

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 13 AUGUST 2013** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present: Parish Councillors: Mr A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mrs M. Hersey (Vice Chairman)
Mrs J. Chatfield
Mr M. Amor
Mr W. Blunden
Mrs V. Upton
Mr S. Hodgson
Mr C Snowling

Also present: Mr John Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society), Councillor Christopher Hersey (MSDC), and ten members of the public.

In attendance: Mr I. McLean (Deputy Clerk)

Absent: Councillor Mr R Plass

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

348. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

348.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Plass and the reason was accepted.

349. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

349.1 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 (MSDC) North East Area Planning Committee or at any meeting which subsequently considered any matter discussed at the present meeting, having seen the Officers reports and heard representations from members of the public and fellow members.

349.2 In respect of item 4(iii) on the Agenda, Councillor Chatfield declared a personal interest as she knew the applicant.

349.3 In respect of item 4 (viii) on the Agenda, Councillor Hersey declared a personal interest as the applicant was her son.

350. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 23 JULY 2013.

350.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 23 July 2013. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

351. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION

351.1 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.

351.2 113/02328/FUL – ASHMEAD, BLACK HILL
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson commended the application.

AGREED RESPONSE: “There are no objections to this application, subject to existing materials and finishes matching existing building.”

- 351.3 13/02341/CND – SHANLY HOMES DEVELOPMENT SITE, BLACKTHORNS CLOSE
VARIATION OF CONDITION 28 OF PLANNING PERMISSION 12/03227/FUL TO READ “THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL BE CARRIED OUT IN ALL RESPECTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE SUSTAINABILITY STATEMENT DATED MARCH 2013 UNLESS OTHERWISE AGREED IN WRITING BY THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY. ON COMPLETION OF THE DEVELOPMENT AN INDEPENDENT FINAL REPORT SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE LPA TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE RECOMMENDATIONS IN THE REPORT HAVE BEEN IMPLEMENTED IN FULL”.

Mr Jesson was concerned by the Parish Council’s proposed response, and commented that the Code 3 level requirements of the existing planning condition should not be changed. Councillors Hersey and Snowling spoke in support of these comments. The Deputy Clerk also clarified the matter further.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council notes and agrees the more comprehensive, revised Sustainability Statement (October 2012), but takes the view that if the normal requirement to Code Level 3 was appropriate in the original Condition, then it should still be appropriate now. The Parish Council sees no reason why the proper standards should not be met as regards this particular development.”

- 351.4 13/02346/FUL – 42 SUNTE AVENUE
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER GARAGE AND ASSOCIATED IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr Jesson took the view that the application was an improvement, but that it was not sufficient to allay the previous concerns. The owner of the neighbouring property said that all the reasons for refusing the previous application were still valid. The applicant said that she believed that all concerns, and MSDC planning requirements had been met. Councillor Snowling said that whilst the applicant had done everything that could be reasonably expected, it had not overcome the fundamental problem.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Although the new plans have tried to address the problem of light to no.44 Sunte Avenue, Lindfield Parish Council does not consider that this is sufficient, and therefore as previously, it cannot support the application, due to its size and the fact that it would still adversely affect the enjoyment of light of the neighbouring property. It still therefore appears to the Parish Council to be unneighbourly, and as such it is contrary to Policy B3 of the District Council’s 2004 Local Plan.”

Note: In accordance with her declaration of interest, Councillor Chatfield left the room during the discussion of this item.

- 351.5 13/02364/TCA – ASHMEAD, BLACK HILL
T1 AND T2 BLUE CYPRESS – FELL. T2, T4, T5 GREEN CYPRESS – FELL.

AGREED RESPONSE: “There are no objections to this application.”

- 351.6 13/02367/TREE – AMENITY AREAS TO THE FRONT OF 45 AND 46 AND ALSO WITHIN TOWN WOOD TO REAR OF 34 AND 35 FINCHES GARDENS.
T1 PINE – REDUCE CROWN BY 33.33%. T2 SYCAMORE – FELL AS TREE IS DEAD.

AGREED RESPONSE: “There are no objections to this application.”

- 351.7 13/01857/COU – SPRINGFIELD, SPRING LANE
RETROSPECTIVE CHANGE OF USE OF SMALL PARCEL OF LAND FROM AGRICULTURAL USE TO GARDEN.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application insofar as any of the relevant land falls within Lindfield Parish Council, as opposed to Lindfield Rural Parish Council."

- 351.8 13/02391/FUL – 1 CHURCH VIEW COTTAGES, FRANCIS ROAD
RE-BUILD SHARED FRONT DOOR STEP IN BRICK AND BRICK TREAD. BRICK EDGE BOUNDARY IN FRONT OF BOUNDARY (HOUSE) SHINGLE AREA IN FRONT OF THE KITCHEN WINDOW.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

- 351.9 13/02399/FUL – CORNER COTTAGE, ROUNDWOOD LANE
ERECTION OF NEW FIVE BED DWELLING.

Mr Jesson felt that the surface water run-off issue had not been addressed. The visibility splays issue also needed to be looked at. An immediate neighbour expressed his objection on the grounds of size and overlooking. The applicant said that the building had been designed in compliance with Local Plan policies, and the Village Design Statement for Lindfield. He referred to pre-application discussions with MSDC. The owner of the subject land said that the same materials will be used as for adjoining properties. Councillor Gomme said that the issue was the design, not the size, but was prepared to be persuaded. Councillor Blunden felt that the proposed comments from the two Councillors who had looked at the application was correct, and this was supported by Councillor Hodgson.

It was **AGREED** on a show of hands, by 4 to 2, that the response should be as follows-

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council is of the view that this is a very modern design, which does not conform to the more traditional style of the adjacent houses in High Beech Lane, and so because of this conflict with the street scene, this application cannot be supported. It does not therefore conform with Policy B1 of the District Council's 2004 Local Plan".

Note: In accordance with her declaration of interest, Councillor Hersey left the room during the discussion of this item.

- 351.10 13/02402/FUL – 2 CHURCH VIEW COTTAGES, FRANCIS ROAD
CHANGE THE COLOUR OF FRONT DOOR, CHANGE FRONT DOOR FURNITURE. BRICK PAVE FRONT GARDEN, BRICK EDGE BOUNDARY. RE- BUILD SHARED FRONT DOOR STEP IN BRICK AND BRICK TREAD.

In respect of this application, and for 1 Church View Cottages above, Mr Jesson wished to commend the applicants for seeking planning consent in accordance with the properties being situated within the Conservation Area, and this was endorsed by the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

- 351.11 13/02445/FUL – LANTERN COTTAGE, SPRING LANE
SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, PORCH TO SIDE ELEVATION, BLOCK UP EXISTING FRONT DOOR AND UTILISE EXISTING WINDOW TO FORM NEW FRONT DOOR.

Mr Jesson commented that although this was a large extension, it was in proportion, and that he could therefore support the application. A neighbour commented similarly.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

- 351.12 13/02485/FUL – SPRINGFIELD, SPRING LANE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. (VARIATION OF DESIGN FROM APPROVED SCHEME 13/01072/FUL).

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson commented that the application was an improvement on the extant planning consent.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

351.13 13/02035/FUL – THE BENT ARMS, HIGH STREET
INTERNAL REDECORATION WORKS AND LANDSCAPE RESURFACING

Mr Jesson was concerned about aspects of the internal works, particularly the glass replacement proposals. This was an important Grade II listed building, and the Conservation Officer at MSDC needs to be involved. Councillors agreed to build these comments into the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council's response falls into two parts. (i) Internal works – this is an important Grade II listed building, and so the internal redecoration arrangements should be supported by approved colour charts, so that the Planning Authority can approve them prior to work commencing. With regard to the replacement of glass proposals, the Council is concerned that the bar window and door (particularly any external facing) should be appropriate and in keeping. It is therefore essential the Conservation officer at MSDC is fully consulted and involved. (ii) External works – Lindfield Parish Council has no issues with the re-surfacing proposals, but does have reservations about the floodlighting, as there appear to be no details about these in the documents or plans. Their location, effect on adjoining properties, times of use, etc., need to be considered, and the subject of appropriate conditions."

351.14 13/02036/LBC – THE BENT ARMS, HIGH STREET
AS ABOVE

AGREED RESPONSE: "See comments above. Additionally, the Parish Council remains concerned that the mis-description of the subject property in the introduction to the Design and Access Statement calls into question the integrity of the whole document"

351.15 13/02481/FUL – LIMES COTTAGE, 105 HIGH STREET
OAK FRAMED GARAGE AND STORE

Mr Jesson made the point that Sussex Police ought to be asked about the security arrangements for the new structure, given the "secure by design" objective. However, Councillors thought that this was more a matter for the applicant to address.

AGREED RESPONSE: "There are no objections to this application."

352. TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

352.1 The Deputy Clerk confirmed that he had no reports to make on this occasion.

352.2 Councillor Hersey raised the issue of the lorry movements along Spring Lane to Fulling Mill Farm. The works at the Farm were not part of the planning permission for the Roundhouse, and MSDC is taking the appropriate action to ensure that planning controls are properly observed.

353. MSDC'S COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY (CIL) – DRAFT CHARGING SCHEDULE

353.1 After discussion it was **AGREED** to respond to MSDC along the lines of Councillor Gomme's email of 13th July 2013), and the Deputy Clerk was authorised to write accordingly by the deadline date of 19th August.

353.2 The Committee expressed its thanks to Councillor Gomme for his work and input regarding this consultation document.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

354. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

354.1 There was none.

The Meeting concluded at 9.00 p.m.