

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 2 JULY 2013** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

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

Also present: 2 members of the public

In attendance: Mrs. C. Irwin

Absent: Councillors Mrs. J. Chatfield and Mr. S. Hodgson

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

334. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

334.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chatfield and Hodgson and the reasons were accepted.

335. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

335.1 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 (MSDC) North East Area Planning Committee or at any 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.

335.2 Councillors Snowling and Blunden declared personal interests in item 5 vi (13/01871/FUL – 1 Pine Cottages) as they also lived in Pondcroft Road.

336. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

336.1 There were no questions or comments from the members of the public present.

337. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 11 JUNE 2013.

337.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 11 June 2013. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

338.1 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

- 338.2 13/01456/FUL – REYDON COTTAGE, 3 HIGH STREET
TAKE UP THE PRESENT PATH AND REPLACE IT WITH A PATH OF PAVING STONES

The applicant, who was present, having heard the proposed response, expressed gratitude as the old path was difficult when wheeling push chairs or for people who needed walking aids.

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

- 338.3 13/01580/FUL – 23 EASTERN ROAD
REMOVAL OF EXISTING AGEING REAR CONSERVATORY AND REPLACED WITH NEW SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION.

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

- 338.4 13/01725/FUL – 40 COMPTON ROAD (LINDFIELD CHRISTIAN CARE HOME)
CONSTRUCTION OF A REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO ENLARGE DINING ROOM FACILITIES.

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

- 338.5 13/01770/TREE – SILVER PENNY HOUSE, 22 BROOK LANE
T1 – THIN CROWN BY 25%.

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

- 338.6 13/01795/LDC – 12 LINDEN GROVE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. 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: "Lindfield Parish Council is not aware of any legal, valid objections to this proposal."

- 338.7 13/01817/FUL – 1 PINE COTTAGES, PONDCROFT ROAD
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY STRUCTURE, REPLACEMENT WITH SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION ON SAME FOOTPRINT AND INTERNAL STRUCTURAL ALTERATION.

Councillors Blunden and Snowling, having declared personal interests in this item, remained present.

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

- 338.8 13/01821/TREE – 35 WEST COMMON
TWO LIME TREES – POLLARD TWO METRES FROM TOP OF CANOPY AND 1 METRE FROM SIDES.

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

- 338.9 13/01825/FUL – 11 DUKES ROAD
ALTERATIONS TO PLANNING APPROVAL 11/00644/FUL. FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION, ALTERATIONS. AMENDED ROOFLIGHT.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

338.10 13/01851/FUL – 63 DENMANS LANE

ROOF CONVERSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUNGALOW TO FORM NEW BEDROOMS AND ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY SPACE. CHANGES TO FENESTRATION AND ERECTION OF NEW ENTRANCE AND PORCH CANOPY ALONG WITH SMALL SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) had been unable to attend this meeting and had forwarded his comments on this application by email, which were read out by the Chairman: “whilst the appearance of the rear elevation is undoubtedly improved, we do have residual concerns about the loss of a bungalow from the neighbourhood’s housing stock in the context of Local Plan Policy H9”. The proposed response had also stated regret for the loss of a bungalow and it was **AGREED** to add the reference to Policy H9 to strengthen this objection.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council considers that because of the extent of the proposed building, the proposal would not conform with Policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

Apart from the effect on the adjacent bungalow, we believe the work could have a detrimental effect on the street scene.

We would also regret the loss of a bungalow which is a potential retirement property, particularly in the context of Policy H9 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan, which states that ‘when determining applications for extensions and alterations to existing houses and bungalows within the built-up areas, account will be taken of the need to maintain a range of types of housing in each locality’

Should permission be granted for this application, we trust that the applicant will consult with the Highway Authority in order to minimise potential disruption when the works are being carried out.”

338.11 13/01896/FUL – HUNTERS END, BLACK HILL SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that matching materials are used”.

338.12 13/01994/FUL – 6 THE CHESTNUTS

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY FRONT ENTRANCE HALL EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that matching materials are used”.

339. **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.**

339.1 Appeal ref: APP/D3830/A/12/2189341 - Land adjacent to the Witch Inn, Sunte Avenue, Lindfield, The Chairman reported that he had attended part of the appeal hearing and it had been quite clear that the developers had eventually produced a completely new flood drainage scheme which had been accepted by Mid Sussex District Council as a satisfactory arrangement but flood risk had nevertheless been one of the Planning Inspector’s grounds for dismissal along with the design of the proposed buildings. In view of the Planning Inspector’s conclusions regarding the flood risk, the Chairman believed it to be highly unlikely that any further applications to build on this land would be receive planning permission.

340. **NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN**

340.1 The Chairman gave a general update on the progress of the Neighbourhood Plan and the work of the Steering Group which had last met on 15 May:

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- the State of the Parishes Report and the Housing Needs Survey Report, drawn up by Action in rural Sussex (AirS), had been published.
- The four Focus Groups had comprised over thirty volunteers from the two Parishes (Lindfield and Lindfield Rural) and their input to the reports, based on local knowledge and views, complemented the statistical information sourced by AirS.
- The Focus Groups had provided local knowledge, with facts on the ground, about the local services and infrastructure, presented as powerful evidence that these services were already stretched and the situation could only get worse with further housing development.
- the work of the Focus Groups had been concluded at the beginning of May, with the exception of the Housing Group which had to deal with the difficulties caused by the approval of the Wates development of 230 dwellings. The work of the Housing Focus Group had not been completely successful and the circumstances had been stressful for its members.
- the effect of the approval of the Wates Development had alleviated the need to identify sites for a large number of houses in the Neighbourhood Plan as the number already approved exceeded the number the two parishes were expected to contribute to the district figure. Claire Tester at MSDC had confirmed that the housing number included the Wates Development and that the commitment for the two parishes would therefore be met.
- the Steering Group would now concentrate on small bespoke developments (e.g. affordable / rural exception sites) to meet the needs and aspirations of local people.
- the Chairman expressed thanks to all members of the Focus Groups for their diligence and effort. It was **AGREED** that a cheese and wine reception should be held for the Focus Group volunteers in due course as a gesture of appreciation.
- the State of the Parishes report and the Housing Needs Survey had been uploaded to the Parish Council's website.
- the Housing Needs Survey had revealed that more people were in need of affordable local housing than were registered with Mid Sussex District Council and it should be one of the aims of the Neighbourhood Plan to address this situation
- AirS consultants were to continue working on behalf of the two Parishes and their next task would be drawing up the draft Neighbourhood Plan with a target to present it to the communities in September.
- it was hoped that the Plan would be ready for a referendum by Spring 2014.
- the Steering Group was making an application to the Department for Communities and Local Government for up to £7,000 to assist with the printing and publication expenses during the current year.

In response to a question from a member of the public present, the Chairman confirmed that for a development of 230 houses there was no requirement to build a new doctors' surgery, although developer contributions would be secured to improve existing services generally.

In response to a question from a second member of the public, the Chairman confirmed that the planned extension to Lindfield Primary School was to meet existing needs, not taking into consideration increase in school age population due to the Wates development. It was noted that St. Augustine's CP School in Scaynes Hill may benefit from an increased reception intake.

341. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

341.1 No other items of business were raised

The Meeting concluded at 8.24 p.m.