

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mr. W. Blunden
Mrs. M Hersey
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mr. R Plass
Mr. S Shortland
Mr. C Snowling

Also present:

Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Mr. C. Hersey (MSDC Councillor)
7 members of the public (for parts of the meeting)

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.

106. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

106.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Upton and Durrant, and the reasons accepted.

107. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

107.1 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.

107.2 There were no other declarations of interest.

108. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2016.

108.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 26 January 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

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

109.2 DM/16/0118 – 37 SUNTE AVENUE
INCORPORATE THE EXISTING PORCH INTO THE KITCHEN AND BRING UP THE ROOF LINE TO MATCH WITH THE EXISTING EXTENSION.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

109.3 DM/16/0119 – CHIMNEY CORNER, HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY GARDEN ROOM EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS very much agreed with the Parish Council's proposed comments. It was the Society's view that the parapet roof rears up over the neighbour's garden, and will spoil the amenity of the neighbouring property. The neighbour at the Old Farmhouse appraised the Committee of the reasons why he thought that the application was not appropriate in the circumstances, and outlined the effects of the proposal on his property. The applicant stated that the neighbours' issues were appreciated, and that although he understood that the latest application reflected the Planning Officer's comments as regards a previous application, he will be reassessing the current design in view of the concerns, and indicated that the application may in fact, be withdrawn. Accordingly, it may come back to this Committee in due course.

AGREED RESPONSE: "As the proposal stands, Lindfield Parish Council considers that the height of the proposed extension of that part of Chimney Corner adjacent to the Old Farmhouse, would have an unacceptable impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the neighbour's light and view contrary to Local Plan policy. The Parish Council therefore objects to the application."

109.4 DM/16/0192 – 30 SAVILL ROAD
SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.

The applicant's wife said that she wanted to support the written representations made to the Parish Council by the applicant, setting out and supporting the reasons for the application. However, it was understood that the neighbours, who were also present to register some concerns about the application, had received some revised plans, which had also been sent to the Planning Officer at MSDC. It was noted however, that the Parish Council had not been officially notified as yet, and so it was made clear that the response had to be submitted on the basis of those plans currently before the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: "As the proposal stands, Lindfield Parish Council considers that the height of the proposed wall adjacent to no. 32 would have an unacceptable impact on the reasonable enjoyment of the neighbours' patio. The Parish Council therefore objects to the application."

109.5 DM/16/0225 – COBBLERS COTTAGE, 115 HIGH STREET
(T1) MULTI STEM SYCAMORE - FELL TO GROUND LEVEL.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the removal of the tree indicated on the plan in the application, provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season."

109.6 DM/15/4457 – LAND TO THE SOUTH OF SCAMPS HILL, SCAYNES HILL ROAD
OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LAND TO THE SOUTH OF SCAMPS HILL TO ACCOMMODATE UP TO 200 DWELLINGS, A 9.54HA COUNTRY PARK AND LAND FOR A PRIMARY EDUCATION FACILITY, TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS ROAD, CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING AND OPEN SPACE. PLEASE NOTE AMENDED DESCRIPTION IN RELATION TO EDUCATION PROVISION.

(Note: Land is within the Rural Parish.)

Mr Jesson stated that the LPS intended also to put in a supplementary response, which would concentrate on the traffic generation issues. The view was that the response of the applicant's technical consultant, in which it was stated that having a full form entry school instead of a half form entry school, would make no difference to the traffic issues was simply not credible. It is the LPS's intention to engage their own highways consultant in order to critique the figures being provided by the applicant in this regard.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: “Whilst the subject of desk top studies, neither the traffic generation data provided in connection with the original planning application, nor the commentary provided by the applicant in the document headed “Technical Note” (dated 18th January 2016), can have full regard for the actual cumulative effects of development in and around Lindfield, not least the current Barratts development at Heathwood Park. The full effects of those developments have yet to be assessed and felt within the local communities. The proposals do not therefore meet the objectives of Policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan. It is clear that the provision of nearly 300 houses already (Kaleidoscope and Heathwood Park), has the potential to add 600 cars to the roads. A further 188 houses takes this to nearly 900. It doesn’t need a big percentage of those to be on the move at any one time, for there to be major impacts on road junctions, and the local road network, much of which is rural in nature. This is especially so at peak times. In that regard it is therefore unclear how West Sussex County Council define “capacity”, given that queuing at road junctions, particularly at peak times, has become a major and real concern. It has already been stated that the developments will not add to the economic benefits of the area, and most of the employment for those living on the estates, will come from areas far from the immediate locality. This will inevitably increase the number of commuting journeys, either to the station at Haywards Heath (as recognised by Haywards Heath Town Council, in its claim for a proportion of the Community Infrastructure Levy money), or elsewhere. The proposals do not therefore meet the objectives of Policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan. In terms of the larger school, the Technical Note makes a whole set of claims, which it acknowledges can only be assumptions. For example, the suggested pupil yield from the two existing developments (referred to above) appears to be significantly underestimated. It is also well known that the proximity of a school to the pupils it serves, is no guide to how many parents will actually deliver their children to the school by car, particularly if they are on the way to and from places of work. It also noted that all the journeys made, will have to take place through the residential areas of the development, leading (as in many other cases) to conflict between local residents and schools traffic. The proposals do not therefore meet the objectives of Policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan. The original Parish Council’s response alludes to the inadequacies of the local public transport system, in what is (and should remain) a predominately rural area. It is now clear from recent press reports that if anything, rural bus services are likely to deteriorate rather than improve, because of pressures on transport budgets. Therefore, the policy objective of NPPF policy which requires the “availability and opportunities for public transport to be considered” becomes a major obstacle to the viability of this proposal. The proposals do not therefore meet the objectives of Policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan. The revised proposals do not in any way address the unsuitability of the proposed development site, in terms of its location to facilities and adequate infrastructure, and so is in clear breach of Policy G3 of the 2004 Local Plan. It therefore also breaches the requirements of National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Chapter 4 in that the location clearly cannot meet the particular objectives as set out in that Chapter. It is noted that under the revised proposal, the school grounds will now be situated directly behind Walstead Place Residential Care Home. The very real likelihood of disturbance and noise therefore increases even beyond that which would have been anticipated from normal school activity anyway, and it is noted that the NPPF requires that proposals “enhance and improve the way that people live their lives”. It is difficult to see how, for the elderly and vulnerable residents of Walstead House, this objective can be fulfilled. Again, the point is made that whilst developments should have regard to the needs of future generations, the needs of present communities should equally be considered and respected. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the objective of Policy B3 of the 2004 Local Plan. It is unclear what effects a one form entry primary school will have on education provision elsewhere in the area, and it seems that the applicant’s consultation and research in this respect, is woefully inadequate. It seems that the applicant is unsure of where the pupils will come from, and what the effects will be. It is noted that the NPPF requires that Authorities work with school promoters to identify and resolve key planning issues before planning applications are submitted. Since this opportunity of responding further has arisen, the Parish Council now re-iterates that the Lindfield and Lindfield Neighbourhood Plan has passed at referendum on 28th January 2016, with a 95% majority

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

in favour of the Plan. It is therefore submitted that as provided for by the NPPF in paragraph 198, the Plan must now be accorded very significant weight in the decision making process. For all of the above reasons, and those previously stated in the original response, the Parish Council reiterates that the proposal is not sustainable, and that it is clear on any objective analysis, that the adverse impacts of approving the application, significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies of the NPPF taken as a whole. **The application should therefore be refused.**

- 109.7 DM/16/0128 – 2 HICKMANS LANE
SINGLE STOREY KITCHEN EXTENSION TO REAR AND SIDE WINDOW TO GROUND FLOOR TO MATCH EXISTING.

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

- 109.8 DM/16/0285 – 14 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
(G1) 5 X LIME TREES. CLEAN TO REMOVE ALL DEAD, DISEASED AND BROKEN BRANCHES, 2 CENTIMETRES IN DIAMETER AND LARGER THROUGHOUT CROWN. THIN CROWN TO REMOVE 15% OF LIVE BRANCHES. REDUCE CROWN HEIGHT BY 4-5 METRES.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season."

- 109.9 DM/16/0297 – 12 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
GROUP OF FIVE LIME TREES (G1) REDUCE CROWN HEIGHT BY 4-5M. REMOVE DEAD BRANCHES AND THIN CROWN BY 15%.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season."

- 109.10 DM/16/0282 – THE BARN, HICKMANS LANE
SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING LEAN TO ROOF AT SIDE WITH A SOLID ROOF INCLUDING ROOF LANTERN.

Councillor Blunden said that he was unhappy with the modern form of the design, and the look of the extension in the context of this historical building. He reminded the Committee that owners of listed buildings are effectively only ever custodians of the particular property for the benefit of future generations, and so applications had to be seen in that context. Mr Jesson said that the property was an old 15th /16th century, but that this related mainly to the frame, and that a number of rebuilt structural elements were relatively modern, as were the two current extensions on either side of the house. He felt that the applicant had been quite careful to respect the nature and character of the property, and that the setting of the property was not adversely affected. Accordingly, on balance the LPS did not have any objections. Councillor Gomme said that he thought that this mix of old and new was what Planning Officers favoured at the present time. Councillor Hersey said that the property had changed over time anyway, and that this seemed to be a natural progression. Councillor Plass said that he thought that the proposal was out of keeping with the listed building and the Conservation Area. Councillor Snowling, taking up the point about its visibility, pointed out that it does not matter how readily the property can be seen, and he remained unconvinced that it met the planning policies set out below. He therefore formally proposed that the response be as appears below, and this was seconded by Councillor Plass. On a show of hands, the proposal was carried by five votes to none, with two abstentions.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council is not able to support this application, because of the concerns about the adverse effects of the proposal on this listed building, and on the setting of the Conservation Area. The Parish Council does not believe that the objectives of Policies B10 and B12 of the 2004 Local Plan, are being met."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 109.11 DM/16/0300 – THE BARN, HICKMANS LANE (LISTED BUILDING CONSENT APPLICATION)
SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING LEAN TO ROOF AT SIDE WITH A SOLID ROOF INCLUDING ROOF LANTERN.

“Ditto above.”

- 109.12 DM/16/0354 – 1 LINDEN GROVE
CONIFER HEDGING - TO REDUCE FROM 9M TO 6M.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season.”

- 109.13 DM/16/0359 – 1A LINDEN GROVE (SAXON GATE)
YEW (T1) REDUCE LATERAL BY 1-2M. YEW (T2) DEADWOOD AND THIN. YEW (T3) SHAPE AND REDUCE BY 0.5M. (T4) SYCAMORE REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2-3M AND LATERAL BY 1-2M.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season.”

- 109.14 DM/16/0370 – 67 NOAHS ARK LANE
SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION. SINGLE FRONT EXTENSION. GARAGE CONVERSION.

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

- 109.15 DM/16/0426 – 96 HIGH STREET (PAOLINOS)
YEW - REDUCE CROWN BY 2 METRES TO SHAPE CANOPY.

Mr Jesson added a cautionary note in that the tree was in a prominent area in the High Street, and although it was in an untidy state, and needed some attention, it was important that the work be done in a professional and proper way, and before the spring, bird nesting season. It was agreed to add these points into the response, and at the request of Councillor Shortland, also in respect of the other tree applications considered above, as these observations equally applied to those proposals.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that the work is done in a professional and competent way, and that the work is completed before the spring, bird nesting season.”

110. 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.

- 110.1 With regard to the next stage of the Neighbourhood Plan (following the successful referendum) it was reported that MSDC would not be formally “making” the Plan until the Council meeting on 23rd March 2016, even though there was an earlier meeting on 24th February. It was noted that although the meeting in February was said to be traditionally for the budget setting only, there was now no opposition, and so the reasons for not taking the Plan to that meeting seemed unclear and unconvincing. Councillors expressed their great disappointment and frustration at the delay, and felt that it would send entirely the wrong message to those who had worked so hard on the Plan, and those who had voted so overwhelmingly in favour of it.

- 110.2 It was therefore **AGREED** that the Clerk/Deputy Clerk be mandated to send an email urgently, on 17th February, to the Leader of MSDC, Councillor Garry Wall, copied to Claire Tester (the Head of Economic Promotion and Planning), Andrew McNaughton (Cabinet Member for Planning), the three Lindfield Ward

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Councillors, and the Clerks at Lindfield Rural Parish Council, Twineham Parish Council, and Turners Hill Parish Council, expressing the Committee's views, and asking that the matter be reconsidered..

111. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 111.1 Councillor Blunden had noted that a Speed Indication Device (SID) had appeared in Ardingly, and it was believed that this is the equipment loaned out to Parish Councils by West Sussex County Council Highways, through the auspices of the relevant County Local Committee (CLC). It was thought that it would be a good idea to request that this be obtained by Lindfield Parish Council, with a view to siting it at appropriate locations in the Parish, e.g. High Beeches Lane, Lewes Road, Hickmans Lane, and/or other suitable places, in order to unofficially try and gauge the speed of traffic on the local roads, and to advise/warn drivers accordingly. Councillor Blunden said that he will speak with the Clerk about seeking to arrange this through the CLC.
- 111.2 Councillor Shortland asked for a progress report on the Traffic Survey/Study currently being conducted by Creative Roads Limited. The Deputy Clerk confirmed that he had in fact just received a short report from Roger Harper earlier today, and that this would be forwarded to all Committee members as soon as possible.

The Meeting concluded at 8.51 p.m.