

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **18 October 2011** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

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

Also Present: 2 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

67. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

68. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

68.1 Apologies were received from Mrs Hersey and Mrs Upton and the reasons accepted.

69. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

69.1 Cllr Blunden stated that, as a neighbour, he had a personal interest in Item 5iii), application 11/02942/FUL at Pondcroft Barn, Pondcroft Road; hence he would not participate in discussion.

Cllr Gomme said that, as a neighbour, he had a personal interest in Item 5iv), application 11/02993/TREE at 23 Finches Park Road, and he would not participate in discussion thereon.

Cllr Snowling stated that he 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 the views of fellow members.

As he was an immediate neighbour, Cllr Snowling also declared a personal interest in Item 5iii), application 11/02942/FUL at Pondcroft Barn, Pondcroft Road; consequently, he felt it would be inappropriate for him to chair that matter - or indeed speak or vote on it - and Cllr Gomme would take the chair at that point.

Additionally, Cllr Snowling said that he intended to speak about the Village Design Statement (VDS) under Item 6, reports from the DC; he declared a personal interest therein, but that would not prevent him talking to it.

70. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

70.1 Mr Neil Kerslake said that he had two fundamental concerns with respect to the District Plan. First, leaving aside the fact that he felt the estimate of the numbers of houses needed was too low, he knew that a large part - some 40% - of the housing solution was planned to be in Burgess Hill where the TC and DC believed the infrastructure gain to the town would be of the order of £40m on 3500 to 4000 houses, ie, £10K to £11.5K per unit. He did not believe any developer would pay such sums. Second, re

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

the Draft National Planning Policy Framework, he believed that the document was so loosely worded on almost every criteria, eg, infrastructure and transport, that there would be no compulsion on developers; he added that 'sustainable development' was an activity that gave economic benefit.

71. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 27 SEPTEMBER 2011

71.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 27 September 2011. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

72.1 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.

72.2 11/02959/TREE – HIGH STREET LIMES (T1 TO T34) - REPOLLARD.

The Deputy Clerk advised that Permission was shown on the MSDC website as given on 18 October 2011, ahead of the meeting.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

72.3 11/02960/TREE – GUILDWOOD, 3 LITTLE BLACK HILL 8 LIMES – REPOLLARD. YEW – REDUCE LATERAL SPREAD ON SOUTHERN SIDE BY ONE METRE.

The Deputy Clerk advised that Permission was shown on the MSDC website as given on 18 October 2011, ahead of the meeting.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

72.4 Cllr Gomme took the Chair.

72.5 11/02942/FUL – PONDCROFT BARN, PONDCROFT ROAD NEW CARPORT TO NORTH WEST (SIDE) ELEVATION.

Cllr Gomme said that, in creating the car port, the owner had advised that his proposals would take the property back to a point where it had been many years previously. The structure would not be visible across the Pond.

Cllr Hodgson said that he and Cllr Upton had examined the plans and had been concerned that the car port would reduce the gap between the property and its neighbour, whereas other dwellings in the road had retained gaps. He felt it was not particularly neighbourly to build right up to the fence and would be imposing on the adjoining property.

Cllr Corp said that the neighbour on that side would not lose any light and he did not feel there was an issue with respect to the Conservation Area. Hence, it was difficult in his view to oppose the application.

Cllr Chatfield had examined the plans with Cllr Gomme and she had no objections.

The Chairman called for a vote: the result was four for "no objection" and one against (with two abstentions from those with a personal interest).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

72.6 Cllr Snowling re-assumed the Chair.

72.7 11/02993/TREE – 23 FINCHES PARK ROAD
OAK (T2) – REMOVE THREE LOWEST LIMBS.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

72.8 11/02995/TREE – 51 FINCHES GARDENS
OAK – LIFT CANOPY BY 2 TO 2.5 METRES. TRIM BACK LOWER CANOPY ON WESTERN SIDE TO
PREVIOUS CUT POINTS.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

72.9 11/03007/TCA – OAK LEE, COMPTON ROAD
OAK - REDUCE CROWN BY ONE THIRD.

For the record, the Chairman said that Oak Lee had been owned by Downland Housing Association (HA) where he had been a member of the Board; however, the HA had recently been absorbed into a new body within Affinity Sutton of which he was not a member and so did not have an interest to declare.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

72.10 11/03062/TCA – 35 COMPTON ROAD
FELL ONE CHERRY.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

72.11 11/03065/TREE – 5 FIELDWAY
OAK (T1) – RAISE CROWN BY REMOVING 4 BRANCHES ON MAIN TRUNK AND 7 SECONDARY
BRANCHES. TRIM BACK LATERAL BRANCHES ON WESTERN SIDE BY 1.2 METRES.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection.”

72.12 11/03078/TREE – 12 DUKES ROAD
SYCAMORE – TRIM BACK CANOPY ON EASTERN SIDE BY 2 METRES. OAK – TRIM BACK ON
EASTERN SIDE BY ONE METRE.

The Tree Warden, Mrs Jane Donald, agreed with the views of Cllrs.

AGREED RESPONSE: “We cannot support this application as we feel that the proposal to trim the Sycamore by 2m and the Oak by 1m is excessive, particularly in view of the Oak being a fairly young specimen and its appearance might be distorted by trimming back the canopy on one side by this amount.”

72.13 11/02907/COU – CLOUGHS, 27-31 SUNTE AVENUE
CONVERSION OF SHOP AND TWO FLATS, INTO SHOP TWO HOUSES AND ONE FLAT.

Cllr Gomme said that the houses in the new proposal were now one bedroomed, noting that the previous application (11/01174/COU) had failed because the space did not meet MSDC requirements.

AGREED RESPONSE: “No objection subject to matching materials and a provision for the relocation of the Post Box within the overall frontage of the property; we would object strongly to the loss of the box.”

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

73. 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.

73.1 The Chairman said that on 10 October the DC Cabinet had approved the Lindfield VDS; at that meeting he commented that it was welcomed locally but had taken longer to complete than was desirable. He felt it was a splendid publication and he had declared a personal interest because it referred to the road in which he lived. He believed the VDS would be helpful when working on the forthcoming Neighbourhood Plan.

73.2 The Deputy Clerk had nothing to report.

74. 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

74.1 The Deputy Clerk had nothing to report.

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

75.1 The Chairman advised that the Draft District Plan would be available for consultation on 24 October 2011 for 12 weeks until 13 January 2012; hard copies would be distributed on 7 November. He noted that there was a large scale development – The Crescent – planned for the north end of Burgess Hill. The DC was not approving the housing proposals at this point because the Plan was going out for consultation. He said that if that development were to fail there would be implications for Lindfield. He added that a Joint WG had recently been formed with the Rural PC and had first met on 4 October; it would work towards producing a Neighbourhood Plan and also comment on the Draft District Plan. No action was needed yet by the P&T Committee, but he said that formal authority would be sought from the Full Council for the Joint WG, for which TORs would be drafted.

76. TO CONSIDER DRAFT NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK CONSULTATION DOCUMENT

76.1 The Chairman said that the DC Better Environment Advisory Group (BEAG) had examined the Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation Document and had a number of recommendations to achieve more precision. He and Cllr Blunden said that they had recommended the PC support the DC suggestions and had left it to the Clerk to respond appropriately and jointly with the Rural Parish.

77. TO CONSIDER ANY ONGOING IMPACT FROM THE RE-ORGANISATION OF THE DC PLANNING STAFFS

77.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that he had no concerns at this stage. The Chairman asked that the matter be placed on the Agenda again for the first Full P&TC meeting planned for 2012.

78. TO CONSIDER THE P&TC BUDGET FOR FY2012/13

78.1 The Deputy Clerk said that the Budget figures were the same as for this FY, that is: £200 for the purchase of publications such as the District Plan; and £10,000 for professional fees for consultants in the context of proposals for large housing developments or for drafting the Neighbourhood Plan. Cllr Blunden stated that, for the latter, Haywards Heath TC was already employing Mr Richard Walker, a consultant that the PC had also used in the past. The Chairman said that the Budget would be forwarded to the FG&P Committee suitably annotated.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

79. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

79.1 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 reference to the Budget, Mr Kerslake said that a forecast was as likely to be overspent as underspent, as he had stated at the FG&P Committee in the past. Knowing that only £2,500 had previously been spent on consultants (for the Limes development), he felt that the forecast was a poor figure. He said the £2,500 figure should be used and if the PC needed more it could be drawn from Reserves. What the P&TC had done on this occasion was to casually seek to add a further £10,000 to the Budget, which appeared to ignore other factors. The Chairman replied that the Committee's approach was only a part of the process; it was for the full Parish Council to decide in public what the Precept should be.

The meeting concluded at 8.33pm.