

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **MONDAY 02 NOVEMBER 2015** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. A Gomme (Chairman)
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mr. R Plass
Mr. W Blunden
Mr. C Snowling
Mr. S Shortland

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
3 members of the public (for parts of the meeting)

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

Absent: Mrs. V Upton, Mrs. E Hinze, Mrs. M Hersey, and Mrs. J Durrant

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

063. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

063.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Upton, Hinze, Hersey, and Durrant, and the reasons accepted.

064. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

064.1 Councillor Hodgson declared a substantial, personal interest in item 4(iii) on the Agenda (3 Portsmouth Wood Close) as this was the property where he lived, and so indicated that he would leave the room for the discussion of this item.

065. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 13 OCTOBER 2015.

065.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 13 October 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

066.1 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 for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

066.2 DM/15/3916 – 36 HIGH STREET
PROPOSED INTERNAL ALTERATIONS, REFURBISHMENT AND RESTORATION TO LISTED BUILDING.

Mr Jesson agreed that this was a very meritorious application, but raised a query on the heritage statement as to the apparent provision of gates and posts within the proposed works. The applicant responded that this paragraph could simply be deleted, and that these items were not in fact being constructed.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council commends this application for Listed Building Consent."

066.3 DM/15/3991 – 14 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
T1 – LIME TREE – FELL.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Parish Council's Tree Warden states that the tree is diseased and needs to be felled. Lindfield Parish Council agrees, and so there are no objections to this application."

066.4 DM/15/4010 – 3 PORTSMOUTH WOOD CLOSE
OAK (T20) – FELL.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. The Tree Warden states that it is an ugly tree, having been topped already. There are plenty of other Oaks on this land."

[Note: In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Hodgson left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.]

066.5 DM/15/4051 – SHENSTONE HOUSE, SHENSTONE
ROOF ALTERATIONS IN CONJUNCTION WITH A LOFT CONVERSION.

Mr Jesson welcomed the fact that the roof alteration would be a replacement with a pitched style of roof, but did note that the property would now be a seven bedroom house, and that there could be future pressure on car parking, which could have an impact on the surrounding area.

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

066.6 DM/15/3840 – OLD DAIRY COTTAGE & WALNUT COTTAGE, BACKWOODS CLOSE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO BOTH PROPERTIES.

Mr Jesson noted that policy B12 of MSDC's Local Plan 2004 applied, and that this strongly resisted the use of UPVC materials in windows. However, it was noted that the property already had these elements present within its existing appearance.

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

067. 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.

067.1 DM/15/3415 – Land north of Birchen Lane: The Deputy Clerk reported that this application had been considered at MSDC's District Wide Planning Committee on 29th October 2015. Although the planning officer's recommendation was to approve it, the Committee had unanimously resolved to refuse the application. It was understood that the progress of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan was a significant factor.

068. LINDFIELD TRAFFIC SURVEY/STUDY.

068.1 It was reported that three bids had been received in response to the brief. One was from Milestone Transport & Planning, another from Creative Roads Limited, and finally from Transport Planning & Highway Solutions. Two of the prices quoted were very close and well within budget, but the other one was significantly over budget. All three made provision for the payment of further un-costed work, should that prove necessary, on a variety of methods, mainly quoted hourly rates. It was also noted that the basis methodology behind all three bids was basically the same. This was to conduct the appropriate surveys in order to assess the problems, gather the data, and then establish and propose the traffic management solutions.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 068.2 Councillor Snowling raised a point about the timing of the study, given the work being done separately on HGV movements by the Lindfield Preservation Society, and their application for a Traffic Regulation Order. However, Councillor Blunden felt that the expectation of the Parish is that the Parish Council needs to act on the study with as little delay as possible, and this was generally supported. Councillor Plass said that he saw no reason why the two couldn't in fact be conducted in parallel. On the conduct of the preliminary work, Councillor Shortland said that it was important to make sure that the size of vehicles using the roads was captured in the survey. It would therefore be necessary to set appropriate parameters for the study, in sending out the eventual letter of acceptance.
- 068.3 Councillor Snowling said that he thought the funding gap with one of the bids would be difficult to bridge, and that the issue therefore came down to choosing between the other two. However, on the balance of the other two very close bids, one stood out.
- 068.4 Accordingly, it was **AGREED** to recommend to Council at its meeting on 12th November 2015, that the bid from Creative Roads should be accepted.

069. HAYWARDS HEATH CENTRE TRANSPORT STUDY.

- 069.1 Councillor Gomme referred to the comment he had previously made about the very high cost of the proposals, and that cyclists seemed to be a disproportionate beneficiary. Councillor Blunden said that he would be concerned by the loss of the one way system around Muster Green, and that this was a successful part of the existing scheme. He felt that the benefits of this system outweighed the benefits outlined in the proposal for changing it. Otherwise, it was agreed that the Parish Council should take a neutral stance, on the basis that it was principally a matter for Haywards Heath Town Council.
- 069.2 Accordingly, it was **AGREED** to respond to the consultation by thanking HHTC for consulting the Parish Council, and noting the study with interest.

070. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 070.1 Councillor Gomme informed the Committee that a consultation document had just been received from Haywards Heath Town Council on its Neighbourhood Plan. He said that as the closing date for responses was not until 14th December 2015, the document would be reviewed, and the matter will come back to the next meeting of the Committee on 24th November 2015.
- 070.2 Councillor Gomme informed the Committee that a letter had been received from a local resident dated 28th October addressed to both the Parish Council and the Lindfield Preservation Society. It raised concerns about planning issues in the Conservation Area (CA), both as to various works being carried out to residential properties and to High Street shops. Councillor Gomme said that he had spoken with John Jesson about the issue, and that they had an idea about how to improve the monitoring of properties within the CA. The matter will therefore come back to the next meeting of the Committee on 24th November 2015.

The Meeting concluded at 8.24 p.m.