

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

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

Present: Parish Councillors: Mr A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mr S. Hodgson
Mr M. Amor
Mr R. Plass

Also present: Mr John Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) and 2 members of the public

In attendance: Mr I. McLean (Deputy Clerk)

Absent: Councillors Mrs J. Chatfield, Mr C Snowling, Mr W Blunden, Mrs M Hersey, and Mrs V Upton.

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

355. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

355.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chatfield, Snowling, Blunden and Upton, and the reasons were accepted. Councillor Hersey had previously indicated that she may not be able to attend the meeting due to personal circumstances.

356. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

356.1 There were none received.

357. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

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

358. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 13 AUGUST 2013.

358.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 13 August 2013. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

359.1 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.

359.2 13/02526/FUL – 14 OAK BANK
DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

359.3 13/02567/FUL – 42 SAVILL ROAD
FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION OVER GARAGE, SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO KITCHEN AND NEW PORCH.

The applicant stated that the application was similar to other extensions that had been carried out in the immediate area. The exterior treatment would be more rendering than pebble dashing. Likewise the new

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

front door was similar in style and appearance to others. The applicant was proposing a much needed face lift for the property and to obtain extra space for his extending family.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no problem with the proposed lay out. However, it does have some concerns about the rendering proposal (pebble dash) of the exterior, as this would appear to be out of keeping with the neighbouring properties. It is also not clear what colour the exterior finishes will be as regards the rendering and the windows. The Council also notes the intention to fit an oak front door – again out of keeping with neighbouring properties. If permission is granted, the proposed colours and exterior finishes should be reserved matters".

359.4 13/02653/FUL – 76 MEADOW LANE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO FORM A DINING ROOM.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

359.5 13/02660/FUL – DUKES BARN COURT, NEWTON ROAD
DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUILDING CONTAINING 14 FLATS AND THE ERECTION OF TWO NEW BUILDINGS CONTAINING 7 HOUSES AND 4 FLATS (11 UNITS TOTAL) INCLUDING ACCESS, CAR PARKING, CYCLE STORAGE, BIN STORE AND LANDSCAPING.

Mr Jesson particularly endorsed the proposed comment about the surrounding roads in terms of their condition and repair after the construction. He raised the issue of the lack of a recycling bin storage area in the plans. It was agreed to refer to this in the response.

Councillor Plass mentioned the need to avoid "builders' creep", and to ensure that the construction site was contained. The ability for neighbouring properties to continue to park in surrounding roads must not be compromised. This all needed to be covered in the Management Plan.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application, but would like to see a comprehensive Management Plan for the demolition and construction. This needs to particularly address the containment of contractors' vehicles and equipment, as surrounding roads should not become clogged to the detriment of nearby residents. The Council would also want to see the appropriate contractual measures being put in place, involving West Sussex County Council (as the Highways Authority) as appropriate, for ensuring that any damage caused to the surrounding roads (Newton Road, Dukes Road and Luxford Road) following the construction is made good at the developer's expense. Finally, the Council notes that there appears to be no provision for a recycling bin storage area, and feels that this issue should also be addressed."

359.6 13/02750/FUL – 1 THE WILDERNESS
GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION WITH BEDROOM ACCOMMODATION IN ROOF TO EAST ELEVATION AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER WESTERN END OF THE PROPERTY. WIDENING OF ENTRANCE AND INTERNAL WORKS.

Mr Jesson commented that although the property was not in an area of Townscape merit, the character of the development needed to be respected. There was some concern about the nature of the front elevation in terms of the materials being used. Although a large extension, the site was large enough to accommodate it, and LPS had no objection in principle.

The immediate neighbour expressed concern about the size of the proposal, which would abut right up to his boundary. There will be a loss of privacy, and the appearance of the houses in the development would be compromised.

Councillor Hodgson referred to the design issues, and appearance of the development. He could not support the application. Councillor Plass had some similar concerns. Councillor Amor said that the property was far less dominating than other properties, as it was set down lower. The reduction in gap

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

between the properties was an issue, but was permissible.

As there was a difference of opinion emerging amongst Councillors, the Chairman decided to put the matter to a formal vote. On the first resolution “that the response be as read out”, this was lost by two votes to one, with one abstention. On the second resolution “that the response be changed to take account of the views and representations received” the resolution was carried by two votes to one, with one abstention.

AGREED RESPONSE: “The Parish Council is not able to support this application on the grounds that it is unneighbourly by virtue of its size and bulk. As such it contravenes the principles of policies B1 (a) and (c) of the 2004 Mid Sussex Local Plan.”

359.7 13/02832/FUL – CROFT END, PONDCROFT ROAD
EXTEND EXISTING DORMER TO ENABLE A LINK CORRIDOR TO EXISTING ISOLATED BEDROOM OVER GARAGE.

Mr Jesson commented that the brickwork of the property was unusual, and the applicant was to be commended in sourcing this from other parts of the work, so as to remain in keeping.

AGREED RESPONSE: “There are no objections to this application.”

360. 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.

360.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that the planning application for 42 Sunte Avenue for a first floor side extension over garage and associated improvements (ref: 13/02346/FUL) had been approved by MSDC despite the objections of the Parish Council and the immediate neighbour at 44 Sunte Avenue, principally on the grounds of the adverse effect of the proposal on the enjoyment of sunlight to the adjoining conservatory.

361. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

361.1 The Chairman read out a statement updating the Committee on progress with the Neighbourhood Plan over the summer. This referred to the receipt of the State of the Parishes report in August and the Parish profiles. It mentioned that the Neighbourhood Plan Development proposal has now been drafted. Work is on-going, along with Action in Rural Sussex, regarding input to the process of now actually writing the draft Plan. This will hopefully be in a form in October such that discussions with MSDC can take place upon it. The submission from Great Walstead School regarding the proposed inclusion in the plan for a housing development was also referred to. This matter is currently being considered. The Chairman also referred to the encouraging comments of the examiner in respect of the Tattenhall Parish Council Neighbourhood Plan, and also the new planning guidance available on the Department of Communities and Local Government website under the “planning policy guidance” link. This contained the latest ministerial guidance on the weight to be attached to emerging Local Development Plans at District level, and also emerging Neighbourhood Plans at local Parish Council level.

362. PLANNING APPLICATION FROM WATES (REF: 13/02746/COU) – GRAVELYE LANE/LYOTH LANE.

362.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the item and stated that, although a matter primarily for Lindfield Rural Parish Council (LRPC), the Committee should be aware of the application given its input into the original planning applications now approved by MSDC. The reasons for the change in boundaries of the approved site for the informal recreation area, did not seem particularly clear. Mr Jesson referred to the email from Terry Oliver, with particular reference to the boardwalks proposed for the site. There was concern that the on-going maintenance of these structures should be raised with MSDC. An appropriate condition would be needed. The ecology and drainage issues were also referred to. It was agreed that the Committee’s feedback, to include the above issues, would be sent to LRPC.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

363. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

363.1 No other items of business were raised.

The Meeting concluded at 8.42 p.m.