

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **28 February 2012** 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  
Mrs J Chatfield  
Mrs M Hersey  
Mr S Hodgson  
Mrs V Upton

**Also Present:** MSDC Cllr Mr C Hersey and 3 members of the public

**In Attendance:** Mr P Hemsley

### 125. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

### 126. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

126.1 Apologies were received from Councillor Blunden and the reason accepted.

### 127. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

127.1 Cllr Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, when present at meetings of 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 fellow members.

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 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 the views of fellow members.

### 128. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

128.1 There was none.

### 129. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 7 FEBRUARY 2012

129.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 7 February 2012. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

130.1 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.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 130.2 12/00253/FUL – WEALDEN HOUSE, ROUNDWOOD LANE  
A TWO-STOREY EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL ACCOMMODATION.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that the property lay outside the Built Up Area Boundary and hence was subject to restraints under Policy C1. He felt that approval of the application would be contrary to Local Plan policy and the matter should go to the CAPC. Notwithstanding these comments, he added that this was a large extension very close to the road in an area where there were quite large houses.

Cllr Gomme said that the boundary was a technicality, a line on a map and Wealden House was clearly not an agricultural dwelling. Cllr Chatfield added that Roundwood Lane was a private road.

The applicant, Mr Peter Furze, said that he had not discussed the application with the Planning Officer. He had lived in the property for 40 years and a further four houses had been built in the lane during that period. With reference to the proximity of his house to the road, he stated that the road passed across his property as his boundary lay on the far side.

The Chairman said that the Committee would include the LPS comments, although it might be that the Plan Policy was no longer applicable. He added that whether or not the matter went to the CAPC was for DC Cllrs to call in.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “We were told by the owner that the trees in the back garden by the swimming pool are to remain and will be protected during the works. However, we understand from the Lindfield Preservation Society that the property lies outside the built-up area boundary which would mean that it would be subject to development restraints under Policy C1. The Parish Council has learned that this part of the private road has had a number of houses built on it in past years and consequently feels that the C1 Policies are an anomaly here and should not be applicable to this application. Hence, the LPC has no objection.”

- 130.3 12/00183/FUL – GREEN SHUTTERS, 20 SUMMERHILL LANE  
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection.”

- 130.4 12/00248/TREE – FINCHES CORNER, HICKMANS LANE  
OAK (T1) – REMOVE LOWEST LIMB ON WESTERN SIDE AND THIN CANOPY BY 15%.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection.”

- 130.5 12/00263/FUL – 13 SHENSTONE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection.”

- 130.6 12/00299/LBC – ST ANN’S, BLACK HILL  
REPLACEMENT EXTENSION TO GARAGE AND SOLAR PANELS TO ROOF OF HOUSE.

Mr Jesson, LPS, echoed the Committee’s remarks. He said that they had enough experience of solar panels in the village to know that these would be visible. This was a well-founded objection. He added that Plan Policies did not yet reflect the latest technology, citing satellite dishes and uPVC windows as well as photovoltaic panels. He felt this application breached B10 in a substantial number of ways.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “We consider that the proposed solar panels would adversely affect the architectural and historic character of this Listed Building and we do not believe that an exception should be made to the requirements of Policy B10. We must disagree with the assertion in the Heritage and Design and Access Statement that the panels would be “well concealed from the surrounding area”. Observation from a number of areas indicates that they would be quite obvious to the public passing by.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Thus Policies B10 and B12 would not be followed and again we cannot see that exception should be made. We see no problem regarding the garage extension.”

- 130.7 12/00367/FUL – 34B APPLIEDORE GARDENS  
INSTALL DROPPED KERB AND UPGRADE HARDSTANDING FOR OFF-ROAD PARKING.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection provided the hardstanding is permeable.”

- 130.8 12/00222/TEL56 – O/S 42 COMPTON ROAD  
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF NEW GREEN COLOURED REPLACEMENT CABINET SHELL (**AMENDED DESCRIPTION 14.02.12**).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “No objection.”

- 131. 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**

- 131.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that:

- An **APPEAL** (Reference APP/D3830/D/11/2163821) had been initiated by Ms Jenny Adam against REFUSAL by MSDC of planning application LF/11/01848/FUL for ‘Demolition of existing roof and vertical extension to form two bedrooms’ at Annexe, White Gates, Black Hill. The Appeal had started on 30 January 2012 with a closing date for observations to the Planning Inspector (PI) of 12 March 2012. The LPC comments, which the DC would send to the PI, had been: “We consider that the proposed redevelopment of the building will not only be acceptable from the point of view of creating a more commodious dwelling house, but also will enhance its setting in the Conservation Area.” It was agreed no further action was necessary.
- The **APPEAL** (Reference APP/D3830/A/11/2162113/NWF) by Mr Ron Skinner - against Refusal by MSDC to approve a matter of detail reserved by a Condition imposed on a previous planning permission (LF/11/01108/FUL re Springfield, Spring Lane) – had been **ALLOWED** on 8 February 2012. However, an application by the appellant for an award of costs had been REFUSED on 8 February 2012.
- An **APPEAL** (Reference APP/D3830/D/12/2169939) had been started on 21 February 2012 by Mr William Broderick against REFUSAL by MSDC on 6 December 2011 of planning application LF/11/02587/COU for ‘Repositioning garden fence and paving area to create two parking spaces’ at 102 The Welkin. At their meeting on 8 November 2011, the P&TC had had ‘no objection’ to this application, whereas the DC had refused it on the grounds that ‘The Proposed hardstanding area would not relate sympathetically to the surrounding environment and would form an incongruous feature to the detriment of the visual amenity of the locality. It would therefore conflict with Policy B1 of the Local Plan’.
- Re LF/11/04087/COND at Falconers, Lewes Road, on 17 February 2012 the DC had **APPROVED** the application for ‘Removal of Condition 14 of Planning Permission 10/03415/FUL’ relating to a traffic regulation order and reissued the Conditions *in toto*.

- 132. 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**

- 132.1 The Deputy Clerk had the following matters to report:

- That progress had been made by the DC relating to works to be undertaken by Barratts on the Pond in the Reserve area.
- That there was increasing concern amongst residents of Eastern Road that new occupants of the Limes were parking in their street. However, as there were no parking restrictions in this area, the District/County Councils were not able to ameliorate the situation.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 133. TO REPORT ACTIVITY BY THE LPC/LINDFIELD RURAL PC JOINT WORKING PARTY TOWARDS THE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 133.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that the LPC/Lindfield Rural PC (LRPC) Neighbourhood Plan Joint Working Party (NPJWP) had met on 31 January 2012 and agreed the following matters:
- To elect Councillor Snowling as Chairman.
  - To confirm membership of the JWP.
  - To agree activities for the Councillors and Council staffs.
  - To write to agencies to identify their requirements for infrastructure over the next 20 years.
  - To meet again on 23 March 2012.

### 134. TO CONSIDER ANY ONGOING IMPACT FROM THE RE-ORGANISATION OF THE DC PLANNING STAFFS MADE WITH EFFECT FROM 1 AUGUST 2011

- 134.1 The Deputy Clerk said that he was not aware of any ongoing problems following the re-organisation of the DC Planning staffs in 2011.

### 135. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 135.1 Given the issues discussed at Item 5iv) – Planning Application at St Ann’s Black Hill - the Chairman asked the Deputy Clerk to write to the DC (Ms Claire Tester) re the need to identify solar panels in the Local Plan policies in the Conservation Area (CA) and for Listed Buildings (LB) and to make the case for such policies to safeguard both the CA and LB.

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. There was none.

The meeting concluded at 8.25pm.