

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of the **Planning and Traffic Committee** held on **6 July 2010** at the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00pm.

Present: Mr C Snowling (Chairman)
Mrs M Hersey
Mr S Willcox

Also Present: MSDC Cllr C Hersey and 12 members of the public

In Attendance: Mr P Hemsley

451. WELCOME AND EMERGENCY ANNOUNCEMENTS

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

452. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

452.1 Apologies were received from Councillors Blunden, Gomme, Leach, Nicolle and Upton and the reasons accepted.

453. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

453.1 Cllr Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion from that given at this meeting, when present at meetings of 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, if he were called upon to substitute at the CAPC, 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.

454. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 15 JUNE 2010

454.1 The Chairman said that, as he was the only Member present who had been at the meeting held on 15 June 2010, he would defer agreement to the Minutes until the next Planning and Traffic Committee meeting scheduled for 27 July 2010; the other Members concurred.

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

455.1 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.

455.2 10/01867/FUL – 55 APPLEDORE GARDENS
REMOVE EXISTING CONSERVATORY TO REAR. CONSTRUCT NEW SINGLE STOREY GARDEN ROOM TO REAR. CONSTRUCT NEW SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE. EXTEND GARAGE TO FRONT (Cllrs Nicolle and Gomme).

Mr Roy Benson, son-in-law of the residents, Mr & Mrs Adair, at 57 Appledore Gardens, said that his parents-in-law had lived at the property for 40 years, were now in their 80s and nervous; they had no objections to the proposals at the rear of No 55. However, on the north elevation, the proposed

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

extension would come right up to the boundary fence and would create a very large blank area of brickwork. The whole of the ground floor and some elements of the first floor would set a precedent in Appledore Gardens, causing a loss of open spaces between premises and be detrimental by in effect creating a link between detached properties. He said that works on the boundary line would be disruptive to No 57 which was a very marshy area where the existing foundations were more than 2 metres deep. Finally, he stated that the extension could not be constructed without access to No 57 which he said would be denied by the Adairs.

Mr George, also son-in-law of the Adairs, said that the proposed blank wall would be very unsightly and would destroy a most beautiful planting area which had won awards over a number of years. The works proposed would prove very stressful to the Adairs. In addition to the comments made by Mr Benson, he said that drainage would be an issue and would undermine planting; there would also be a loss of light. Although there were no windows in the proposals that overlooked No 57, it would be a forbidding structure and it would be a shame to spoil such an open space. Maintenance of the new extension would be impossible from No 55.

The applicant, Mrs Jacqueline Berryman, said that the extension of the garage would not be as far out as No 57. She stated that there was already a precedent set at No 53, her neighbour on the opposite side, where there was a two-storey extension, and also at No 59. The elevation of the roof of her proposals would be the same as existing, only the degree of the slope on the roof would be changed. The extension would not disrupt light for No 57. At the moment, No 55 had unsightly pipes on the side. She said she had made offers to the Adairs about the planting and to putting up a trellis on the blank wall for clematis. She had also offered to give additional space near the patio of No 57. In summary, she said that she did not believe that the application would be detrimental to the road. She was avoiding flat rooves and any disruption with works could be confined to her side only.

Members then discussed the matter. Cllr Hersey said that there could be a loss of light but not sunlight in winter months. The building being on the boundary was not a planning issue but a private, legal matter. However, she expressed concerns over the garden at the back of the house. In sum, she felt the application was unneighbourly and that it would lead to a loss of light. Cllr Willcox shared Cllr Hersey's views. The Chairman said that a balance had to be sought. He said they could dismiss any concerns about the works at the rear, but it was the impact of the works at the side on the amenities of the neighbours (at No 57) which raised concerns, particularly the stretch of wall. He added that, if the Planning Officer were minded to approve it under delegated powers, they should ask for it to be considered by the CAPC.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The PC have no concerns about the proposals for the rear of the property. However, we are concerned about the impact of the large wall of the side extension on the amenities of the neighbours at No 57 and cannot therefore support that part of the proposals. If the Planning Officer is minded to approve the application, we request that it be determined by the CAPC."

- 455.3. 10/01725/CON – TIPTOE, DENMANS LANE
TO REPLACE EXISTING WOODEN FENCE ON EASTERN BOUNDARY OF PROPERTY BY
EXTENDING EXISTING BOUNDARY WALL FROM FRONT OF PROPERTY TO DENMANS LANE
(Cllrs Nicolle and Gomme).

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection, subject to materials matching."

- 455.4 Ten members of the public left at this point; three remained, including MSDC Cllr C Hersey.

- 455.5 10/01627/FUL – 13 PICKERS GREEN
CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY EXTENSION AND DETACHED GARAGE (Cllrs Snowling and
Gomme).

Mr John Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), said that he felt the height of the garage would be an issue as viewed from the Green. More importantly, he had been advised that there had been an oil

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

tank on the site serving the community and it could be an issue re clearance of the residue. He did not object to the application *per se*.

The Chairman suggested that, if the response were 'no objection', the PC should alert the DC to the matter of the oil tank.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection to the proposed development. However, we understand that an underground community oil tank used to be sited near the site of the proposed garage and the PC wishes to make the DC aware that there may therefore be an issue about clearance of residue and hence potentially a contaminated land matter."

455.6 10/01668/FUL & 10/01671/CON – CHESTNUT HOUSE, 131 HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS TOGETHER WITH
ENCLOSURE OF SIDE PORCH AND REPLACEMENT OF WINDOWS. REVISED PLANS RECEIVED
23.06.10 SHOWING AMENDMENT TO PROPOSED DOOR AND GLAZING OF PORCH (Cllrs Snowling
and Gomme).

Mr Jesson said that he mourned the loss of the name of the property, formerly Romany Cottage. He was concerned about the alterations to the porch which he felt were inappropriate, that is, an enclosure that would signal a change of character to the appearance from the High Street. It would be an objectionable feature on a Listed Building in a Conservation Area.

The Chairman said that he and Cllr Gomme had felt the proposed amendments to the porch enclosure to be an improvement. Cllr Willcox held similar views. In summary, the Chairman said that the proposals would lead to tiling at the front and slate at the back, that is, they would match existing.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

455.7 10/01699/FUL – PRIMAVERA, 1 LITTLE BLACK HILL
REMOVAL OF EXISTING DILAPIDATED SUMMERHOUSE AND INSTALLATION OF TRADITIONAL
STYLE ALUMINIUM GREENHOUSE ON BRICK PLINTH WALLS TO REAR (Cllrs Nicolle and Gomme).

Mr Jesson said that it was a shame that this feature would not be visible from the street.

AGREED RESPONSE: "No objection."

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

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

- Re 10/01195/LDC, at 5 Pickers Green where Members had had concerns about the size of the proposed porch, that a Certificate of Lawful Development had now been granted.
- Re 10/01205/FUL & 10/01254/CON, 104 High Street, that the Deputy Clerk *inter alia* had spoken against the proposals at the CAPC held on 24 June, but the application had been **APPROVED** with Conditions by a majority vote of 6 to 5.
- That an application at the Lindfield Primary School, WSCC/075/10/LR, had been advised by WSCC relating to the proposed provision of one single modular temporary classroom for a period of 7 years. The PC had requested a copy of the plans and an extension to the deadline of 23 July for comment so that it could be addressed at the next P&T Committee meeting.

457. NEWTON ROAD DEVELOPMENT

457.1 The Deputy Clerk advised that:

- Five Councillors, including WSCC Cllr Mrs Field and MSDC Cllr Mr Hersey, the Clerk and Deputy Clerk and many local residents had visited The Limes development site on 25 June and had had a conducted tour by the Site Manager, Mr Gerry Rice.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- Following the decision of the Committee on 15 June, he had written to the DC Tree & Landscape Officer to request consideration of a Tree Preservation Order for an oak tree on the Wilderness Field, currently the property of Barratts Homes.
- As he still awaited a response from MDSC to his letter of 17 May, the Deputy Clerk had emailed Mr Steve Ashdown to get an update on activities on the site. Mr Ashdown had replied to say that: he had given instructions over to the DC legal section to issue a Breach of Condition Notice with respect to the hours of operation and the wheel wash facilities; he commented on the matter of the mini-roundabout at the junction of High Street and Lewes Road by saying that, notwithstanding the views of the Parish Council and the Lindfield Preservation Society and the request by Barratts for a meeting with WSCC and MSDC, in his understanding there was a technical justification for the roundabout and it should proceed; finally, he said that he was encouraged by the reduced number of complaints received about construction traffic, citing the fact that the site manager had sent back several vehicles that had not complied with the instructions on their delivery notes.

458 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

458.1 There was no other business.

The meeting concluded at 8.36pm.