

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 16 MAY 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. S Hodgson (Chairman elect)
Mr. C Snowling (Vice-Chairman elect)
Mrs. V Upton
Mr. W Blunden
Mr. R Plass
Mrs. M Hersey

Also present:

Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Councillor C Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council)
4 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting)

In attendance:

Mr. I. McLean (Planning Administrator)

Not present:

None.

The Chairman of Council, Councillor Will Blunden, opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

280. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE MUNICIPAL YEAR.

280.1 This being the first meeting of the new Committee for the new Council year, Councillor Blunden as Chairman of Council, called for nominations for the office of Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2017/18. Councillor Hodgson was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Snowling and **SECONDED** by Councillor Plass. There being no other nominations, Councillor Simon Hodgson was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2017/18.

281. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN.

281.1 Councillor Hodgson, having duly taken the Chair, called for nominations for the office of Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2017/18. Councillor Snowling was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Blunden and **SECONDED** by Councillor Upton. There being no other nominations, Councillor Christopher Snowling was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2017/18.

282. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

282.1 There were none.

283. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

283.1 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.

284. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 25 APRIL 2017.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

284.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 25 April 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

285.1 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.

285.2 DM/17/1579 – LIVERTON HOUSE, ROUNDWOOD LANE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

285.3 DM/17/1689 – 7 DENMANS LANE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that the treatment of the windows, in terms of UPVC versus powder coated frames, to be installed in the extension should meet the Conservation Officer's requirements satisfaction. The applicants stated that they would be happy to look into the matter.

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

285.4 DM/17/1732 – 54 NOAHS ARK LANE
NEW PORCH TO FRONT ELEVATION.

Mr Jesson noted that this proposal was an improvement on the previous scheme, not yet implemented.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to materials matching the existing dwelling house.

285.5 DM/17/1119 – TACHBROOK, LEWES ROAD
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND KENNEL BUILDINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING WITH A FURTHER TWO (SEMI-DETACHED) DWELLINGS TO THE REAR.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had no objections in principle to the proposed development, but raised the issue of flooding, and referred particularly, to the Flood Risk Assessment. It was unclear whether the Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) solutions suggested in the report, were to be implemented. The applicant stated that the land was not in a flood risk zone, but that he needed to discuss the matter with MSDC, with a view to the issue being addressed by condition. He said that in the application's favour, the architect had tried to be creative, and had not sought to maximise density. The applicant was proposing to use traditional design features and materials, and had sought to try and ensure that the development would fit in with its surroundings. Councillor Snowling said that some good points had been made, and that these should therefore be incorporated in the Parish Council's response.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, but does note and regret the loss of another bungalow in Lindfield. However, the Parish Council also considers that the issues and remedies set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (such as the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems) should as necessary, be dealt with by condition.

285.6 DM/17/1773 – 36 HIGH STREET
PROPOSED HARD LANDSCAPE IN FRONT YARD.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

285.7 DM/17/1807 – LONE OAK, 21 WEST COMMON SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that the property appeared to be a genuine Turner House, and therefore the question of whether the proposal preserved the appearance of the property, was a valid issue. Features of the property, e.g. the bay window, should be replaced or installed on a like-for-like basis in order to preserve the characteristics of the house. The LPS had no objection in principle, but that MSDC do need to consider the application in sympathy with its particular features. The applicant said that it was his intention to enhance the proposals in order to try and ensure that these points were taken on board. Councillor Snowling said that the bay window/quarry tile features of this style of house, were a great asset, and were important to try and preserve. He hoped that they would be reinstalled.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, but comments that it very much supports the proposal to reinstall the bay window/quarry tile feature to the rear extension, in order to help preserve the characteristics of this Turner style property.

286. 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.

286.1 DM/16/3747 – Whitesands, Lewes Road: Side and rear two storey extension. The Parish Council has been notified by the Planning Inspectorate that following refusal of the application (as previously reported to Committee), the application had been allowed on appeal, in a decision letter dated 27th April 2017, subject to conditions.

286.2 DM/17/0928 – Lindfield Coffee works, rear of 70, High Street: Retrospective application for change of use of premises to class Café (A3) with coffee roastery at the rear and outdoor seating area. This application has been approved by MSDC (at Committee level) on 12th May 2017, as set out in the Planning Officer's recommendation, subject to a range of conditions.

286.3 DM/17/1029 – The Palms, Lewes Road: Extension, alteration and addition of first floor to create a two storey, 4 bedroom dwelling, together with the erection of a new detached garage. This second, revised, application has been approved by MSDC on 5th May 2017, subject to conditions.

287. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

287.1 It was reported that an approach had been made to the Parish Council, by the promoter/developer for the redevelopment of the vacant site at the former Tavistock and Summerhill School, who wanted to offer the opportunity of explaining the proposals for the re-development of the site to the Parish Council, as part of the pre-planning application discussions.

287.2 It was accepted that the land is a brown field site, within the built up area boundary, and is therefore a site that is contemplated for some sort of development by policies set out in the Neighbourhood Plan.

287.3 Councillors referred to the standard position of the Parish Council, which was not to engage with developers prior to planning, as there is a risk that such engagement can be misinterpreted, or that it could be later argued that Councillors had not approached a subsequent planning application with an open mind.

287.4 Although it was noted that there is some guidance and a protocol circulated by MSDC for such engagement, the majority view of Councillors was that the Parish Council should be consistent with its previous decisions, and should not take up the invitation above. It was recognised that this was a much more difficult matter than in respect of other approaches from developers. However, Councillors wanted to make clear that any developer of land should always refer to the Neighbourhood Plan, and more especially, the Village Design Statement for guidance on design and density issue.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

287.5 The Planning Administrator reminded members that no formal decisions or action could be taken under the item, but that he had enough information from the discussion held to be able to formulate a response to the enquirer. Councillor Blunden also mentioned that it may be appropriate for the matter to be ratified at a future full Council meeting, should this prove necessary.

Note: Prior to the start of the item, Councillor Hersey declared a personal interest, as the enquirer was a close relative of hers. She therefore took no part in the discussion of the matter.

The Meeting concluded at 8.38 p.m.