

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **MONDAY 03 APRIL 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mrs. V Upton
Mr. W Blunden

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

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

Not present: Mr. R Plass, Mrs. M Hersey, and Mr. C Snowling.

In view of the recent resignation of the Chairman from the Parish Council, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Hodgson took the Chair in order to open the meeting. He duly welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

263. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR.

263.1 Councillor Hodgson called for nominations for the office of Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the remainder of the Council year 2016/17. Councillor Hodgson was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Blunden and **SECONDED** by Councillor Upton. There being no other nominations, Councillor Simon Hodgson was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2016/17.

264. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR.

264.1 Councillor Hodgson, having formally been elected to the Chair, called for nominations for the office of Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2016/17. Councillor Christopher Snowling was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Blunden and **SECONDED** by Councillor Upton. There being no other nominations, Councillor Snowling was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the remainder of the municipal year 2016/17.

265. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

265.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Plass, Councillor Snowling, and Councillor Hersey, and the reasons accepted.

266. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

266.1 Councillor Blunden declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda item 7(v) (The Palms, Lewes Road) as he is a Trustee of a neighbouring property. He therefore said that although he would not leave the room for the duration of the discussion of the item, he would neither speak nor vote on the matter.

267. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

267.1 There were none on this occasion.

268. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 14 MARCH 2017.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

268.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 14 March 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

269.1 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.

269.2 DM/17/0728 – 17 EASTERN ROAD PROPOSED REAR GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson observed that the rear elevation was not architecturally very pleasing, but that the LPS raises no objections.

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

269.3 DM/17/0928 – LINDFIELD COFFEE WORKS, REAR OF 70 HIGH STREET RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR CHANGE OF USE OF PREMISES TO CLASS CAFÉ (A3) WITH COFFEE ROASTERY AT THE REAR AND OUTDOOR SEATING AREA.

Mr Jesson said that in principle, the LPS supported businesses in Lindfield, but that the extended opening hours proposed were a concern. The LPS does not seek refusal, but a sensible set of planning conditions to control the use of the premises. Three members of the public spoke against the application. Points covered were noise transmission issues, outside smoking, traffic issues, and the effect on other similar businesses in Lindfield. It was noted that there are clear planning policies that seek to protect residential amenities (Policy B3 of the Local Plan). The applicant stated that there were other businesses in Alma Road, and that he is very aware of the issues. He said that appropriate measures would be put in place to control these. However, he needs the flexibility in terms of the hours in order to grow the business, and keep it as a good community facility in Lindfield.

Councillor Blunden said that he agreed with the concerns expressed by the residents, and couldn't support hours that went late into the evenings. Councillor Upton agreed, and particularly supported the objectives of policy B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan. In further points, it was noted that Alma Road may have been a busy road in the past, but was now generally serving a quiet residential area. It was generally agreed that the attachment of planning conditions would be a good way of solving the issues, but it was felt that these should not be specified by the Parish Council in detail. It was therefore agreed that the Deputy Clerk will finalise the response in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to the proposed use class of A3 (café). However, the Parish Council takes the view that nearby residents are justified in raising concerns about the proposed opening hours, particularly in respect of the usage of the patio area for the consumption of alcohol in the evening. There is a risk of noise and disturbance causing significant harm to the amenities of nearby residents, in contravention of Policies B2 and B3 of the Mid Sussex Local 2004 Plan, and policy 3 of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan. It is submitted that these issues could be mitigated by the use of appropriate planning conditions, such as those imposed in respect of other similar premises nearby, and that the hours of use should be restricted to those, which would be more appropriate to a sensible and reasonable mix of business use and residential amenity in this particular road.

269.4 DM/17/0839 - LAND PARCELS AT 533311 AND 125586 AT BIRCHEN LANE RESERVED MATTERS APPLICATION FOR THE APPROVAL OF THE APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION DM/15/3415 FOR RESIDENTIAL

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 40 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING, CAR PARKING, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, AND THE FORMATION OF ACCESS ROADS.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had not yet looked at this application in detail, but referred to other responses on the MSDC planning website, which although raising points, were generally supportive (given that outline consent had already been granted). Members of the public meanwhile, felt that the plans were totally inadequate, and failed to address a number of issues. For example how are the flood control measures (SUDs) to be managed? There were also issues about how the ambient light would be dealt with, so as to ensure that levels are kept to a minimum in this mainly rural area. The Plans submitted are therefore incomplete. Representatives from the Save Birchen Fields Group agreed to send through to the Deputy Clerk, a number of their concerns so as to help with the response. It was therefore agreed that the Deputy Clerk will therefore finalise a response in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

AGREED RESPONSE: Whilst only the northern part of the development falls within the Parish, Lindfield Parish Council very much supports and endorses the response of Haywards Heath Town Council dated 3rd April 2017, as to lay out, boundary treatment and screening, drainage and flooding, and the imposition of appropriate conditions. With regard to the drainage solutions (SUDS), it is particularly important to ensure that the responsibility for future maintenance and, any flooding issues, should those solutions ever fail, rests in perpetuity with the developer, and that appropriate bonds should be taken. In addition, the Council also supports concerns about street lighting, and the need to take steps in order to ensure that any lighting is appropriate for a rural area, and that light pollution is kept to an absolute minimum.

269.5 DM/16/0755 – 6 ALMA ROAD
PROPOSED SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson referred to the Village Design Statement, and the objective contained within it, that extensions should seek to blend in with the particular property, rather than stand out as such for all time. The applicant said that she rather agreed, and will take those points on board in coming to the final design. A member of the public spoke whole heartedly in favour of the application.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, as long as matching materials and finishes are used.

269.6 DM/17/1029 – THE PALMS, LEWES ROAD
EXTENSION, ALTERATION AND ADDITION OF FIRST FLOOR TO CREATE A TWO STOREY, 4 BEDROOM DWELLING, TOGETHER WITH THE ERECTION OF A NEW DETACHED GARAGE.

Mr Jesson said that the application was a big improvement on the previous one, but still felt that the loss of a bungalow was a concern. The applicant said that in consultation with MSDC, the previous issues had been overcome, and noted that the previous application had in principle, been supported by the Parish Council. However, Councillors now took the view that in view of the overall planning concerns, it would be difficult to support the application.

AGREED RESPONSE: In considering the response to this new application, there is still concern about the loss of another bungalow in the Village. In view of this concern, and the considerable impact the proposal would have on neighbouring properties in terms of the objectives of Policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan, as well as on the street scene, it is felt on reconsidering the matter and in the light of the grounds for the refusal of the previous application, the application cannot be supported.

(Note: In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Blunden took no part in the discussion of this item.)

269.7 DM/17/1032 – 27 BLACKTHORNS
GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSIONS INCLUDING NEW PORCH AND DRIVEWAY. REVISED SCHEME TO APPROVAL DM/16/2898.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application as long as matching materials and finishes are used.

- 269.8 DM/17/1147 – CHANTRY COTTAGE, 121 HIGH STREET
(T1) PINE - FELL. (T2) ORNAMENTAL CONIFER - FELL.

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

- 269.9 DM/17/0961 – 21 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
GROUND FLOOR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND CONVERSION/ RECONFIGURATION
TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

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

- 269.10 DM/17/1086 – 32 CHESTNUTS CLOSE
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that it was difficult to support the proposal on the grounds of bulk and design. It did not comply with the objectives of Policy B1 of the Local Plan.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has issues with the bulk and design of the proposed extension, and finds the overall effect unsympathetic. As such, the Parish Council takes the view that it does not meet the objectives of policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004.

- 269.11 DM/17/1189 – 6 THE GLEBE
FIELD MAPLE - REMOVE. HOLLY - REDUCE BACK TO MAIN FORK.

(Deferred to next meeting, as the description has been amended, and the application re-advertised.)

- 269.12 DM/17/1248 – 10 WOODPECKER CHASE
OAK (T1) 3 METRE CROWN REDUCTION, SYCAMORE (T2) 3 METRE CROWN REDUCTION, 25%
THINNING AND CROWN LIFTING TO 5 METRES.

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

- 270. 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.**

- 270.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that the licensing application for the premises to be known as Tamasha Restaurant, formerly the White Horse Public House, 22 High Street, Lindfield, will be heard by Mid Sussex District Council (the Licensing Authority) at 10.00 a.m. on Friday, 21st April 2017. As an interested party, the Parish Council has been advised of its right to attend, and must submit the Regulation 8 Notice (confirmation of attendance or otherwise) by 13th April 2017.

- 270.2 It was thought that the Vice-Chairman might be interested in attending, but the Deputy Clerk indicated that he would in any event, be prepared to attend the hearing on behalf of the Parish Council. It was however, agreed that no further representation was necessary, and that the written submission previously made to the Licensing Authority should be relied upon.

- 271. BUDGETARY MATTERS.**

- 271.1 The Chairman introduced the paper, which set out the Committee's budget progress report for 2016/17. All payments up to the financial year end 31.03.17 were recorded, and the available balances of the budget heads set out.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

271.2 This showed that the balances (as at year end) were £150 for the miscellaneous budget head, £14,507.12 for the professional fees/neighbourhood planning budget, and £6,397.13 for the traffic study budget. The budget progress report was therefore duly **NOTED**.

272. TO RECEIVE AN UPDATE ON THE PROGRESS OF THE TRAFFIC SURVEY.

272.1 The Deputy Clerk reported as follows:-

A meeting was held with Roger Harper, the Traffic Consultant, on 20th March 2017. Roger Harper has a list of all the comments and input made by members of the public, and the "Residents Group" in response to the interim report, which was published on the website some months ago. Roger is looking at the comments, with a view to analysing and responding on them, particularly as regards the suggestion that Denmans Lane be reopened to traffic. The results of the modelling for the High Street/Lewes junction traffic lights, carried out by Talent were reported. This gave 3 options for the phasing of the traffic lights at the junction, assuming that it was agreed to go ahead with that idea. He did indicate that based on the results, he didn't think that a trial would be necessary. Option 1 is based on the signals operating in four stages: 1) High Street northbound, (2) High Street southbound, (3) Pedestrians crossing High Street, (4) Lewes Road. Option 2 is based on signals operating in four stages: High Street in both directions, (2) High Street northbound, (3) Pedestrians crossing High Street, (4) Lewes Road. Option 3 is based on signals operating, (1) High Street northbound and pedestrians crossing High Street southbound, (2) High Street southbound and pedestrians crossing High Street northbound, (3) Lewes Road. In terms of increasing capacity and queuing lengths, it was considered that although option 3 gives a better queuing time, option 2 gives the overall better performance, and so it is recommended that the Parish Council starts with that one. It was noted for example, that option 3 gives a staggered crossing, which is considered a disadvantage. Roger Harper will be doing further work to appraise the various options, but will concentrate on option 2. It was acknowledged that the problem of "rat running" is difficult to stop whatever is done, although Roger Harper did present one radical idea of making the section of the Lewes Road up to the High Street eastbound traffic only, so requiring all westbound traffic to go down Gravelye Lane. However, it was agreed that there were many problems and obstacles with this proposal, which would be difficult to overcome. It was noted that traffic is now beginning to make more use of the Haywards Heath by-pass road, which helps traffic flows in Lindfield. The issue of 20 mph speed limits throughout the Village would need to be justified to, and supported by West Sussex County Council. In Roger's experience this is not easy to achieve. Possibly the only solution for the Hickmans Lane/High Street junction is the use of differential road marking and colouring. Consideration however, is to be given to restricted use for buses, cyclists, and pedestrians only. Solutions need to be seen in the context of the ever expanding housing developments nearby, particularly if the Wates application for a further 200 houses and a full form entry School is consented (on appeal in May). Roger will take away the various points from the discussion, and prepare an outline drawing for all the issues, with a view to presenting a further, formal report along with appropriate recommendations.

272.2 The report was duly **NOTED**.

273. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

273.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.55 p.m.