

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **13 April 2010** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

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

Also Present: 9 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

411. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

412. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

412.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Blunden, Leach, Nicolle and Willcox and the reasons accepted.

413. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

413.1 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, when present at meetings of MSDC's 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 Gomme stated that he had a personal interest in Item 6(iv), Planning Application 10/00823/TCA, as he had two grandchildren attending Lindfield Primary School.

414. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

414.1 Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that, whilst he understood that Barratts had been sanctioned to repair the damage to verges and pavements caused by construction vehicles accessing Newton Road, because the houses were to be built in phases over what might be some considerable period, he was concerned that the developer might not reinstate these features were they to face financial constraints. He suggested that a bond should be taken and that the Parish Council should meet with WSCC to ensure that the refurbishment would take place whatever the outcome on the development.

The Chairman said that the Parish Council would advise the WSCC Councillor, Mrs Christine Field, of these concerns.

414.2 Mr Neil Kerslake made two points:

- He said that, with reference to the mini roundabout at Post Office corner, Mr Roger Harper, WSCC, and Mr Steve Ashdown, MSDC, had said it was clear that this feature would go ahead, despite the fact that the Parish Council had changed its mind, because it formed part of Condition 11 of the Permission for the development. Mr Kerslake reminded the meeting that the Condition required the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

construction of the mini roundabout before the first house was occupied at Newton Road, which could be in a few months.

- He said that the village should not be in a position where pedestrians do not take precedence over traffic. Consultants had said that pedestrians were at risk on the crossing outside Somerfield. This aspect needed resolution and more action than the exchange of letters; rather it needed a meeting between the Parish Council and MSDC/WSCC in the next few weeks. He believed that the village was in danger of the developer acting unilaterally as had been the case elsewhere.

415 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 23 MARCH 2010

- 415.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 23 March 2010. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

- 416.1 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.

- 416.2 10/00823/TCA – LINDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE
FELL ONE CYPRESS, ONE MAPLE, ONE WILLOW AND ONE OAK (Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

Mr Jesson, LPS, believed that a TPO should be placed on these trees. He stated that the application included no details as to the proposed classroom, which he felt was unsatisfactory, even unsound. He said that these trees formed an important group and that there had been a number of cases in the past where the application for development had been submitted before there had been a consideration of issues concerning trees. He felt there was no justification for this application. He noted that the tree wardens had identified an alternative site for the classroom.

The Chairman concurred and stated that perhaps the applicant had approached this matter in the wrong sequence. He felt that it would be inappropriate to support the proposal ahead of details of the classroom being known, noting that the applicant was the Head Teacher rather than the Education Authority.

The Deputy Clerk read out the letter from Mrs Jane Donald, on behalf of the tree wardens (*copy attached*).

Members then debated the issue. Believing it to be premature, they were unanimous in their response.

AGREED RESPONSE: We believe that the question of whether these trees should be felled should follow an application to install the classroom and so the Parish Council does not support their removal at this time.

- 416.3 10/00869/FUL – 23 MEADOW LANE
TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

Mr Jesson, LPS, offered a photograph to support his objections on two grounds:

- The bungalow at No 24 to the right of the property was at a lower level than the applicant's semi-detached house.
- The proposed extension of the property to the right flank would leave a 90cm gap only, a walkway between the properties.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

The effect would be that the extended semi-detached property would be extremely oppressive to the resident at No 24, contrary to Local Plan Policies B1 and B3. He urged the Committee to pass on his objections to the DC.

Members discussed the application in detail and, although there was no issue of overlooking windows, they agreed that the proposals were overpowering and moreover unneighbourly.

AGREED RESPONSE: We cannot support this application because the proposed extension would be overpowering and unneighbourly contrary to Local Plan Policies B1 and B3 in its impact on the resident at No 24.

- 416.4 10/00525/CON – TIPTOE, DENMANS LANE
TO REPLACE EXISTING FENCE ON EASTERN BOUNDARY OF PROPERTY BY EXTENDING EXISTING BOUNDARY WALL FROM FRONT OF HOUSE TO ROAD (DENMANS LANE). ALL BRICKS TO MATCH EXISTING BOUNDARY WALLS (Cllrs Snowling and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: We can see no problems with this application; indeed, we believe it will enhance the street scene. No objection subject to materials matching existing.

- 416.5 10/00780/TCA – 92 HIGH STREET
TWO YEWS – REDUCE CANOPIES BY UP TO 2 METRES. LABURNUM – FELL (Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

AGREED RESPONSE: No objection.

- 416.6 10/00816/TCA – MEAD COTTAGE, LEWES ROAD
ONE BIRCH AND ONE WALNUT – REMOVE LOWEST BRANCH ON WESTERN SIDE OF EACH TREE – AMENDED DESCRIPTION (Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

AGREED RESPONSE: No objection.

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

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

- That the Council had been notified of an **APPEAL** (APP/D3830/A/10/2123733/NWF), with a start date of 24 March 2010, against the **REFUSAL** by MSDC to approve 09/03236/FUL, application for a roof top antenna installation at 5 Portsmouth Wood Close. The PC had objected to the application. The Appeal would be dealt with by a Hearing. Exceptionally, the Chairman allowed two neighbours of the applicant to speak as material facts had changed since the application had been submitted: Mrs Hodgson, 3 Portsmouth Wood Close, said that a tree had been felled by WSCC which would now permit the proposed antenna to be visible from Brook Lane as well as from Portsmouth Lane, both roads lying in the Area of Townscape Character; Mr Damsell, 1 Portsmouth Wood Close, asked whether the residents should be represented by a consultant. The Chairman said that the appeal was against the DC and they would be represented; it was his personal opinion that the residents did not need a consultant. The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to write to the Planning Inspector with a copy of the PC's response to the 2009 application, to include the new observations from residents, to meet the deadline for comments of 3 May 2010.
- That, re 10/00367/FUL, 18 High Street, at the last meeting Members had been concerned that timber features such as soffits and fascias were to be replaced by UPVC. However, at that meeting, the applicant - and subsequently MSDC - had confirmed that the plans had been amended to remove all reference to UPVC. Accordingly, Members had agreed *ex committée* that the application did not need to be re-advertised and the response to the DC was amended to: "No objection provided matching materials are used."
- That 09/03569/FUL and 09/03571/CON, proposal for a new dwelling at Springfield, Spring Lane, to which the PC had had no objections, had been approved at the CAPC with a number of Conditions, details of which were awaited from the DC.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- That 10/00159/ADV, application for an illuminated external fascia sign and projection sign at 35-37 High Street (Somerville/Co-operative Store), to which the PC had objected, had been **REFUSED** consent by MSDC on 25 March 2010, by reason of its size, colour and means of illumination which would be unduly prominent in the street scene and detrimental to the visual amenities of the locality (Conservation Area) under S.69 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990, contrary to MSDC Local Plan Policies B19 and B20.

418. NEWTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT

- 418.1 The Deputy Clerk updated the Committee on activity relating to the Newton Road development:
- He read out the key elements of a letter from Mr Steve Ashdown, MSDC, to the developer, Barratts, relating to breaches of the Condition of the approved Construction Management Plan (*copy attached*).
 - The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to continue to advise the DC of complaints received regarding breaches of Conditions and urge the DC to take forceful action.
- 418.2 Two members of the public left at this point; 7 remained.

419. TO CONSIDER THE MSDC SHLAA (STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT) REVIEW 2010

- 419.1 The Deputy Clerk advised that the request from MSDC to identify sites with potential for housing development had been circulated to all Members but no responses had been received. Members discussed the matter, including the fact that other parish and town councils could identify sites within the Lindfield Parish Council area. It was **AGREED** that the response to MSDC would be that the Parish Council had carefully considered the MSDC request to identify sites with potential to be included in the SHLAA Review 2010, but they believed that they were already overburdened by the 120 houses on the Newton Road development and were satisfied that there were no other suitable sites available.

420. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 420.1 There was no other business.

This part of the meeting concluded at 8.57pm.

421. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

- 421.1 Mr Jesson, LPS, said that:
- MSDC had invited comment on the Lindfield Village Design Statement, which had a closing date of 10 June, and he hoped that the PC would offer some supportive statements.
 - With regard to the Core Strategy, the LPS had been approached by a group defending the Penland Farm Area and asking that the LPS collaborate with them. However, Mr Jesson said that the LPS would not collaborate with them unless all similar groups acted together to state that the Haywards Heath area was already overburdened with development.
- 421.2 Mr Kerslake, making reference to the tree application at the Lindfield Primary School, said that the matter harked back to the issue of the floodlights at Oathall Community College and it was clear that, where the WSCC owned the site, they would use Regulation 3 to approve the application internally. He recalled that there had been a tree at the Oathall site which they had wanted to remove, but which MSDC had refused. It seemed to him that WSCC was a closed shop and he was saddened at the loss of trees.

The meeting concluded at 9.01pm.