

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **MONDAY 01 AUGUST 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at **8.00 p.m.**

**Present:**

Parish Councillors: Mr. A Gomme (Chairman)  
Mr. W Blunden  
Mrs. M Hersey  
Mr. C Snowling  
Mr. R Plass  
Mr. S Shortland  
Mrs. V Upton

**Also present:** Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).  
Councillor C. Hersey, Mid Sussex District Council.  
14 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting).

**In attendance:** Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

**Not present:** Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

**166. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

166.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor S Hodgson, and the reason accepted.

**167. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

167.1 Councillor 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 Planning Committee A, the District wide Planning Committee, or at any meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow Members. She also declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(iii) 34 Dukes Road, as she has spoken about the matter at Mid Sussex District Council, and so would not take part in any discussion or vote concerning this item.

167.2 Councillor Plass declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(i) (1 Old Orchard Close), as his family is acquainted with the applicant.

167.3 Councillor Snowling declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(xi) (Lindfield Motors) as he is a customer of the garage.

167.4 Councillor Upton declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(ii) (Lindfield Evangelical Free Church) as she is a former member of the Church. She also later declared a personal interest in item 5(vi) (20 Sunte Avenue) as she is acquainted with the applicant.

167.5 Councillor Blunden later declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(iii) (34 Dukes Road) as he had had previous planning dealings with the applicant, and so said that he would not take part in the discussion or decision.

**168. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.**

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

168.1 Mr Jesson noted that the Gravelly Lane (site 6) Taylor Wimpey planning application (DM/16/1012) had been refused by Mid Sussex District Council on 21st July 2016. He said that he was grateful for the support that had been received in raising objections to this proposed housing development. However, he was concerned by the fact that the Parish Council had not been able to be represented at the planning meeting, in order to take up one of the three public speaking spaces. He said that the Parish Council ought to make contingency arrangements to ensure that someone from the Parish Council is available to speak at any MSDC planning meeting where a significant planning application affecting the Parish, was to be considered. Mr Kerslake spoke in support of this point, and reiterated the effect of the proposal on the views from the Common. Mr Kerslake also referred to the problems being created by the continued absence of the District Plan, and said that he had been in correspondence with the Chief Executive at Mid Sussex District Council in order to express his disappointment at the delays. He mentioned the impact that this was having on the weight that can be attached to Neighbourhood Plans. He reported that the Chief Executive had acknowledged that although the overall housing numbers had been increased, there would still be significant challenges ahead.

### 169. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 12 JULY 2016.

169.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 12 July 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

### 170. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL (MSDC) FOR CONSIDERATION.

170.1 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. It was also agreed to alter the order of the Agenda, where necessary, for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

170.2 DM/16/1018 – 1 OLD ORCHARD CLOSE  
TO ERECT 2 NO. WOODEN CLIMBING FRAMES 3M HIGH. AMENDED SITE AND BLOCK PLANS RECEIVED 01.07.16 AND 04.07.16 SHOWING THE REMOVAL OF THE CLIMBING FRAME.

Councillor Gomme noted that there had been some objections from neighbours as to the proposed height of the apparatus. Councillor Snowling agreed that whilst there is no problem in principle with the proposal, the height is a valid concern.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council does not object to this application in principle, but having reconsidered the revised proposal, is now concerned that the proposed height of the frame makes the proposal rather unneighbourly. It cannot therefore support the proposal in its present form.

170.3 DM/16/2762 – FRIENDS UNLIMITED, LINDFIELD EVANGELICAL FREE CHURCH, CHALONER ROAD  
DEMOLITION OF FRONT ENTRANCE. SINGLE STOREY PORCH EXTENSION WITH MODERN GLASS FRONTED DOORS INCLUDING RAMPED ACCESS.

The applicant queried whether the site was actually within the Conservation Area, and the Deputy Clerk was asked to double check this. However, even if it is not, Councillor Hersey pointed out that it was within the setting of the CA. Overall however, it was felt that the proposal did in any event, blend in well with the surroundings.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council believes that the property falls within the Lindfield Conservation Area, although this is disputed by the applicant. However, because the proposal will blend well into the surroundings, the Parish Council raises no objection in respect of this application in any event.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 170.4 DM/16/1138 – 34 DUKES ROAD  
PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSIONS TO THE SIDES AND REAR, INCLUDING REMODELLING OF THE FIRST FLOOR TO CREATE FIVE BEDROOM TWO STOREY DWELLING WITH DOUBLE GARAGE.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS would be objecting to the application on a number of planning grounds. These include bulk and scale, the effect on the nearby Conservation Area, and harm to the amenities of neighbouring properties. The owners of one of the immediately neighbouring properties both spoke firmly against the proposal, and cited a number of planning policies which would be breached by the development. The loss of outlook, daylight and sunshine, were particularly referred to. The proposal was both intrusive and unneighbourly. It is simply the wrong development in the wrong place.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** The property is part of an attractive cul-de-sac in which a number of the houses have been extended. However none of those extensions has had an adverse effect on neighbouring properties in any way comparable to the present application. It therefore falls foul of Policy B3 in that it would cause significant harm to the amenities of nearby residents due to loss of privacy, overlooking, reduction of sunlight and daylight and reduction in outlook. Although there is currently a screen of trees between the property and the Conservation Area with its Listed Buildings in the High Street there has to be concern that Policy B15 could also be affected. In the Parish Council's view, the proposal amounts to overdevelopment of the site, and is unneighbourly. In the Parish Council's submission, the proposal breaches the following policies of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004 - Policy B1 (because of the unsympathetic scale and nature of the proposal), Policy B3 (as above), Policy H9 (because the proposal is not in keeping with its surroundings, and will have an adverse impact on the character of the locality), and policy DP24 of the emerging District Plan (as it will cause significant harm to the amenities of the existing neighbourhood), and paragraph 56 of the National Planning Policy Framework in terms of the impact of the design on the current aspect of the development. The Parish Council must therefore object on several key planning grounds to this application.

- 170.5 DM/16/2873 – PRIORY COTTAGE, 86 HIGH STREET  
MAGNOLIA - REDUCE CANOPY BY 1.5M.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

- 170.6 DM/16/2898 – 27 BLACKTHORNS  
GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSIONS INCLUDING NEW PORCH AND DRIVEWAY.

Mr Jesson commented that the fact that the property had a very deep front garden meant that the proposal could just about be accommodated. The applicant said that he had tried hard to keep the proposal in line and keeping with other similar extensions in the road. A neighbour also spoke in favour of the proposal.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

- 170.7 DM/16/2913 – 20 SUNTE AVENUE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.

A neighbour said that the proposal was out of scale and keeping with the surroundings. The extension would be visible from the footpath. There will be a loss of the sense of space and security. Mr Jesson referred to the proposal not meeting the standards set out in the Village Design Statement, and nor was the designation of the area as an Area of Townscape Character being respected.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** As the front of the proposed extension does not reflect the appearance of the rest of the building and its neighbours, the application would be detrimental to the street scene and cannot be supported. In addition, it is the Parish Council's view that the proposal does not respect the designation within the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan of the area as one of

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Townscape Character, and nor does it conform with the objectives of guideline 3 in the Village Design Statement, which define the character of important views and prospects, particularly river views, views of natural beauty, views of cultural significance, seen both within and from the Lindfield Conservation Area, views and settings of all Listed Buildings and views of other significant buildings and townscapes, including the following, and should be protected (inter alia): The semi-detached Edwardian villas at 10 to 20 Sunte Avenue.

170.8 DM/16/2932 – 14 SUMMERHILL GRANGE  
(T1) LIME - FELL TO GROUND LEVEL.

The owner of the neighbouring property spoke to confirm that felling was the better option, and that owner of the tree agreed.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

170.9 DM/16/2959 – 63 DENMANS LANE  
T1 - OAK - REDUCE CANOPY BY 1.5-2 METRES. RAISE TIPS OF LOWEST HANGING LIMBS BY 1.5 METRES.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

170.10 DM/16/1860 – 13 SAVILL ROAD  
CONSTRUCTION OF FIRST FLOOR OVER GARAGE, GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR ADDITION AT REAR OF HOUSE, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REPLACEMENT FRONT PORCH. (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 6TH JULY 2016).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

170.11 DM/16/2850 – 54 NOAHS ARK LANE  
TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSION, NEW CONSERVATORY TO REAR.

Mr Jesson said that he had some concern that the extension will take out a pleasant area of greenery and landscaping, and the extension will be further forward of the porch.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

170.12 DM/16/2971 – LINDFIELD MOTORS, LEWES ROAD  
PARTIAL DEMOLITION OF EXISTING WORKSHOPS AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW.

Mr Jesson commented that although the proposal itself is acceptable, there is a concern about the effect on on-site parking, and possible overspill onto the pavement or road. Mr Kerslake agreed, and said that although it may be a highway, rather than a planning matter, it was nonetheless, a concern. Councillors expressed the view that on balance, the appearance of the site will be greatly improved.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. However, there is some concern that the proposal will lead to additional on-site parking pressure for cars awaiting service, and that further on-street or pavement parking will result. This needs to be avoided.

170.13 DM/16/2972 – 19 EASTERN ROAD  
REMOVAL OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY, AND PROPOSED TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson referred to the need to ensure that the brickwork detailing matches the existing.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that matching brickwork is used, particularly as to the decorative detailing of the existing dwelling-house.

170.14 DM/16/2978 – 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

WILLOW (T8) FELL CLOSE TO GROUND LEVEL. YEWS (T1, T6) - REMOVAL OF YOUNG TREES. HAZEL (T2, T3) - PRUNE TO GROUND LEVEL. HAZEL (T7, T9, T10) - SELECTIVE REMOVAL OF STEMS CLOSE TO GROUND. HAZEL (T11) - SELECTIVE PRUNE TO STOOL BASE.

Mr Jesson noted that the arboriculture report was prepared in the context of the application to build a new property on the land, and said that there would be different objectives in terms of how the proposal was presented. The applicant said that there was a valid concern about the condition of the trees, and some had already leaned over. He thought that the proposal would encourage new growth. He had only used the planning application report, because he believed that a separate report would only have said the same thing.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

- 170.15 DM/16/3023 – 7 FRENCH GARDENS  
ERECTION OF A FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION WITH SIDE FACING BALCONY.

The applicant spoke to say that there had been no neighbour objections.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.

171. **TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS OR ISSUES MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.**

- 171.1 DM/16/1461 – The Palms, Lewes Road. Extensions and alterations to a single storey, 3 bedroom dwelling with attached garage to create a two storey 4 bedroom dwelling, with detached garage: The Deputy Clerk reported that this application had been submitted for appeal under reference AP/16/0056. The deadline date for further submissions is the 25<sup>th</sup> August 2016. The view was expressed, given the divergence of opinion at the Committee meeting (10<sup>th</sup> May 2016) at which the application was originally considered, that the matter ought to be reviewed in the context of the appeal. It was therefore **AGREED** that the matter would be placed back on the Agenda for the next meeting of the Committee on 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2016 for further consideration.

- 171.2 DM/16/1012 – land to the east of Gravelye Lane, Gravelye lane (land is within Lindfield Rural Parish). Outline planning application for residential development with some matters reserved, comprising the erection of up to 130 no. dwellings, together with some vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space, car parking and landscaping: The Deputy Clerk confirmed as above, that the application had been refused by Mid Sussex District Council at its District Wide Planning Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> July 2016. He read out the reasons for the refusal, which are a matter of public record. Councillor Hersey mentioned that research had shown that the nearby listed building had been a Toll House around the 1700s, and this added to its historical importance. She had also been reassured that the open space aspect as one of the planning reasons for refusal, was set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.

172. **CONFIRMATION OF ACTION TAKEN UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY.**

- 172.1 DM/16/2333 - Land at Barrington Close, being to the east of High Beech Lane, Lindfield (land is within Lindfield rural parish): outline application for the erection of 49 no. one, two, three, four and five bedroom dwellings (use class C3) with associated infrastructure, landscaping and access. All matters to be reserved apart from access. It was noted and confirmed that the response sent to MSDC on 19<sup>th</sup> July 2016 under the delegated authority procedure was-

*“The Parish Council strongly objects to this application on the following grounds:-  
As regards the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan (LLRNP):The proposal does not accord with the principles of the LLRNP, the importance of which is supported by the District Plan in Policy Code and Policy DP5, and by the stated intentions of the NPPF regarding the localism agenda, which is a core planning principle set out in paragraph 17 of the NPPF. Furthermore, paragraph 198 of the NPPF,*

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

*whilst the subject of recent legal analysis, is quite plain. It says “where a planning application conflicts with a neighbourhood plan that has been brought into force, planning consent should not normally be granted”. This must surely mean that exceptional circumstances have to apply for a decision maker to decide in favour of an application. The LLRNP was formally “made” by MSDC on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2016. As above, the area is outside the current built up area boundaries of recognised settlements, and so in addition to the LLRNP, the proposal runs counter to a number of Mid Sussex District Council’s own planning policies concerning proposed development, where it is proposed to develop outside the built up area boundaries of recognised settlements. It is clear from recent case law that where, under paragraph 49 of the NPPF, housing policies (whether they be contained in a Local Development Plan or a Neighbourhood Plan) are considered to be out of date by virtue of the fact that the Local Planning Authority has no 5 year housing land supply, such policies are nevertheless relevant and important considerations, and it follows that they must therefore still be accorded very significant weight. These principles are well supported in the case of Crane and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Harborough District Council 2015. As regards the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004: The proposal will not respect the character of the locality, contrary to Policy B1(a), nor will it maintain or enhance the quality of the rural character of the District at the fringes of Lindfield, and the High Weald Area of Natural Outstanding Beauty immediately to the north of the site. The proposal is contrary to Policy B3 in that the proposal will lead to a loss of amenity, and potential overlooking of nearby or adjoining properties, despite mitigation by screening. Tree and hedge screening is generally ineffective in the summer months. The proposal is contrary to the objectives of Policy B6 in that the area is one of recreational, conservation, and wildlife value. This policy applies to private areas of open space. The proposal does not accord with Policy C1, which seeks to protect the countryside. The area is designated as a Countryside Area of Development Restraint, and there are no exceptional circumstances, which could justify such a development. It is noted that the Policy seeks to protect the countryside for its own sake. Indeed, it is submitted that this is a valuable green lung and natural green space between existing settlements to the east and west of the site. There are concerns about compliance with Policy C6 in that the site is regarded to be a natural habitat for a number of animal species, and the location of a number of wildlife habitats in the area. It is noted that the assumptions made by the applicant appear to result from a desk top study, and it is submitted that the issue deserves proper survey and consideration. The environmental damage that will occur as a result of development in this area, contributes significantly to the unsustainability of this proposal. The significance of the traffic and road safety issues, which do not meet the objectives of Policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan or of policies in the emerging District Plan, are particularly significant in this area. Developers and West Sussex County Council Highways, appear to view planning applications in isolation, but it is the cumulative effects of development in this part of mid Sussex that it putting an intolerable strain on the local road network, much of which is of course rural in nature. High Beech Lane is already a fast and well used road, and the proposal will simply create yet another dangerous junction within the confines of Lindfield. Indeed, this road is one of the focal points of the Parish Council’s ongoing traffic survey. This has shown that traffic calming is already required to cope with existing use and capacity, and if the application is to succeed, additional measures suggested by the applicant to address the acknowledged issues, must be backed up by proper legal agreements, and be fully funded by the applicant. Policy C6 seeks to resist development resulting in the loss of trees. Whilst no direct loss is anticipated, it is noted that the some of the new dwellings will be built right up against a line of Oaks bordering the site (just behind Barrington Close), which are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders. Therefore, the possible long term, adverse effect on those trees of the development, needs to be properly addressed. Mid Sussex District Council has already accepted many of the above principles, because the site was assessed as unsuitable for development in its own recently updated Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment study. The site is clearly not sustainable being situated far from local facilities and amenities. As regards the emerging District Plan:- The proposal does not meet the requirements of Policy DP4, which states that development will only be permitted if it is appropriate in scale and function to its location, including the character and amenities of the surrounding*

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

area. If Lindfield is to retain its village status and character, and if the already overstretched amenities are not to collapse altogether, the application should be refused. Furthermore, the Policy states that the proposal should be in accordance with the relevant Neighbourhood Plan. Clearly, as stated above, it is not in accordance with the LLRNP. The proposal fails to take account of Policy DP5, which sets out an informed and strategic basis for the future delivery of housing requirements across Mid Sussex, and which acknowledges the significant contribution of Neighbourhood Plans. The proposal does not meet the objectives of Policy DP10, which seeks to protect and enhance the countryside (which is to be valued for its own sake). The proposal does not meet the objectives of Policy DP13 in that there can be no special justification for this development. There are major issues regarding meeting the requirements of Policy DP41 as regards potential flooding issues. Underground water flows down Savill Road whenever it rains, throughout the year. The Water Board confirms that there are no water leaks from any of their pipes in this area. There is significant run-off of rainwater from the house driveways in this road area. Consequently, when it rains, water pours down the road like a river. It is understood that these underground springs occur due to a geological fault (where the sandstone ridge meets the clay subsoil). It is believed that this fault line runs across the top of the hill in Savill Road and then westwards across the field that the applicant wishes to build on. Objectors are extremely concerned that if just one episode of trench digging caused this underground spring to emerge - what would be the effect if the top of this hill were to be built over? It could displace the water underground, and new springs could then arise. There is also a history of land subsidence to properties on this wet hillside and in the immediate vicinity to the proposed building site. There is a grave concern that the situation, which occurred at Frankland's Village, Haywards Heath where, it is believed that new build was constructed over an area of underground springs resulting in a massive subsidence to the properties below it, will be repeated. The application should not succeed on this ground alone, until far more research has been done into the well-known and documented flooding problems in this area. Even then, it needs to be clear, by the attachment of appropriate conditions, that if developers propose mitigation measures, such as Sustainable Drainage Systems, then if such measures do not work (as increasingly seems to be the case) the developer remains fully liable for the consequences. This needs to go further than simply ongoing maintenance and repair for a period of time. As regards the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF): The proposal will not meet the requirements of paragraph 61 of the NPPF, which states that planning policies and decisions should address the connections of people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built, and historic environment. As regards the potential for flooding, the proposal does not meet the objectives of paragraphs 100 to 103 of the NPPF for the reasons stated above. The applicant's Flood Risk Assessment may seek to address the potential problem of flooding within the site, but is very light on addressing the already pressing issue of surface water run-off, existing underground water pressure, and storm event water run-off, on existing roads and houses to the south of the site, in terms of the additional effects of building over the field at the top of the hill. Existing drainage capacity, which the report appears to rely on to resolve the issue, is already inadequate. The land is not flat, and given that water will always find its way on level, there is clearly a valid concern. The proposal does not meet the objectives of paragraph 109 of the NPPF in that the natural environment will be neither conserved nor enhanced. The proposal does not accord with paragraphs 165 and 166 of the NPPF in that it fails to take into account the need to meet the demands of the natural environment. The proposal does not address the infrastructure deficit of providing more and more housing in Mid Sussex, other than by agreeing to allocate money to the problems. This does not help the aspirations and objectives of Policy DP18 of the District Plan. It is contended that s.106 monies (and/or CIL monies in the future) are simply not delivering the level of infrastructure requirements and improvements that are needed to make such developments anything like sustainable. The provision of such appropriate infrastructure and the weight being attached to the lack of it should be given very significant consideration. The provision of adequate infrastructure cannot be defined by the level of developer contributions, which then simply accumulate and sit in a section 106 pot. Actual infrastructure requirements must be properly addressed before any further large scale housing development is

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

*permitted, and indeed many objectors have referred to the severe pressures on existing services.*

*General comments: In the Parish Council's submission, it is simply a matter of common sense, given that the District Plan is so far advanced, and so much work has gone into it, to enable the well documented and acknowledged housing need, to be delivered in a well thought out and planned way. The painstaking process of "getting it right" for the benefit of both current communities (and residents of the District), and as concerns future inhabitants, which is encouraged by the NPPF, should not be undermined by having piecemeal development imposed on inappropriate locations across the District. One should not override the other. Accordingly, the needs of Mid Sussex should be spread across the district in a way which reflects "the needs of future generations, without impacting on the needs of existing generations, towns and villages." The Parish Council does not believe that the importance and the weight of highly relevant planning reasons to refuse an application, can always be overcome by mitigation, or are any less weighty because the District lacks a 5 year housing land supply. Everything is capable of being mitigated to one degree or another, but at what permanent cost to the environment and to the enjoyment of people who already live in an area. For all of the above reasons, the Parish Council concludes that the proposal is not sustainable, not least by the lack of local infrastructure, which as stated above, cannot be mitigated by money. There are no substantive or economic benefits from the proposal, and any there are will merely be transient, such that they should carry very limited weight. There are no social benefits, as apart from an element of so called "affordable housing", it will merely add to the supply of expensive middle and high earner large detached properties in this part of West Sussex. It will simply add to Haywards Heath's growing reputation as a dormitory town. There are evidently no environmental benefits, as clearly set out above. It is therefore clear on any objective analysis, that the adverse impacts of approving the application, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. **The application should therefore be refused.**"*

### 173. BUDGETARY MATTERS.

- 173.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, which set out the year end budget progress report for 2016/17. All payments up to 30.06.16 were recorded.
- 173.2 **NOTED:** that against the miscellaneous budget of £200, the sum of £50 had been spent under the agreed donation to the Mid Sussex Biodiversity Centre for the work it had done in updating the Biodiversity report that went with the Neighbourhood Plan. Otherwise it was **NOTED** that although an invoice in respect of the Traffic Survey was expected shortly, there had been no expenditure incurred against either the professional fees/neighbourhood planning budget of £14,507.12 (balance carried forward from last year), or the £20,000 traffic study budget.

### 174. UPDATE ON TRAFFIC SURVEY/STUDY.

- 174.1 The Deputy Clerk said that the first written report from the consultant, which was expected prior to this meeting, had not yet been received, and so he was asked to chase this up.

### 175. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 175.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 21.26 p.m.