

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **29 November 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
Mrs J Chatfield
Mr L Corp
Mr S Hodgson
Mrs V Upton

Also Present: 5 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

88. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

89. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

89.1 Apologies were received from Mr Blunden and Mrs Hersey and the reasons accepted.

90. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

90.1 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.

91. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 8 NOVEMBER 2011

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

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

92.1 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.

92.2 11/03640/FUL – 12 DENMANS CLOSE
TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO ADD A FOURTH BEDROOM WITH BATHROOM IMPROVEMENTS AT FIRST FLOOR AND NEW KITCHEN/DINING ROOM WITH UTILITY SPACE AT GROUND FLOOR.

The applicants, Mr & Mrs Nicholas Nunn, were present but, given the favourable response of councillors, made no comment.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "This is a large extension and so it could affect the street scene; however, we have no objection."

- 92.3 11/03433/FUL - 7 FRENCH GARDENS
ALTERATIONS AND ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION INCLUDING CHIMNEY
AGAINST EXISTING SIDE ELEVATION.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 92.4 11/03494/LDC – 30 CHESTNUTS CLOSE
NEW TILED ROOF PAGODA. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE
DEVELOPMENT IS LAWFUL: THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS
OF THE PROPOSED USE CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

AGREED RESPONSE: "As this is a request for a certificate of lawfulness for the proposed development, there are no reasons for legal, valid objections, as far as we are aware."

- 92.5 11/03500/FUL – 6 THE WELKIN
CONSERVATORY AT REAR.

Mrs Glenda Wallace, mother of the applicant, said that, before exchanging on the property, the (estate) agent Mark Revill had approached Mr Holman, who as owner of No 7 had no objection, on the strength of which her daughter and son-in-law went ahead to completion. She said that 3 metres' width would be within Permitted Development. However, they wished the conservatory to be larger requiring an extra rafter as recommended by the construction company; hence the need for planning permission.

As one of the two councillors who had examined the plans, Cllr Corp said that he would keep to his initial view which had been made after an essential, dispassionate analysis. Cllr Snowling, the other councillor involved, said that it was always a difficult matter and he could see both sides. Members agreed to retain the response as drafted.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The property forms part of a row of joined houses with small back gardens facing west. So far none of the properties in the row has been extended or had a conservatory added. The proposed conservatory at No. 6 would be likely to adversely affect the reasonable amenities of the occupiers at No. 7, the adjacent property to the north, in that it would have an overshadowing and overbearing effect and lead to loss of light as well as reduce the open aspect created by the design of the row."

- 92.6 11/03524/FUL – FALCONERS, LEWES ROAD
PROPOSED CHANGE OF EXTERNAL MATERIALS AND INSTALLATION OF NEW VEHICULAR
ACCESS WITH ON-SITE PARKING AS PREVIOUSLY PERMITTED UNDER APPLICATION NUMBER
10/03415/FUL.

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that he had some anxiety concerning the limited area at the front for on-site parking, unlike the two new properties to the south. He thought it difficult to see how vehicles could be turned on site unless there were only one. Moreover, from time to time there would be a demand for more than one on site which would lead to backing out into Lewes Road. This was not an application for building as the extension fell within Permitted Development.

Cllr Corp said that the bungalow and the two new houses were supposed to have identical front gardens. A single car would be acceptable within the narrow frontage; however, others would need to be parked on the road, but that was already the case. Cllr Snowling said that he could recall estates where the garages were converted to living space.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 92.7 11/03608/COND – FALCONERS, LEWES ROAD
VARIATION OF CONDITION 14 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 10/03415/FUL, TO READ: NO WORKS SHALL COMMENCE ON SITE UNLESS AND UNTIL AN APPLICATION HAS BEEN MADE TO WSCC FOR A TRO RESTRICTING ON-STREET PARKING TO SECURE THE REQUIRED VISIBILITY SPLAY.

The Chairman said that the wording of the application was puzzling: it appeared that the applicant wanted to have the Condition as listed on the Agenda; however it seemed (from the detail in the papers) that they also wanted to get it removed.

Mr Neil Kerslake said that he was puzzled. The applicant could want it to read as it did previously. As he saw it there were two problems: the applicant had gained FUL planning permission in 2010 when they knew they had this Condition; and now they had started work, they sought to have it removed. He felt there was also an issue with the left-hand turn out of Gravelye Lane where the road layout was like a slip road virtually up to the stream. There were often cars parked by the cottages, although none at Falconers at present as it was unoccupied. Now cars would be introduced. He believed the Condition should not be removed because of the difficulty with traffic from Gravelye lane; there was a potential vehicular hazard.

The Chairman said that, in the absence of views from WSCC Highways and having heard the comments of Mr Kerslake and Cllr Corp, he was inclined to the position that the Committee could not offer a view.

Mr Jesson, LPS, said that Highways had recommended a Condition be attached and there was no substantial justification in planning terms to remove it. The Condition was in the original consent; unless they could argue in a substantial way that it should be removed and WSCC agreed, it should remain.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We note work has commenced already and, in the absence of comments from WSCC Highways, we are unable to offer any reason why the Condition should be lifted."

- 92.8 11/03295/FUL – 2 PINE COTTAGES, PONDCROFT ROAD
REPLACING EXISTING ROTTEN SASHES WITH LIKE FOR LIKE. THE NEW SASHES WILL INCORPORATE DOUBLE GLAZED UNIT AS PER SECTION DRAWING PROVIDED.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 92.9 11/03367/FUL – 63 BARNCROFT DRIVE
ERECTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR CONSERVATORY AT APPROVED PLOT 108 AT THE LIMES, BARRATT HOMES DEVELOPMENT, LINDFIELD (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 10 NOVEMBER 2011).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

- 92.10 11/03559/FUL – 27 DENMANS LANE
REPLACE EXISTING CONCRETE DRIVE WITH MARSHALLS DRIVESETT TEGULA BLOCK DRIVE IN TRADITIONAL COLOUR AND SOAK AWAY DRAIN. REPLACE EXISTING WOODEN PICKET FENCE WITH BLACK WROUGHT IRON FENCE TO MATCH ADJACENT PROPERTY.

Mr Jesson, LPS, said they supported this application.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

93. **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**

- 93.1 The Deputy Clerk advised that he had nothing to report.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

94. 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

94.1 The Deputy Clerk advised that he had two matters to report:

- Cllr Upton had reported a digger had been operating on Sunday 27 November at odds with the terms of Condition 12. The Deputy Clerk had brought this to the attention of Mr Steve Ashdown, the DC Planning Officer responsible, but as yet had heard nothing in reply.
- Cllr Upton also advised that contractors' vehicles were still parking in Eastern Road and on the pavements in that area although there was now less of an issue about litter.

95. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

95.1 There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 8.33pm.