

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 15 NOVEMBER 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).  
Mr. S Shortland.  
Mr. R Plass.  
Mr. W Blunden  
Mrs. V Upton  
Mr. C Snowling

**Also present:** Mr John Jesson; Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).  
1 member of the public (for all or part of the meeting).

**Not present:** Councillor Mrs. M Hersey.

**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.

**206. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

206.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hersey, and the reason accepted.

**207. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

207.1 Councillor Blunden declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in item 6 (High Street Works – minute 211 below) as he is Chairman of the Management Committee for the King Edward Hall.

207.2 Councillor Plass declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in item 6 (High Street Works – minute 211 below) as he is member of the Management Committee for the King Edward Hall.

207.3 Councillor Snowling declared a personal interest in item 6 (High Street Works – minute 211 below) as he is a Trustee of the King Edward Hall. He said that he would therefore speak on the matter, but would not participate in any vote.

**208. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 25 OCTOBER 2016.**

208.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 25 October 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

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

209.2 DM/16/3807 – WALNUT COTTAGE, 1C BACKWOODS CLOSE  
PROPOSED TWO STOREY EXTENSION.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson expressed concern at the errors in the original plans, and felt that there still issues with the accuracy of the drawings. One aspect particularly depended on the accuracy of the plans, and this was the extent to which the proposal will lead to a loss of light and outlook for the neighbouring property. Councillor Snowling felt that in terms of the adverse effects on the neighbouring property, this was a serious defect of the proposal and so should be included in the response.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application on the basis of the scale and size of the proposed extension. It will have serious, adverse effects on the neighbouring property in terms of loss of light and outlook. As such it will be unneighbourly, and so is not in compliance with policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004. The Parish Council also still has some concerns over the accuracy of the plans, in that whilst the existing elevations now appear to be correct, the descriptions against the actual drawings seem to be at odds with each other.

209.3 DM/16/4258 – 32 BLACKTHORNS  
TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH.

Mr Jesson noted that the proposal was quite bulky in scale, but in overall terms the LPS found it acceptable. The applicant pointed out that the proposal was to fulfil a family need, and that they have been long standing Lindfield residents.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided it is clear that matching materials and finishes must be used.

209.4 DM/16/4266 – 9 HICKMANS CLOSE  
(T1 AND T2) BEECH TREES - CROWN REDUCE BY 2M AND REMOVE DEAD WOOD.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the proposed reduction, and to the removal of the dead wood.

209.5 DM/16/4530 – 8 WOODPECKER CHASE  
T1 OAK - FELL.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has some concerns about the total removal of the tree, and would suggest as an alternative, that the tree is professionally trimmed and reshaped, reducing the crown so as to allow in more light.

209.6 DM/16/4550 – 48 HICKMANS LANE  
T1 OAK - 5 METRE CROWN REDUCTION.

Mr Jesson said that he agreed that the proposed reduction was too much, and so supported the Parish Council's proposed response.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council is only prepared to agree to a crown reduction of 2 metres. The view is that a reduction of 5 metres could have an unbalancing effect on the tree.

209.7 DM/16/4587 – 38 MEADOW LANE  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND PROVISION OF FRONT, SIDE, AND REAR EXTENSIONS.

Mr Jesson felt that this proposal had to be seen in the context of other similar extensions, and was in fact better than most. Councillor Plass reiterated his concern about the proximity to the neighbour's boundary. Councillor Snowling said that he could not agree to the inclusion of the particular window in the lounge extension.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application in principle, but cannot agree to the addition of the window in the lounge. This part of the extension is very close to the

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

boundary of the neighbouring property, and will have an overlooking and adverse effect. As such, this aspect of the proposal is unneighbourly.

- 209.8 DM/6/4595 – 67 SUNTE AVENUE  
PROPOSED DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF NEW TIMBER GARDEN BUILDING

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

**210. 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.**

- 210.1 DM/16/0541 – 3 Francis Road: To replace windows and front door with uPVC double glazed sash windows and composite wood grain floor. The Deputy Clerk reported that the application, which had previously reported as having been refused by MSDC, had gone to appeal at the Planning Inspectorate under reference number APP/D3830/W/16/3158082. The appeal has now been dismissed by the Planning Inspector in a decision letter dated 28<sup>th</sup> October 2016.
- 210.2 DM/15/4715 - Buxshalls, Ardingly Road: Removal of condition number 22 relating to planning permission 14/01120/FUL to remove restriction for dwelling to be occupied by persons 55 years of age or over: As reported to the Committee at its meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2016, this application was refused by MSDC on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016, following further representations against granting consent, submitted by the Parish Council. The matter has now been submitted for appeal under MSDC planning appeal reference AP/16/0070.
- 210.3 DM/16/3885 – 7 Denmans Lane: proposed part demolition of the existing garden wall, plant a new hedge and with the addition of a paved area for a parking space. The Deputy Clerk reported that this application (considered by the Committee at its meeting on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2016) had been refused for a second time by MSDC in a decision letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> November 2016. It was also noted that the application had not been called in (for a Committee decision), as had been requested by the local Ward Councillor. It was acknowledged that the applicant would now have to consider going to appeal.

**211. REVISED HIGHWAY WORKS TO LINDFIELD HIGH STREET.**

- 211.1 Members raised a number of concerns with regard to the revised highway works to Lindfield High Street as proposed by Barratts Homes as part of the works required by the section 106 Agreement entered into in respect of the planning consent granted to Wates for the ongoing housing development at Gravelye Lane (planning reference number 12/01346/FUL). These concerns are (i) the unnecessary addition of street furniture clutter in this important part of Lindfield, (ii) the danger of creating a pinch point for pedestrians crossing over to and from the King Edward Hall (KEH), if the gaps in the railings at the three other breaks are closed off, (iii) the fact that the proposal includes taking some land from the path outside the KEH, which is not highways land, (iv) the impact on the users of the Hall, given that the proposal will reduce the ability for occasional parking outside the KEH for delivery and collection, particularly in terms of the ability of disabled persons to access the Hall, (v) the fact that if car parking is curtailed, this is likely to enable the traffic in that part of the road to speed up, thereby increasing the dangers for pedestrians making the crossing to and from the KEH, (vi) the fact that the proposals do not recognise the likely increase in traffic, both vehicular and pedestrian, once the former White Horse public house opens as an Indian Restaurant, (vii) the re-alignment of the part of the road opposite Pear Tree will increase the danger of traffic turning left into the High Street from the Lewes Road coming into conflict with traffic proceeding north on the High Street, (viii) the money for the project would be better spent on implementing measures that may result from the Parish Council's ongoing traffic survey, (xi) the proposals will not add anything to the safety of the Village, and are unlikely to be supported.
- 211.2 It was therefore **AGREED** that the Parish Council cannot support these proposals, and would object to them on the above grounds. The Deputy Clerk will make the appropriate response accordingly.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 212. FURTHER CONTRIBUTION TO LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL TOWARDS PLANNING COSTS.

- 212.1 The Committee considered whether or not to agree a request from Lindfield Rural Parish Council to make a further contribution to the costs of employing the planning consultant (Bell Cornwell) to deal with Wates' Scamps Hill planning application, ref. no: DM/16/4457. After discussion, it was **RESOLVED** to make a contribution in the sum of £498.98 towards the second invoice sum of £2,992.50. This would in effect confer a 1/3 Lindfield Parish Council and 2/3 Lindfield Rural Parish Council split across the total of both this invoice, and the previous invoice for £2,991.15, which was discussed by full Council on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016. All figures are given net of VAT.
- 212.2 Although there were time constraints with regard to this particular application, the Deputy Clerk was asked to ensure that there is a closer working relationship between the two Councils in respect of any similar procurement in the future, and to make appropriate representations to LRPC accordingly.

### 213. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 213.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.40 p.m.