

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **15 June 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
Mr M Leach

Also Present: 21 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

440. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

441. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

441.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Hersey, Nicolle, Upton and Willcox and the reasons accepted.

442. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

442.1 Cllr Snowling stated that, if he were called upon to substitute at the Central Area Planning Committee, he reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting should the CAPC agenda include 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(vii), Planning Application 10/01646/FUL at 9 Finches Park Road, as he was a neighbour; he said he would leave the room and not vote on that matter.

Cllr Snowling stated that, re Item 8 an application by Tyco Electronics at Little Walstead Farm, he would give his views as an LPC Cllr versus an LRPC Cllr, there being an opportunity for the latter at a later date.

443. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

443.1 There was none.

444. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 25 MAY 2010

444.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 25 May 2010. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

445.1 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.

445.2 Cllr Gomme left the room.

445.3 10/01646/FUL– 9 FINCHES PARK ROAD

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

REDEVELOPMENT OF ONE DETACHED HOUSE TO PROVIDE 3 THREE BEDROOMED DETACHED HOUSES WITH ON PLOT PARKING (Cllrs Blunden and Upton).

The Chairman reminded objectors that they needed to copy any correspondence to the DC.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that the PC list of objections was commendable; he offered comments to strengthen it. First, he stated that, of 20 dwellings that lay within 110 metres of No 9 Finches Park Road (FPR), the nearest was 7.2 metres and the average 8.25m from the highway at their nearest points. By comparison, Plots 1 to 3 in the application now lay at 5.4m, 1.7m and 3.8m respectively from the road, with the only change from the earlier application being that Plot 2 had previously been at 2.6m. Second, the two car parking spaces at Plots 1 and 2 overlapped the front boundary; indeed, to achieve extra drive space, the applicant had had to remove the porch from Plot 2 *in toto*, where porches are a key feature of FPR. He asked that his points be added to the list of objections.

Mr Jeremy Campling, resident of 28 FPR, said that there was a strong groundswell of local opinion against this application. He said that the announcement of 9 June regarding amendments to PPG3 should include this site. He cited 26A By Sunte as an example of the desecration of the street scene and 9 FPR would be significantly closer to the road. He added that the flood risk deserved reiterating: the application said that the site was flat but it is not level as it slopes towards the area of flood risk. Soak-a-ways in some neighbouring gardens are demonstrative of the risk. He was surprised that the Planning Officer had said that flooding was not an issue. Moreover, he was concerned that the traffic hazards were high on this extremely awkward bend. It appeared perverse that the Highways Authority had rubber-stamped the earlier application and now, following a site visit, seemed yet more content. Even those not neighbours of No 9 had written in to object on grounds of traffic issues. Finally, he felt that the new application had not addressed the overlooking concerns adequately.

Members then discussed the matter. Cllr Blunden said that the PC response should incorporate the comments from Messrs Jesson and Campling. He was supported fully by Cllr Leach. The Chairman said that they were unanimous in their strong objection to this application and would include the comments of objectors above.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Although the applicant has taken steps to meet some of the previous objections to LF/10/0981/FUL which was withdrawn, we feel there have been insignificant amendments to the plans to change our previous response, except reference to staircases to the second floor level on Plots 1 and 2 which have been removed. Accordingly, we object to this application as follows:

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.
3. It contravenes Local Plan Policy B3 as the proposals would harm amenities of nearby residents, particularly at No 7, 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 car parking shown is inadequate and will lead to cars 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. We understand that WSCC Highways Agency originally did a table-top assessment for the earlier application and have since visited the site; we are at a total loss to understand why they still have not objected to the proposals on the grounds of road safety and urge that they be asked to revisit this matter.
6. Importantly, it is a fact that the lower end of Finches Park Road is prone to flooding. The proposed dwellings would certainly have an adverse effect and increase the problem. The application states that the site is flat but it is in fact sloping towards the area at risk of flooding; some gardens already have soak-a-ways which acknowledges this very real risk.
7. The pleasant street scene will be significantly changed, to the detriment of the surrounding houses.
8. We have concerns about an established oak in the front garden at No 7 from which we believe the roots enter the applicant's property at a point where the proposed development could impact upon it.
9. 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, or Permitted Development Rights should be withdrawn.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

10. All three dwellings proposed are sited much nearer to the front boundary line than any other properties in this street including the existing property, ie, 5.4m, 2.6m and 3.8m (Plots 1 to 3 respectively). By way of comparison, of the 20 dwellings that lie within 110 metres of No 9, the nearest to the boundary line is 7.2 m and the average is 8.25m.

11. The two-car parking spaces/driveways shown on Plots 1 and 2 overlap the front boundaries into the footway.

12. Following the statement by the Communities Secretary on 9 June 2010, we believe this application will be captured by the new Government policy which has removed residential gardens from the 'brownfield' category. Hence, the PC objects on these grounds as the proposals would *inter alia* diminish the character of the neighbourhood.

In sum, Members were unanimous in their strong objection to this application, feelings shared by the neighbourhood at large."

445.4 Cllr Gomme returned. At that point, 11 members of the public left; 10 remained.

445.5 10/01396/FUL – 26A BY SUNTE
CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO DINING ROOM (APPLICATION ADDRESS AMENDED) (Cllrs
Hersey and Willcox).

Cllr Gomme stated that, if the application to build the house had been before the Committee now, it would have been refused on the grounds of parking. With the current application, the drawings had not been amended to show how access to the proposed dining room would be achieved. Cllr Blunden agreed with his colleague and objected most strongly to this application. The Chairman said that there were two reasons for their concerns: there was no off-street parking; and the plans were incorrect unless it were intended to have a free-standing dining room. He agreed that it was likely the original application for the house would be refused now.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We are concerned that the conversion of this garage would result in off street parking at the junction of Fieldway and By Sunte. Equally importantly, from the drawings it appears that the dining room proposed would be freestanding as the only access shown is through the garden, there being no internal access. Finally, were the application for the entire property, lying as it does on land that was previously part of 26 By Sunte, to come before the Committee for consideration today, we would have objected to it because of the parking issues. In sum, we object most strongly to this current application."

445.6 10/01357/FUL – 4 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
PARTIAL CONVERSION OF GARAGE INTO HABITABLE LIVING AREA (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

445.7 10/01406/FUL – 5 COMPTON ROAD
GROUND FLOOR CONSERVATORY (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection, providing materials match."

445.8 10/01444/TCA – LINDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE
PINE – LIFT CANOPY BY 3 TO 4 METRES. TWO SPRUCES – FELL (Cllrs Nicolle and Leach).

The Deputy Clerk explained that, because he had been advised by the MSDC Tree & Landscape Officer - Mr David Saunders - that the closing date was 15 June, this application had been examined *ex committee* by the Chairman, Vice-Chairman and himself. They had agreed the comments provided by Cllrs Nicolle and Leach and these had been sent to Mr Saunders on 14 June.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We met Mr White on site. Having had the security aspect explained to us, we have no objection to this planning application."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 445.9 10/01522/FUL – 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE
REMOVAL OF EXISTING DILAPIDATED SHED, FAUX FENCING AND RAISED PATIO AREA AND
REPLACEMENT WITH PRIMARY OAK FRAMED DOUBLE GARAE WITH INTEGRAL BIN STORE
(Cllrs Hersey and Willcox).

The applicant, Mr Jeffery Kirkham, said that he would ensure that there was no tree root damage. Additionally, he said that he had Conservation Area consent to remove one sapling but he would not be doing so.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection, but we would like Officers to be mindful of any possible damage/root disturbance to trees on the development site.”

- 445.10 10/01553/FUL – 30 WEST COMMON
PROPOSED PART TWO STOREY AND PART SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION (Cllrs Hersey and
Willcox).

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

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

- 446.1 The list had been circulated. **NOTED:**
- That the DC had **APPROVED** an application, 10/00936/ADV, for illumination at the Co-operative Store with 7 Conditions, which met concerns expressed by the PC on an earlier application, 10/00159/ADV.
 - The Deputy Clerk indicated that, on behalf of a number of residents abutting the Co-operative Store, he had raised objections with the Planning Investigations Officer, Mr Michael Martin, about the conformity of the structures recently erected under 10/00219/FUL at the rear of the store. Mr Martin had advised that he had written to the Store to ask them to reapply for planning permission. Additionally, the Deputy Clerk said that advertising hoardings had been posted on the rear of the store which he believed breached CA rules and he would bring these to the attention of the DC Planning Officers.
 - That the Council had been notified that the **APPEAL**, APP/D3830/D/10/2126266, against the **REFUSAL** on 2 February 2010 by MSDC to approve 09/03662/FUL, application for a single storey and part two storey extension at 32 Denmans Lane, had been **DISMISSED** on 4 June 2010. The Chairman was able to update the Committee further to say that the comments of the PC had been critical to the Planning Inspector reaching his decision, as these related to the impact of the proposals on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers, points not aired by the DC in their submission.

447. **NEWTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT**

- 447.1 The Deputy Clerk updated the Committee on activity relating to the Newton Road development:
- He said that the Committee were being asked to consider an Oak tree in the middle of the Wilderness Field for protection under a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The tree was sited on land currently belonging to Barratts, the developer, but in an area which was destined to be transferred to the Council in due course. The Tree Wardens had examined the tree and were recommending a TPO. Members were unanimous in their support for a TPO and the Chairman tasked the Deputy Clerk with taking the necessary action with the DC.
 - He, acting on behalf of concerned residents in Newton Road, had inquired of the MSDC Project Officer, Mr Steve Ashdown, about the future use of the strip of land at the southern boundary of the development and had been advised that it would be left as a buffer between the existing and the new housing and be planted up with trees to discourage any potential anti-social use. It was expected that this would also encourage wildlife.
 - He reported that further breaches of operating hours on a Sunday had been advised to him by residents and he had passed these on to Mr Ashdown, who had said that he had instructed the Enforcement Officer to begin proceedings for a Breach of Condition Notice to be served on Barratts.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- He said that Mr Ashdown had had a site visit with Mr Gerry Rice on 4 June and consequently the PC should anticipate a letter from Mr Ashdown shortly in response to the PC letter of 17 May, which had been copied to Mr Nicholas Soames, MP.
- He stated that Barratts had indicated that the site sales office would open in mid July.
- Finally, Ms Robyn Barnes, Technical Manager of Barratts Southern Counties (BSC), had advised him on 15 June that she had contacted MSDC to request that they arrange a meeting with WSCC Highways to discuss works to the mini-roundabout at Post Office corner, which the Clerk had advised in a letter dated 24 May was no longer supported by the PC.

447.2 The Chairman advised that he and Cllr Hersey had recently visited the site. He said that once houses were occupied, S106 monies would flow and funds for desperately needed affordable housing would become available. Cllr Blunden said that residents in Newton Road should get compensation for the levels of dust that they had to endure and Barratts should contribute to window-cleaning expenses.

448. CONSIDERATION OF AN APPLICATION BY TYCO ELECTRONICS, ON BEHALF OF VODAPHONE LIMITED, TO INSTALL A FURTHER BASE STATION CABINET AND TWO ADDITIONAL ANTENNAS AT THE EXISTING TELECOMMUNICATIONS MAST SITE AT LITTLE WALSTEAD FARM, EAST MASCALLS ROAD

448.1 Although the site of the mast lay within the Lindfield Rural Parish boundary, earlier applications for the mast had been examined by the LPC P&T.

448.2 Cllr Gomme said that it would be better to use one mast for the communications of more than one company, rather than have the possibility of more masts; Cllr Leach agreed. In summing up, the Chairman said that the Committee could see no objections.

449. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

449.1 The Chairman said that, in his capacity as a District Councillor, he wished to make the Committee aware that a community governance review for Haywards Heath was underway and that Bolnore Village was seeking to establish its own parish, that is, to be autonomous of Haywards Heath Town Council. The proposal would be put out to consultation.

449.2 He advised the Committee that there was a suggestion that Brook Lane and Roundwood Lane in Lindfield Parish might be transferred to Haywards Heath. He believed that the residents of those roads would be unlikely to consider that to be acceptable.

This part of the meeting concluded at 8.47pm.

450. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

450.1 Mr Jesson, LPS, said that:

- With reference to the Newton Road development and in view of the verbal feedback just received, a reply from Barratts about the mini roundabout would be redundant.
- He believed that, as Newton Road was a recurring item on the Agenda, the PC should invite Ms Robyn Barnes of BSC to a Full meeting of the Committee.
- He had not been aware of the Tyco Electronics application; the Deputy Clerk advised that this was not a formal planning application and, in any event, if it were, it would go to the Rural Parish. Mr Jesson was given a copy of the papers.
- With reference to the Village Design Statement, the roads to the west were shown accurately. He added that there was now a gap in representation from the DC and, as it was important to complete the consultation, the DC now needed to identify a point of contact. He accepted an action to write to the Chairman to highlight the situation.

450.2 Members agreed that it would be appropriate to invite Ms Barnes to the next Full meeting to be held on 17 August.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 450.3 Mr Kerlake made two points:
- With reference to the Appeal being allowed at Mansell McTaggart and also the acceptance by the DC of the right-hand flank window (53A High Street), he said that he would write to the Chairman to suggest how such a situation might be avoided in the future.
 - He believed that the PC felt very strongly that it should assume the ownership and management of the Wilderness Field. He recalled that the SSHA had suggested that the DC should take over Paddockhall versus the Cuckfield PC. Management would be much stronger in the hands of the PC versus the DC, which might have a greater interest in development versus amenity.
- 450.4 Cllr Blunden said that the last matter was being dealt with in the Environment and Amenities Committee.

The meeting concluded at 8.57pm.