

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 10 JANUARY 2017** 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. S Shortland.  
Mr. R Plass.  
Mrs. M Hersey  
Mrs. V Upton  
Mr. C Snowling

**Also present:** Mr John Jesson; Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).  
Councillor C Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council)  
1 member of the public.

**Not present:** Councillor Mr. W Blunden.

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

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

**231. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

231.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Blunden, and the reason accepted.

**232. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

232.1 Councillor Snowling declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda item 4(vi) (King Edward Hall) as he is a trustee of the King Edward Hall, which is the subject property for the tree in question. He said that he would therefore leave the room for the duration of the discussion of the item.

232.2 Councillor Plass declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda item 4(vi), (King Edward Hall) as he is a member of King Edward Hall Management Committee, the KEH being the subject property for the tree in question. He said that he would therefore neither speak nor vote in the matter.

**233. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 20 DECEMBER 2016.**

233.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 20 December 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting. However, it was noted that there were some issues with regard to the Minutes, which would be raised under item 8 on the Agenda (Any Other Business).

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

234.1 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.

234.2 DM/15/2908 – POSTMASTERS, 34 HIGH STREET  
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF A TIMBER SUMMER HOUSE TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY, AND REPLACEMENT FENCING.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Kerslake said that he supported the proposed response, and referred to his letter sent to MSDC, in which he had set a number of planning policy objections to the application. This had been seen by all Members, and he urged that similar policies should be stated. Mr Jesson said that because of problems with the loading of the electronic file at MSDC, he had only just seen the completed application, and that therefore his comments were his own, rather than on behalf of the LPS. He raised a number of concerns with the proposal, in terms of the lack of information on the flag pole, e.g. as to its nature and location. He also said that the Village Design Statement required that properties of this type and location should be looked at as a group, rather than individually.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council comments on the replacement of the picket fence, that prior to World War II, it is most likely that there were metal railings in place, but to restore them now, although it may be correct in an historic sense, would not be appropriate, unless all the fences in front of this row of cottages were to be replaced with metal railings. The proposal is not therefore in keeping with the appearance of the Conservation Area, and so the Parish Council regards it as being in breach of policies B1, B10 and B11 of the 2004 Local Plan. In regard to the Garden Room/Studio, this appears to have been erected in accordance with the 2015 application. Overall however, we consider that this new retrospective application is not supported by complete and proper documentation, and so the application is of an unacceptable standard. For example, there is no indication of the nature, and the location of the flag pole. We cannot therefore support the application at the present time.

234.3 DM/16/5361 – SECKHAMS, 117 HIGH STREET  
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT TIMBER GARDEN BUILDING AND REPAIRS TO EXISTING BOUNDARY FENCE.

Mr Jesson said that there was some concern with regard to the potential for noise to the neighbouring property, given that the structure was very near to the boundary of the neighbouring property, and given that it is unclear what the building would be used for. It could for example be used as a workshop.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, but as the location of the structure is very close to the neighbouring property, there should be a condition on use, such that the amenity of the neighbours, particularly in terms of possible noise disturbance, is adequately safeguarded.

234.4 DM/16/5384 – 26A BY SUNTE  
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR SIDE EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that the proposed work was out of character with the previous work along the line of houses in this street, and felt that it might serve to close in the entrance to Fieldway. He also said that whilst it was stated that matching materials would be used, it needed to be clear that this applied particularly to the brickwork. Also, there were grounds for objection as the tile hung detail is not in keeping with the existing extension.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council notes that matching materials are to be used. However, the tile hung detail is not in keeping with the previous extension, and there is a need to match particularly the brickwork. The Parish Council cannot therefore currently support the application, unless these concerns are met by the attachment of appropriate conditions.

(Due to an error, it was noted that the Agenda incorrectly described the property as 26A Sunte Avenue.)

234.5 DM/16/5425 – 31 PICKERS GREEN  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SUN ROOM AND ITS REPLACEMENT WITH A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

234.6 DM/16/4906 – 4 ALMA ROAD  
REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED 20.12.16.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson said that there was a need to bolster the matching materials point, particularly as regards the treatment of the roof, and the painting colour to be used.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council notes that matching materials are to be used. However, it needs to be clear that the roof should be slate, and that the application of white coloured paint should be restricted to the ground floor. The Parish Council cannot therefore currently support the application, unless these concerns are met by the attachment of appropriate conditions. It should be clear that the use of any materials or finishes beyond those matching the existing, should be the subject of a separate application.

234.7 DM/16/5552 – KING EDWARD HALL, 24 HIGH STREET  
(T1) LIME - FELL.

Mr Jesson pointed out, and was concerned by, the lack of technical evidence provided with the application. He felt that the application should not have been validated without this information. He agreed that it may indeed be that the damage being done by the tree is an issue, but this should be supported by the appropriate evidence as the application form requires.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application in principle, but would like to have seen the written technical evidence, or expert's appraisal of the problems, which the reasoning for the felling of the tree, sets out. Despite this seemingly being a requirement of box 8 in the application form, no such evidence has been provided.

(In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Snowling left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.)

234.8 DM/16/5555 – 20 SUNTE AVENUE  
PROPOSED DORMER WINDOW TO FRONT ELEVATION MATCHING THE ADJOINING  
NEIGHBOUR.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has objections to this application, subject to materials matching the existing.

**235. 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.**

235.1 DM/16/2333 – Land at Barrington Close/High Beech Lane, Lindfield: Application by Reside Developments to build approximately 49 dwellings on the land. Councillor Hersey reported that this application had recently been withdrawn by the applicant, although the Deputy Clerk pointed out that the Parish Council had not received any official confirmation of this from MSDC.

**236. PROPOSAL BY WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL TO INSTALL ROAD SIGNAGE IN EACH DIRECTION ALONG THE LEWES ROAD, WARNING OF THE NARROWING OF THE ROAD AT THE HIGH STREET END.**

236.1 Various Committee members, Mr Jesson, and Mr Kerslake all spoke out against the proposal. However, Mr Jesson said that as he had only just seen the proposal, his comments had to be of a personal nature, rather than on behalf of the LPS. However, points and concerns with regard to the proposal include that the signs are in the wrong place, they will not enhance the Conservation Area or the street scene, they would not improve safety, and they would be likely to be constantly being damaged by vehicles. Mr Kerslake said that this was a sensitive matter, and that WSCC should have consulted with the Parish Council first. Councillor Hersey wondered where the proposal had come from, and had an actual site visit been done by the WSCC officer concerned?

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

236.2 It was **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk respond to WSCC outlining all of the above points, and ask for an on-site meeting with the appropriate highways officer in order to discuss the matter further. It would also be important to copy in, and to involve the Lindfield West Sussex County Councillor, Councillor Christine Field.

### 237. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

237.1 With regard to minute 228.2 of the Committee's meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> December 2016, Councillor Hersey wanted to make clear that the MSDC Ward Councillors had received some advance warning of the planning matter (DM/16/2012) to be taken under urgent business at the District Wide Planning Committee meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> December 2016, albeit that it was at very short notice. Councillor Lea had also indicated that there had been "little" rather than "no" notice of the matter. Councillor Hersey also pointed out that she had said that she had a right to speak at the meeting as a Ward Councillor, and so had expressed her deep regret and disappointment at the decision taken by MSDC. She said that the decision would have consequences not just for Lindfield but for the whole of Mid Sussex. On a separate point in the same minute, Councillor Lea had said that he had "sympathised with Mr Jesson's points, rather than "agreed".

The meeting concluded at 8.42 p.m.