

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **MONDAY 03 OCTOBER 2016** 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. C Snowling
Mr. S Shortland
Mrs. V Upton

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

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

Not present: Mr. W Blunden, Mrs. M Hersey, and Mr. R Plass.

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

192. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

192.1 Retrospective apologies were received from Councillors Blunden, Hersey, and Plass.

193. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

193.1 There were none declared.

194. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

194.1 Mr Jesson noted that this was the first full meeting since the appeal relating to the housing development at fields at Birchen Lane had been allowed on appeal. He stated that the LPS were concerned about the Statement of Common Ground (SCG) agreed by MSDC in relation to that matter, and that it didn't contain any real fight against the application. The LPS was therefore disappointed with MSDC's contribution to the document, and had also noted that it had not been signed by an MSDC officer. He has now seen the SCG for the Scamps Hill planning appeal, and although this wasn't much better, it had at least, been signed by an MSDC officer. He took the view that MSDC should be making a lot more of the document to define, and fight their case.

194.2 Mr Kerslake stated, in regard to the Palms planning appeal (reported at minute 197.1 below), that he had concerns about errors being made by planning officers, and noted that because the "consultation" letter issued by MSDC in connection with the appeal had been incorrect, the further submission agreed by the Committee at its meeting on 23rd August 2016, had also been rejected by the Planning Inspectorate. He therefore said that this made it even more important, when the Parish Council was objecting to an application, to state clearly the precise planning policies relating to the objection, as it was possible that in relation to a subsequent appeal, the Parish Council might not get a further opportunity to add to its case. He also suggested that in deciding its responses generally, it would be advisable not to take account of (or rely on) the opinions of the particular planning or conservation officer at MSDC, as their views would be part of the planning report in any event.

195. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 13 SEPTEMBER 2016.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

195.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 13 September 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

196.1 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.

196.2 DM/16/3664 – 30 NEWTON ROAD
PROPOSED RAMP ACCESS TO FRONT DOOR.

Mr Jesson said that he understood the purpose and reason for this application, but felt that there were better alternatives, which did not lead to such an extensive concreting over of the front garden. It will have a sense of permanence, notwithstanding future ownership. Councillor Snowling said that he sympathised with the point, but felt that given the purpose of the application to provide a disabled access, it couldn't be objected to.

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

196.3 DM/16/3739 – OLD DAIRY COTTAGE, 1B BACKWOODS CLOSE
ASH TREE T1 REDUCE LOWER LIMB BY THE EDGE OF THE PATIO BY UP TO 2 METRES.

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

196.4 DM/16/3747 – WHITESANDS, LEWES ROAD
SIDE AND REAR TWO STOREY EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that he agreed with the Parish Council's proposed response, but added his concern about the extent and painting of the external rendering. It was agreed to add this point to the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: As the proposed extension facing Noahs Ark Lane would adversely affect the open aspect of the entrance to that estate, Lindfield Parish Council objects to the application. As such its scale and bulk is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area and the street scene. It does not therefore comply with Local Plan policies, notably policy B1 and H9 of the 2004 Local Plan. The Parish Council is also concerned by the extent of the proposed rendering, and the white painting of these areas, which will be very prominent and stark, in contrast to the other properties on this side of the Lewes Road.

196.5 DM/16/3737 – 63 DENMANS LANE
T1 AND T2 OAK TREES - REDUCE CANOPY ON THE HOUSE SIDE BY UP TO 1.5M AND REMOVE EPICORMIC GROWTH ON TRUNK.

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

196.6 DM/16/3797 – 30 APPLIEDORE GARDENS
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that this was a much better proposal, and justified the stance taken on previous applications for an extension to this property.

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

196.7 DM/16/3871 – 53 BROOKWAY

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY WITH GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO REAR OF PROPERTY.

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

- 196.8 DM/16/3879 – 18 WEST COMMON DRIVE
TWO STOREY EXTENSION OVER EXISTING GARAGE WITH DORMER TO THE REAR.

Mr Jesson noted that this related to a previous application, but with the addition of a further dormer. As previously, there may be overlooking concerns, but accepted that there are not sufficient grounds for objecting, particularly as permitted development rights could apply.

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

- 196.9 DM/16/3902 – 1 BACKWOODS LANE
FELL (T1) - CHERRY TREE.

Mr Jesson said that he was pleased to see the re-planting proposal, and this sentiment was endorsed by the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, and is particularly pleased to note the replanting proposal put forward in the application.

- 196.10 DM/16/3905 - ALONG SUMMERS LANE (BEFORE SUMMERS REACH), SCHOOL LANE
(T1) YEW - FELL. (T2) YEW - CROWN REDUCE ON SOUTH EAST AND WEST SIDE BY UP TO 1.5M.

Mr Jesson noted that this was in effect the evolution of previous applications, but that now it was proposed to fell one of the Yews. He said that there didn't appear to be a tree report to justify the proposals, and was concerned by this. However, it was accepted that the MSDC Tree Officer would have to be satisfied about the application.

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

- 197. 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.**

- 197.1 DM/16/1461 (AP/16/0056) – 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 the appeal had been dismissed in the Planning Inspectorate's report dated 22nd September 2016 in that it fails to meet the standard of urban design required by policies B1 and H9 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004, not respecting the character of the locality, especially neighbouring buildings, their landscape and townscape setting.

- 197.2 DM/16/3285 – 94, The Welkin. Proposed replacement of existing fence and new fence to enclose shed. Wooden fence 2m height: The Deputy Clerk reported that this application had been refused by MSDC on 26th September 2016, as by virtue of its length and siting, the proposed close boarded fence is considered to be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area, and does not comply with planning policies, including those contained in the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan.

- 197.3 DM/16/1263 – Allens Wall, Black Hill. Erection of new detached dwelling and garage with subsequent demolition of existing detached dwelling and garage: The Deputy Clerk reported that this application has been withdrawn as at 30th September 2016.

- 198. BUDGETARY MATTERS.**

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

198.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, which set out the Committee's budget progress report for 2016/17. All payments up to 30.09.16 were recorded. Items of forthcoming expenditure not yet recorded, are the agreed contribution payments to Lindfield Rural Parish Council relating to the costs incurred for the Scamps Hill planning application (see minutes of the meeting held on 13th September 2016), and also the first invoice for £4,125.25 received from the traffic consultant regarding the report referred to below. The budget progress report was duly **NOTED**.

199. UPDATE ON TRAFFIC SURVEY/STUDY.

199.1 The interim (phase 1) report from the traffic consultant had been received, and circulated to all Councillors prior to this meeting. It was a lengthy document, and contained a great deal of data and helpful information. However, it needed careful consideration as to the options and solutions being put forward for the traffic problems addressed in the report. It was noted that some of the solutions would be very costly, and their affordability could be a stumbling block. It was felt that the recommendations would need to be discussed with the consultant, and that a meeting would therefore be arranged as soon as possible. It would be necessary to ensure that West Sussex County Council Highways were aware of the report sooner rather than later, and were involved in how best to take it forward. This would also need to be done in conjunction with keeping Councillor Christine Field, local WSCC ward Councillor, fully informed.

199.2 It was **AGREED** that the report should be published on the website, so that if anyone had any views, these could be communicated to the Parish Council.

200. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

200.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.28 p.m.