (c).
2. It contravenes Local Plan Policy B2, Section (c) and Para 4.16.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

3. It contravenes Local Plan Policy B3 as the proposals would harm amenities of nearby residents, particularly at No7, due to loss of privacy, overlooking and reduction in outlook.
4. It contravenes Local Plan Policy H3, Sections (d), (e), (f) and (g).
5. The re-submitted drawings are not correct and are misleading. Two of the proposed dwellings have stairs to a higher, second-floor level that has been deleted and we do not know why.
6. The car parking shown is inadequate and will lead to any cars other than one per dwelling being parked on a blind bend, which is highly dangerous as the road is quite narrow. Moreover, cars emerging from the drive of Plot 3 would have poor visibility on this bend.
7. Importantly, it is a fact that the lower end of Finches Park Road is prone to flooding. The proposed dwellings will certainly have an adverse effect and increase the problem.
8. The pleasant street scene will be significantly changed, to the detriment of the surrounding houses.
9. We have concerns about an established oak in the front garden at No7 from which we believe the roots enter the applicant's property at a point where the proposed development could impact upon it.
10. Finally, if the application were to be approved, we believe that a Condition should be placed on the Permission with respect to no development in the roof space (to which it appears from the resubmitted drawings dated by MSDC 20 April 2010 that staircases still feature for Plots 1 and 2), or Permitted Development Rights should be withdrawn."

426.3 21 members of the public left at this point; 6 remained.

426.4 10/ 00936/ADV – 35-37 HIGH STREET (SOMERFIELD/CO-OPERATIVE STORE)  
FASCIA SIGN EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED BY SWAN NECK DOWNLIGHTERS; PROJECTION SIGN  
– NON-ILLUMINATED (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "No objection."

426.5 10/00923/FUL – 43 COMPTON ROAD  
REPLACE CONCRETE FRONT PATH AND HARDSTANDING, WHICH IS CRACKING AND FLAKING,  
WITH DRIVESSETTS IN RED BRICK COLOUR TO MATCH HOUSE AND EQUIVALENT PATH AND  
HARDSTANDING AT No 41 COMPTON ROAD (Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "No objection."

426.6 10/00951/FUL – 12 BY SUNTE  
PROPOSED TWO STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION (Cllrs  
Hersey and Willcox).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "No objection."

### 427 **REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE**

427.1 The list had been circulated. **NOTED:**

- Re 10/00219/FUL, 35-37 High Street (Somerfield/Co-operative Store): that the application for works for air conditioning units at the rear of the store and to paint the front window surrounds white had been **APPROVED** on 13 April with 3 Conditions, one relating to noise which reflected the concerns of the Parish Council.
- Re 10/00823/TCA: proposal to fell 4 trees at Lindfield Primary School. The Parish Council had expressed concerns to MSDC that the tree matter should be considered after the application for the proposed new classroom. However, the tree warden had confirmed that the trees had already been felled.
- Re **APPEAL** APP/D3830/C/09/2117467 & 2117468 relating to a car port at 5 Pickers Green that had been erected without planning permission and for which an Enforcement Notice (EN) had been issued for its removal: that it was **DISMISSED** on 15 April 2010 by the Planning Inspector with a variation in the detail of the EN relating to the concrete base.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- Mid Sussex District (Lindfield No. 1) Tree Preservation Order (TPO) 2010 – trees at The Witch Inn, Sunte Avenue – and (Lindfield No. 2) TPO 2010 – trees at Newton Road (but not on the Barratts development) – had been confirmed, both on 7 April 2010.

### 428. NEWTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT

- 428.1 Members discussed recent activity on the site. In particular, they were alarmed to learn that activity had been reported on Sunday 2 May and during the Bank Holiday, Monday 3 May, both periods at odds with Permission Condition 13. There were also continuing concerns about the routeing of contractors' vehicles, which seemed to be using Eastern Road, Luxford Road and Chaloners Road with impunity. It was felt that the reason for these breaches was due in part to the lack of access signage. Cllr Hersey said that there was a forthcoming application at Crawley Down, to be addressed at the CAPC, when there would be an opportunity to reject similar developments which were totally unsuited to the infrastructure of the site proposed.
- 428.2 The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to write to MSDC and WSCC, copy WSCC Cllr Mrs Christine Field, to express the Parish Council's continuing dismay at the lack of progress with regard to enforcing the Permission Conditions and erecting access signage.

### 429. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 429.1 There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 8.36pm.