

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson; Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
2 members of the public (1 of whom was present for part of the meeting only)

Not present: Councillors Mr. W. Blunden, Mrs J. Durrant and Mr. C. Snowling

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.

137. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

137.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blunden, Durrant and Snowling and the reasons accepted.

138. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

138.1 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.

138.2 Application DM/16/1476 – 18 Finches Park Road. Councillor Gomme declared a personal interest in this item as he lived relatively close to the property. The Clerk also made it known that she lived next door to this house; she had taken advice from SSALC and was not required to leave the room for this item.

139. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 19 APRIL 2016.

139.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 19 April 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

140.1 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.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 140.2 DM/16/1461 – 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.

Mr. N. Kerslake expressed objections to the proposal in terms of the impact of the enlarged building, with its contemporary design, on the adjacent Conservation Area and the Grade II Listed Building at 2 Old School Court from which he stated it would be highly visible. He added that approval application may result in people feeling more empowered to propose contemporary design in the Conservation Area.

Mr. J. Jesson commented that the Lindfield Preservation Society's main concern was the loss of a bungalow close to the village facilities. There were also concerns that the design was not ideal, but not unacceptable.

The applicant, Mrs. Wright, stated that the Planning Officer had found the previous plans to be just about acceptable except for the pitched roof to the garage and some other elements. The garage roof had now been flattened to minimise the impact on neighbouring properties and the other matters had been addressed in the amended plans. She had spoken to neighbours and expressed willingness to speak to any other residents about softening the impact with planting.

AGREED RESPONSE: "In considering its response to this amended application, Lindfield Parish Council noted that the applicant has taken steps to address the concerns of the Planning and Conservation Officers regarding the siting and design of the garage and the impact of the upper floor of the house on the Conservation Area..

We continue to have concerns about the loss of another bungalow and consider that the design is not ideal in the context of the locality. However, in view of the statement made by the Conservation Officer that the proposal would have a neutral impact on the setting of the Conservation Area and is considered to meet the requirements of the relevant policies, it would be difficult to justify objections on planning grounds, provided that the Planning and Conservation Officers are satisfied with the amended plans".

- 140.3 DM/16/1476 – 18 FINCHES PARK ROAD
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS.

Having declared a personal interest, Councillor Gomme left the room for the duration of this item. Councillor Hodgson, as Vice Chairman of the Committee, took the Chair.

Mr. Jesson commented that the proposed extension would double the footprint of the original house, but felt that this could be accommodated within the site, particularly in view of the concave curve in this line of houses, with the rear gardens tapering outwards. He considered the proposal to be just on the edge of acceptability and although the extension would be large it was not objectionable.

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

Councillor Gomme returned to the meeting and resumed the chair.

- 140.4 DM/16/1512 – 32 SUNTE AVENUE
T1 CONIFER - FELL. T2 ASH - FELL. T3 OAK (NEARLY DEAD) REDUCE BY 50%.

The comments from the Tree Warden were noted and it was agreed that they should be incorporated into the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: "We understand that the applicant has realised that permission is not required for the felling of the ash and conifer, however we will offer comments on the application as it stands.

We have no objection to the felling of the ash, which is a beautiful shape but is understood to be causing significant root damage to the adjacent block of garages, or to the felling of the conifer which again is

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

impressive in terms of its shape and size, but is clearly too large for its situation. The oak has a TPO on it and it is considered that a revised application for a 50% crown reduction would be more likely to be supported than an overall reduction of 50%, which seems excessive in view of the apparent lack of new growth at present”.

- 140.5 DM/16/1601 – 47B COMPTON ROAD
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR REPAIRS TO TWO CHIMNEYS TO MAKE SAFE. DISMANTLE AND REBUILD CHIMNEYS TO MATCH EXISTING.

Mr. Jesson stated that the work carried out appeared to be neat and tidy and similar to the repairs carried out at 43 and 45 Compton Road. However he commented on the use of cement to seal the stacks where they passed through the roof, which he felt was not appropriate in the Conservation Area and believed that this may have been picked up if the application had been submitted before the work was carried out. It was agreed to make this point in the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this retrospective application, however we would make the point that if this application had been lodged before the work was carried out, the use of cement fillets to seal around the chimney stacks where they pass through the roof, which is not considered appropriate in the Conservation Area, may have been picked up”.

- 140.6 DM/16/1668 – HIGH BEECH, ROUNDWOOD LANE
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR A TIMBER TREE HOUSE.

It was **NOTED** that the Committee would have considered supporting any objections from affected neighbours, but Members were not aware of any such objections.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council is unaware that the neighbouring residents have any concerns and therefore we have no objections to the tree house”.

- 140.7 DM/16/1697 – 2 WOODPECKER CHASE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed extension, we can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware”.

- 140.8 DM/16/1777 – 8 SHENSTONE (KEMBLE)
T1 LINDEN (LIME) TREE - OVERALL CROWN REDUCTION OF 3M AND RESHAPE. REMOVAL OF EPICORMIC GROWTH.

Mr. Jesson commented that this tree was a magnificent example and the work should be carefully thought about particularly as there was no report of disease or damage and because cutting it back would encourage further growth.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this proposal”.

141. **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.**

141.1 There were no matters to report under this item

142. **ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**

142.1 No other items of business were raised.

The Meeting concluded at 8.22 p.m.