

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 08 MARCH 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mr. W. Blunden
Mrs. J. Durrant
Mrs. M. Hersey
Mr. S. Shortland

Also present:

Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
4 members of the public (until the conclusion of Minute 115.2)

In attendance:

Mrs. C. Irwin (Parish Clerk).

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

112. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

112.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Upton, Snowling, Hodgson and Plass and the reasons accepted.

113. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

113.1 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 Planning Committee A, the District wide Planning Committee, or at any meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen officers' reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow Members.

113.2 Councillor Blunden declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 4 (iv) - 54 Meadow Lane as he owned the next door property.

114. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 16 FEBRUARY 2016.

114.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 16 February 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

115.1 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, where necessary, to alter the order of the Agenda for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

115.2 DM/16/0119 – CHIMNEY CORNER, HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY GARDEN ROOM EXTENSION (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 22 FEBRUARY 2016).

The resident of the adjoining property, The Old Farmhouse, who had not raised objections to the original proposal, but had objected to the previous revised plans, explained that without further amendment this

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

further set of amended plans would not mitigate the overbearing impact and loss of outlook and amenity that would result, because of the height of the proposed extension and its proximity to the mutual boundary.

Mr. Jesson stated that LPS still had concerns that the extension would be intrusive.

The applicant spoke in defence of the amended plans which he believed were in keeping with the existing architecture and should not affect light levels. The building would be extended by less than 5 metres to the north and ceiling height had been reduced as far as possible.

During discussion it was noted that attempts had been made to address the objections: the proposed height of the building had been reduced by 750mm. However members were not convinced the objective had been achieved. Councillors Gomme and Shortland, who had paid a site visit, confirmed that the neighbours' privacy would not be affected because the east elevation would be a solid wall, with no windows, but it would affect outlook and light. It was felt that an objection should be made so that these concerns would receive further consideration by the Planning Officer.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We note that the height of the proposed extension has been reduced by approximately 750mm, however in view of the as yet unresolved concerns of the neighbours at The Old Farmhouse in terms of loss of outlook and amenity due to the height of the proposed extension, contrary to Local Plan policy, Lindfield Parish Council continues to object to the proposal.

115.3 DM/15/4936 – HEATHERS, BRUSHES LANE
ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING RESIDENTIAL ANNEXE TO FORM SEPARATE RESIDENTIAL UNIT.

Mr. Jesson stated that LPS could see no planning reason for raising objections. However there were concerns that work had begun on the conversion although the form stated that it had not.

During discussion it was suggested by Members that the work which had been started may have been covered by the previous application. It was agreed that there were no objections on planning grounds, although there was some regret at the changes to what had been a beautiful house.

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

115.4 DM/16/0476 – 14A SUMMERHILL DRIVE
PROPOSED ALTERATIONS AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION.

Mr. Jesson stated that this infill development between the existing house and the garage, would result in a massive single structure, verging on overdevelopment because of its bulk.

Councillor Hersey reported that when viewing the plans she and Councillor Plass had shared the opinion of LPS, but having seen the property from outside and having spoken to the neighbour, who had confirmed that they had no objections, they did not consider that the objections should be made.

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

115.5 DM/15/0522 – 69B HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION, AND CHANGE OF USE FROM EXISTING OFFICE AND CLINIC TO RESIDENTIAL, TO FORM NEW 1 BEDROOM APARTMENT.

Mr. Jesson stated that the proposed extension would not be highly visible but expressed some reservations about the loss of potential retail space to the rear of the boutique.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 115.6 DM/16/0540 – 54 MEADOW LANE
SINGLE STOREY ENCLOSED PORCH TO FRONT ELEVATION WITH WC.

Councillor Blunden, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest in this item, withdrew from the meeting room for the duration of this item.

Mr. Jesson stated that the proposed porch would come 2.4 metres forward of the front building line, but the impact on the street scene would be limited due to the fact that the ground fell steeply.

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

Councillor Blunden re-joined the meeting.

- 115.7 DM/16/0541 – 3 FRANCIS ROAD
REPLACE WINDOWS AND FRONT DOOR WITH UPVC DOUBLE GLAZED SASH WINDOWS AND COMPOSITE WHITE WOOD GRAIN FRONT DOOR.

Councillors Gomme, Shortland and Snowling, who had viewed the plans, had noted that similar works had been carried out on other houses in Francis Road. Councillor Snowling had added that use of UPVC was contrary to Conservation Area policy and should not be supported.

Mr. Jesson agreed that traditional materials should be used and stated that a precedent to affect the whole area should not be allowed.

During discussion it was noted that there had been an exchange of correspondence between the applicant and Planning Officer including a photograph to illustrate replacement windows at other properties in Francis Road. It was agreed that the application should not be supported and that the response should include a request for the Parish Council to be notified of any change in policy regarding replacement windows in the Conservation Area.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council objects to the proposal as the use of UPVC for the replacement windows in the Conservation Area would be contrary to Policy B12 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan and should not be supported. The application form notes the pre-application advice referring to other properties in the road with double glazing but does not identify the materials the frames are constructed from. We would ask to be notified of any change in policy regarding replacement windows in the Conservation Area.

- 115.8 DM/16/0609 – 56 FIELDWAY
NEW PORCH.

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

- 115.9 DM/16/0581 – 7 DENMANS LANE
APPLICATION FOR THE DEMOLITION OF A GARDEN WALL, ADDITION OF PAVED AREA TO FRONT GARDEN, AND DROPPING OF THE KERB.

Mr. Jesson had noted that similar work had been done at number 5 and he that the Conservation Area boundary on the Conservation Area maps available was along the front boundary of the row of cottages, but it was unclear whether or not the wall was within the Conservation Area, but he believed that it was not.

It was agreed to raise no objections, but to include the point about the Conservation Area boundary as regards the wall.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Conservation Area boundary runs along the front boundary of this group of cottages and is delineated on the available maps by a relatively thick line, making it difficult to identify

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

whether the front garden wall is within the Conservation Area or just outside it. Nevertheless, Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application”.

- 115.10 DM/16/0790 – 84 AND 88 HIGH STREET
(T1) - NORWAY SPRUCE- FELL. (T2 AND T3) - WALNUT - REDUCE THE CANOPIES ON THE SOUTHERN SIDE BY 3 METRES.

Mr. Jesson stated that he had been unable to see the walnut tree and could not therefore tell whether the proposed work would result in an unbalanced tree.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to the proposed tree work, provided that the Tree Officer is satisfied that the canopy of the walnut tree will be balanced on completion”.

- 116. 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.**

- 116.1 DM/15/2385 – 75A High Street (retention and continued use of replacement glass panels and metal posts serving raised decking). **NOTED:** although the Planning and Traffic Committee had raised no objections to this application at the meeting on 30 June 2015, MSDC had refused permission and the applicant had appealed. The Planning Inspector had dismissed the appeal as she had considered the proposal to be out of keeping and there were no public benefits or other justification to outweigh the harm to the Conservation Area.

- 116.2 DM/16/0023 – Site opposite 1 Grahams Cottages, Spring Lane. **NOTED:** this application for conversion of a detached garage to a single one-bedroom dwelling, to which the Parish Council had objected, had been refused by MSDC.

- 117. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**

- 117.1 Pre- application discussion. It was **NOTED** that a developer had approached the Parish Council, seeking pre-application discussion about proposals for a small scale building project within the built area of the village. The Chairman pointed out that it was not the Council’s practice for Councillors to enter into pre-application discussions, but it was suggested that the developer could be invited to meet with the Clerk and Deputy Clerk to talk over the proposals in the context of the Neighbourhood Plan and the Village Design Statement.

The Meeting concluded at 8.47 p.m.