

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **1 March 2011** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr A Gomme (Vice Chairman and Chairman for this meeting)
Mr W Blunden
Mr M Leach
Mr S Willcox

Also Present: One member of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

557. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

558. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

558.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Hersey, Nicolle, Snowling and Upton and the reasons accepted.

559. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

559.1 There were no declarations of interest.

560. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 8 FEBRUARY 2011

560.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 8 February 2011. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

561.1 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.

561.2 11/00217/TREE – 16 FINCHES GARDENS OAK – REDUCE OVERALL CROWN BY 20%.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that this was a majestic tree but it stood much too close to the dwelling. He said that it provided a lesson to use when examining applications for new developments that allowance should be made for the growth of existing trees on site.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

561.3 11/00410/FUL – ST ANN'S, BLACK HILL
RENDERING EXISTING EXTERNAL FACE BRICK AND PAINTED BRICK WALLS. REPAINTING ALL EXTERNAL WALLS A NEW COLOUR.

Mr Jesson, LPS, endorsed the Councillors comments regarding omissions from the descriptions. He said that painting the gate piers would place an obligation on the applicants to maintain the character and appearance of these features in the Conservation Area.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection. It should be noted that no mention of replacing clay tiles or rendering and painting the gatepost appears on the application description. Also painting and rendering the East elevation (for which there are no drawings at all) is not described. Accordingly, we have concerns about incomplete plans and the lack of information relating to the East side. Moreover, there is unease about the painting of features such as the entrance gate piers where the brickwork would appear to be in good condition, as the applicant would thereby assume an ongoing commitment regarding the character and appearance of these elements in the Conservation Area."

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

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

- That 10/03880/FUL & 10/03881/LBC – applications for internal alterations at Blackhill House, Black Hill - had received Permission and Listed Building (LB) Consent respectively in February: the Conditions addressed the comments of Members about this important LB.

562.2 At the last Planning & Traffic Committee meeting held on 8 February 2011, the record indicated (Paragraph 555.1, Bullet 2) that the Clerk would write to the DC about concerns relating to the practice of splitting the timing of LBC and FUL applications. The Deputy Clerk advised the current meeting that such concerns had in fact been raised with Mrs Sarah Sheath in December 2010. Her response had been:

"Thank you for your email. Whilst it is undoubtedly much easier if FUL and LBC applications are submitted together, it is sometimes the case that one application may be valid but the other is not.. Due to the tight timeframes we have in which to determine applications it is not possible to hold back the valid application in the hope that the other may be made valid. This is because it may be the case, it was with Stable Lodge, that the other application is not validated for some [time].

On the basis that the issues considered for FUL and LBC application are different it is not a requirement that both applications have to be determined at the same time. With LBC applications we are only considering the impact on the historic and architectural character of the Listed Building. With the FUL applications whilst this issue is considered, all other material considerations are also taken into account as well, e.g. neighbour amenity issues, access and parking, etc.

Just because one application has been approved does not automatically mean that the other application will be approved (and vice versa) and an applicant must have both approvals in place in order to carry out the works proposed."

Notwithstanding this response, Members remained disappointed in particular at the recent outcome regarding Stable Lodge (10/03036/FUL & 10/03078/FUL), where they felt that the District Councillors had not been briefed properly at the Central Area Planning Committee. Moreover, the Deputy Clerk cited very many other cases of what could be considered poor administration in the DC planning process which had led to the need for amended plans and re-advertising that had resulted in much nugatory work for Parish Cllrs. Hence, the Cllrs believed that the issue should be addressed more formally by letter to Ms Claire Tester, Head of Economic Promotion and Planning at the District Council. The Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk, in concert with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, to draft a letter which would be offered for discussion at the next Full Meeting on 12 April 2011.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

563. THE LIMES DEVELOPMENT

- 563.1 The Deputy Clerk said that he had received a response from Mr Steve Ashdown dated 3 February, to the inquiry raised by Councillor Nicolle at the meeting on 18 January, regarding the lighting at the entrance to The Limes, as follows:

"I do apologise, but I have not had the opportunity to go and see the light in question in operation.

As part of the works to create the site entrance, the applicants had to apply to WSCC for a licence to undertake the work to the highway, this included detailed construction plans for the bellmouth. These plans show a lighting column on the left hand side of the entrance, approximately 12m back from Newton Road. The specification for the lamp for this light is a 50w SON (high pressure sodium) bulb, which is in accordance with WSCC guidance in these matters. In respect of Condition 24, the street lighting has been shown on the relevant submitted condition drawings that deal with road construction and layout and the Council have not raised any issue with the scheme that has been submitted. Policy B24 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan deals with light pollution, but its main emphasis is in relation to assessment of applications for floodlighting and other similar installations. Street lighting is slightly different. The policy does not set down any specific guidelines as to what is an acceptable level. The lighting installed, in so far as the site access, has been the subject of a licence by WSCC and deemed acceptable and I do not believe that there is any further action required in respect of this matter.

I trust this is of assistance to you."

- 563.2 The Deputy Clerk said that he had received a number of reports from members of the public regarding damage to the road surface and grass verges and also with regard to the incorrect routeing by contractors' HGVs, particularly via Chaloner Road. He had reported these to the DC, copy to Barratts. Additionally, Cllr Willcox alerted Members to apparent breaches of Condition 12, hours of operation, on two recent Saturdays; the Deputy Clerk said that he would report these to the DC for their investigation.

564. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 564.1 The Chairman noted that the Appeal (APP/D3830/A/10/2132146) against the DC for Refusal of Outline Planning Permission for development of 42 dwellings north of land at Bylanes Close, Cuckfield (09/03857/OUT) had been ALLOWED. Although the site lay outside the Lindfield Parish boundary, the issues raised were considered relevant to the village. Accordingly, the Chairman said that the matter would be discussed at the next Full meeting on 12 April 2011.

The meeting concluded at 8.14pm.