

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 10 OCTOBER 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at **20.00**

Present:

Parish Councillors:

Mr. C Snowling (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs V Upton
Mrs. M Hersey
Mrs. S Richmond

Also present:

Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
9 members of the public.

In attendance:

Mr. A Funnell (Parish Clerk)
Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

Not present:

Mr S. Hodgson (Chairman)
Mr W Blunden
Mr. R Plass

In the Committee Chairman's absence the Vice Chairman, Councillor Snowling, chaired the meeting.

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

338. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

338.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Hodgson, Councillor Blunden and Councillor Plass Councillor Upton and the reasons accepted.

339. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

339.1 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 other meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting. Such an opinion could be developed after receiving officers' reports and having heard representations from members of the public and the comments of fellow Members.

339.2 Councillors Hersey and Upton stated that as they attended All Saints Church they had an interest in item 342.16

340 QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC. (This item will be limited to a maximum of 15 minutes). (There will be an opportunity to speak on planning matters, which are agenda items as they arise).

340.1 Mr Jesson asked about the signs placed either side of the pond advising that a pedestrian crossing was to be installed between 23rd October and 3rd November. The Chairman advised that this would be addressed under AOB

340.2 Mr Jesson expressed his surprise at the white line machine that he had seen operating in the High Street, given his understanding that the High Street is due to be resurfaced. The Chairman noted his comments

340.3 Mr Kerslake (in the public gallery) raised three issues:-

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- a) that he had a number of observations to make in respect of Planning Inspectors Bore's impact on the Neighbourhood Plans (MM06 / Policy DP6) and in particular that Lindfield will be unable to meet its residual requirement of 540 homes
- b) Conservation Area Policy (MM16 / Policy DP24), noting in particular that it is unclear who drafted this
- c) Character & Design (MM25 / Policy DP33) which he considers misses vital aspects

Mr Kerslake emphasised the 13 November deadline for responses and agreed to supply the Parish Clerk with his detailed papers in this regard (subsequently received)

340.4 A member of the public questioned Councillor Hersey's statement that she reserved the right to express different opinions at other planning committees and asked why this was so. The Chairman explained that this was to avoid the potential for accusations of pre-judging or pre-determination, prior to additional information being provided at such committees and was usual for councillors who are members of different committees / councils.

341. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS) HELD ON 19 SEPTEMBER 2017.

341.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 19 September 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

342.1 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.

342.2 The Committee agreed that agenda items (5 Denmans Close), vi (43 West Common), vii (17 Dukes Road) & x (3 Backwoods Lane) should be considered first as four members of the public were attending specifically regarding these applications.

342.3 DM/17/3705/TREE – 5, DENMANS CLOSE
(T1) OAK - REMOVE 3 LOWEST SECONDARY LIMBS FROM MAJOR BRANCH OVERHANGING NEIGHBOUR. REMOVE EPICORMIC GROWTH FROM TRUNK AND TWO MINOR SECONDARY LIMBS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS PRUNING POINT OVER GARDEN.

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

342.4 DM/17/3629/FUL – 43, WEST COMMON
PROPOSED SINGLE BAY OAK FRAMED GARAGE WITH SIDE AISLE INCORPORATING A LOW ROOF HEIGHT DESIGN.

The Committee noted that the garage would be very well screened from the road and be built mainly on an area of driveway already used to park a car (i.e. not replacing the only green space outside the house). Given the lack of adverse impact on the street scene or neighbours the Committee saw no objection to the proposal.

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

342.5 DM/17/3728/FUL – 7, DENMAN'S LANES
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. AMENDMENT TO DM/17/1689 TO REDUCE THE SIZE.

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

342.6 DM/17/3759/FUL – 3, BACKWOODS LANE

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

EXTERNAL REFURBISHMENT COMPRISING OF NEW WINDOWS AND DOORS, NEW ROOF COVERING (SLATES), NEW CHIMNEY POTS AND REPOINTING, TOGETHER WITH REMOVING EXISTING RENDER TO GABLE WALL.

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

- 342.7 DM/17/3537/TREE – 161, HIGH STREET (LINDFIELD PLACE)
TWO GROUPS OF LEYLANDII TREES REDUCE TO 6 METRES.

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

- 342.8 DM/17/3652/TREE – 14 & 18, OLD SCHOOL COURT
T1 LIME TREE IN GARDEN OF 14 OLD SCHOOL COURT - RE-POLLARD. T2 LIME TREE IN GARDEN OF 18 OLD SCHOOL COURT - RE-POLLARD.
The Council's tree wardens advised that they had no objection to the proposed work

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

- 342.9 DM/17/3675/FUL – 13, FRANCIS ROAD
PROPOSED CONSERVATION STYLE ROOFLIGHT ON SOUTH SIDE ROOF SLOPE.

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

- 342.10 DM/17/3706/TREE – 117, HIGH STREET (SECKHAMS)
T1 CHESTNUT - POLLARD BY 5 METRES.

Mr Jesson raised doubts about pollarding an apparently healthy tree which was also the subject of a TPO and questioned whether the proposed contractor had the appropriate skills to undertake the work required. The Committee reviewed the submission, noting that it referred to poor historic pollarding and that major limbs were liable to break off; one branch already having done so. The Council's tree wardens had no objection to the proposed work. The Committee felt unable to judge the qualifications of the proposed contractor.

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

- 342.11 DM/17/3683/TREE – 17, DUKES ROAD
T1 SYCAMORE - LIFT CROWN BY 2M, REMOVING SECONDARY SIDE SHOOTS. T2 SYCAMORE – LIFT CROWN BY 2M. T3 SYCAMORE - REMOVE EPICORMIC SHOOT FROM TREE. G1 - G3 HOLLY TREES - FELL.

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

- 342.12 DM/17/3732/FUL – 1, WILDERNESS
PROPOSED EXTENSION OF THE WEST ROOF ALONG WITH THE ERECTION OF ROOMS IN THE PROPOSED EXTENSION. MINIMAL EXTENSIONS TO THE SOUTH OF THE GROUND FLOOR PLAN, AS WELL AS THE PROPOSAL OF NEW WINDOWS DOORS AND A BALCONY.

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

- 342.13 DM/17/3768/LDC – 14, APPLIEDORE GARDENS
PROPOSED REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO THE GARAGE, WITH CONNECTIONS TO EXISTING DRAINAGE. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT IS LAWFUL. THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS OF THE PROPOSED USE CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

342.14 DM/17/3703/FUL - 26, PICKERS GREEN

PROPOSED TWO AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, NEW ENTRANCE PORCH AND INTERNAL REMODELLING INCLUDING THE PROVISION OF A CHILDREN'S PLAY ROOM WITHIN THE LOFT SPACE.

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

342.15 DM/17/3833/TREE - 85 HIGH STREET (THE MANOR HOUSE)

TWO CHERRY (T1) REMOVE AND REPLACE. YEW (T2) CROWN LIFT OVER PATH TO GIVE 3M CLEARANCE. CYPRESS HEDGE (T3) REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2M. MAPLE (T4) REDUCE APEX GROWTH UP TO 1M. MAGNOLIA (T7) REDUCE BY 2M (NOT PAST PREVIOUS PRUNING POINTS).

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

342.16 DM/17/3846/TREE - 137 HIGH STREET (THE VICARAGE)

OAK (G1) REDUCE LOWER CANOPY BY UP TO 2M. YEW (T3) REDUCE LOWER GROWTH BY UP TO 2M. HAZEL AND HOLLY (G4) RE-COPPICE 1/3 OF STEMS. HAWTHORN AND HOLLY (G5) CROWN REDUCE BY 3M. LIME, HORNBEAM AND SYCAMORE (G6) REMOVE THREE LOWEST LIMBS. SYCAMORE (G7) FELL. OAK, HORNBEAM AND SWEET CHESTNUT (G8) REMOVE LOWEST LIMB. HAZEL (G9) REMOVE TWO LIMBS OFF FENCE. SYCAMORE (G10) REMOVE SECONDARY BRANCH. YEW (G11) CROWN REDUCE BY 1.5M.

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

342.17 DM/17/3880/TREE - 33 WEST COMMON

HORSE CHESTNUT (T1) REDUCE MAIN LEADER ON ROADSIDE BACK TO FORK AND REDUCE THE REST OF THE CROWN BY UP TO 3M ON ALL SIDES.

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

342.18 DM/17/3901/TREE - 1 LITTLE BLACK HILL (PRIMAVERA)

T1 WILLOW - RE-POLLARD AND REMOVE BRANCHES OVERHANGING ADJACENT PRIVATE ROAD.

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

343 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.

343.1 DM/17/3139 – Amberley, 51 Sunte Avenue. Permission had been given by MSDC for this development, which LPC had considered unacceptable, citing concerns re overdevelopment of an existing building

343.2 DM/17/3135 – 39 High Street. Permission had been given by MSDC for this development about which LPC had no objections but had noted safety concerns re visibility on the stairs for the adjoining flats.

The Committee **NOTED** these decisions.

344 BUDGETARY MATTERS. Planning & Traffic Committee Budget progress 2017/18: to review payments made to 31st August 2017 - (budget progress report attached).

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

344.1 The Committee considered and **NOTED** the paper.

345 To note MSDC Paperless Notification of Planning Applications to Towns and Parishes (see attached papers)

345.1 The Parish Clerks highlighted that MSDC were moving to an online system at the end of March 2018 and that this would have implications for how LPC dealt with Planning Applications in the future. Councillors were advised that MSDC was holding an introductory workshop on 10th November which would be attended.

Councillor Richmond suggested that investigations be made as to how other Parish Councils were addressing these changes.

It was **AGREED** that the Parish Clerks should investigate and report back to the Committee.

346 To note MSDC Main Modifications Consultation on the District Plan, closing date 13th November 2017 - To consider whether the Council will provide a response (previously circulated)

346.1 Councillor Hersey advised that the modifications received significant scrutiny and that there had been a good debate at the MSDC meeting which she attended.

The Chairman asked what the level of discussion in relation to Lindfield had been, with Councillor Hersey advising that Hassocks had been the main focus at scrutiny.

The Committee **AGREED** that the Parish Clerk, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Committee, should respond to the consultation.

347 TRAFFIC STUDY – To receive latest update

347.1 The Parish Clerk updated the Committee on the meeting held on 2 October 2017, by reading the following report:

Present:

Roger Harper	Creative Road	
Richard Speller	WSCC Highways	(Arrived 08:35)
Andrew Lea	Councillor MSDC & WSCC	(Left 08:45)
Will Blunden	Chairman	
Iain McLean	Deputy Clerk	
Andrew Funnell	Clerk	

Will Blunden started the meeting off by giving some background on the study and asked Councillor Andrew Lea for his support for the project moving forward.

Andrew Lea stressed that he is very keen on projects that promote sustainable transport (cycling and walking). He would like local residents to walk and cycle not just for pleasure, but as part of their daily routine.

The Council were advised that in order for any scheme to be considered it will need the backing of our WSCC Councillor (Andrew Lea). WSCC are not able to fund schemes using capital, so S106 funding and Council funding are the only options. The amount of available S106 funds will be critical in establishing whether proposals can be progressed.

Richard Speller explained the scoring that WSCC use to assess Highway's Improvement Schemes. Potential developments are assessed against the following areas:

- Transport & Public Space
- Economic Growth
- Environmental Impact

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- Feasibility and Deliverability
- Policy Support

Richard stressed that the committee scoring are extremely critical and thus plenty of evidence is required in justifying a scheme.

Richard explained that should any modifications of public footpaths take place they will need to comply with the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. The Act includes a requirement that footpaths are widened to 1.5m.

Timeframe:

The following time frame for 2018 has been provisionally agreed:

Immediate	Roger Harper will; contact WSCC about available S106 funds. Review each proposal against the scoring criteria provided
Mid-Late November	Roger Harper to come to the office for additional meeting
Sat 13 th January	LPC Public consultation to be held at the KEH.
20 th February	P&TC Full Meeting
15 th March	Full Council Meeting
April	Roger to attend office to assist office staff with application process
June	Committee meets and will review applications

The Committee **NOTED** the report.

348 ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 348.1 **Pedestrian Crossing** – signs had been placed on the roadside either side of the pond advising that a pedestrian crossing was to be installed between 23rd October and 3rd November. The Parish Office and individual Councillors had received a number of expressions of concern at this (unexpected) development

The Parish Clerk read out a Press Release which had been prepared following a request from Lindfield Life and agreed with Councillor Blunden.

“Lindfield Parish Council were not aware that the development had been approved. In November 2016 the Parish Council opposed the proposed revised highways works to Lindfield High Street. We understand that the planning application to which the work relates is the Land to the East of Gravelly Lane, Lindfield, which dates back to 2013. We have been in contact With West Sussex Highways, and our West County Council Councillor, Andrew Lea. We understand that Andrew Lea, is on our behalf, making urgent enquiries regarding the works. We have reiterated that the Parish Council opposes the works. The Parish Council is concerned that the works will potentially remove parking spaces for the King Edward Hall, which is a building widely used by the local community. Additionally, we would like any proposed traffic works within the Parish to be implemented as part of a cohesive plan following our Traffic Study. In summary, the Council wishes to see a holistic rather than piecemeal approach, having under gone full Parish consultation.”

The Deputy Parish Clerk also stated:-

I have now spoken with Andrew Howick who runs the Highway Agreements Scheme at WSCC.

- He advises that this follows PP from 4 years ago and with Barratts looking to get their road bonds released, the scheme was being implemented.
- He is however very aware of the local concern and has already called Barratt's (Glenn Pendry) with a view to getting the works stopped and they were receptive

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- He is currently writing an email to confirm this but flags that Barratt's will want to get their bond released / not delay for too long. There is likely to be some cost incurred in cancelling the contractor but following that it is possible that Barratt's will seek bond release and pay to do so, less any costs incurred. Andrew seemed receptive to the idea that such funds could be earmarked towards proposals under LPC's plans following the traffic survey.

Councillor Hersey stated that she had spoken with MSDC officers, who were surprised at this unplanned notice. However, following representations, it seemed that the crossing had been deferred / moved on. Councillor Hersey also noted that the proposed works were in a conservation area. The Chairman, one of the Trustees of the King Edward Hall, was concerned as to the potential impact on users of the Hall if they were to proceed

Mr Kerslake suggested that the Parish Council considered whether other developers had similar works in the pipeline and asked if WSCC could assist

Councillor Richmond questioned whether there was a legal requirement to consult with Parish Councils before such works were undertaken and also whether a copy of the statement to Lindfield Life could be published in the Village and on the Council's website

The Committee **NOTED** the above and were keen that developments were closely followed.

- 385.2 **Former Tavistock and Summerhill School** – A member of the public was keen to understand the Parish Council's responsibility regarding the knocking down of the former school. The questioner was also keen to understand how closely the Parish Council would scrutinise re-building plans.

The Chairman explained that the Council had no responsibility in this regard – it rested with MSDC. He further explained that had the property been listed or in a conservation area the position would have been different. In respect of re-building, the Council would scrutinise the plans in line with its statutory responsibilities but it could not pre-judge its approach and must react only to plans submitted and permission sought

The meeting concluded at **20.58**.