

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 17 MARCH 2015** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

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

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS), and 6 members of the public (for part of the meeting only).

In attendance: Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

Absent: Councillors Mrs. M Hersey, and Mrs. V Upton.

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

556. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

556.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Hersey and Upton, and the reasons accepted.

557. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

557.1 There were none declared.

558. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

558.1 Mr. Graham Turner raised the issue of heavy vehicles and lorries travelling up and down the High Street, and the big increase in such movements over the last 18 months. There is a concern amongst residents that vibration damage is being caused to buildings. His objective therefore, is to try and secure a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) in order to impose a weight restriction on the High Street, and a width restriction along the Lewes Road. He read a statement entitled "Preservation of Lindfield", which highlighted the width of the roads in various areas, and gave examples of other roads in the District, where weight restrictions (7.5 tonnes) had been imposed. It was not clear why Lindfield had been left out of these considerations. He also said that the signage in and around the Parish was perverse, in that it directs traffic through Lindfield, even where that might not be necessary. A TRO would therefore protect the heritage of Lindfield. Accordingly, West Sussex County Council Highways Department has been approached, and Mr Turner has also raised the issue at the last Central Mid Sussex County Local Committee meeting on 10th March. There is a need to act urgently, and Lindfield Parish Council is urged to support the proposal. Councillor Gomme said that he thought there would be considerable sympathy for the problem, but that the solutions needed to command community support. On that point, it was noted that the Lindfield Preservation Society is organising a petition in order to back up any application. Mr Jesson gave some examples of the damage that could very well be resulting from the heavy traffic, such as the problems with the Tiger and other heritage buildings in the High Street. A member of the public also referred to structural damage being caused to his property. Councillor Gomme said that it was important that an evidence base of such damage was compiled, so as to directly support any application for the appropriate TRO.

559. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 24 FEBRUARY 2015.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

559.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 24 February 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

560.1 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 for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

560.2 DM/15/0450 – “AMBERLEY”, 51 SUNTE AVENUE
CONSTRUCTION OF REAR AND SIDE SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION.

The applicant said that the neighbouring properties had similar extensions, and so he was somewhat confused by the Parish Council's proposed response. Mr Jesson noted that the features and detailing around the doors and windows are not repeated in the application. Councillor Blunden agreed about the absence of the features, and so couldn't support the application. Councillor Hodgson said that the issue was particularly relevant as this was an Area of Townscape Character. Councillor Snowling also supported the points made by Mr Jesson, and said that whilst the application had to be dealt with on the basis of what was before the Committee, the details present in the house, needed to be worked into the proposed extension.

AGREED RESPONSE: “The Parish Council does not feel that the side extension sits well in the street scene, and doesn't fit in with the adjacent house. Therefore, the Parish Council cannot support this application as it does not meet the requirements of Policy B1 of the Local Plan.”

560.3 DM/15/0532 – 27 HICKMANS LANE
PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER EXISTING GARAGE AND PORCH.

Mr Jesson said that the application did not appear to be significantly different from the previous one, other than the roof detail in order to try and address the bulk issue. Accordingly, the LPS was still not enthusiastic about the proposal. The applicant said that he has tried to match the extension with others, e.g. by use of the gables, and had taken guidance from the planning officer.

AGREED RESPONSE: “The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this application.”

560.4 DM/15/0506 – 10 THE GLEBE
ELM TREE – RAISE CANOPY BY 2.5M WITH AN OVERALL REDUCTION OF 1 METRE THROUGHOUT.

Mr Jesson noted that the description on the planning notification was different to that worded in the application, and that it appeared to have been sanitised. He is concerned that this appears to be becoming a more common occurrence. Councillor Snowling took up the point, and proposed that the response should therefore refer to the issue.

AGREED RESPONSE: “The Parish Council notes that the description of the proposed work in the application differs from the wording set out in the planning notification. Accordingly, the Parish Council raises no objection in respect of those works described by the applicant.”

560.5 DM/15/0643 – “ASHLEA”, LEWES ROAD
GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY.

AGREED RESPONSE: “The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this application.”

560.6 DM/15/0767 – 28 FIELDWAY
REMOVE EXISTING PORCH, CONSTRUCT NEW PORCH.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this application."

- 560.7 DM/15/0360 – 10 DUKES ROAD
PROPOSED CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF SIDE GARAGE.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this application, subject to matching materials and finishes being used."

- 560.8 DM/15/0789 – 7 SUNTE AVENUE
DEMOLISH EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND ERECT PART SINGLE STOREY, PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson expressed his support for the Parish Council's proposed response.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Parish Council considers the proposed extension to have an unneighbourly impact on the amenity of the adjacent properties. We echo the concerns of nearby residents with respect to the potential for overlooking, which would bring the proposal into conflict with policy B3 of the Local Plan. We also have reservations about the bulk of the proposed extension, which we note is a further addition to an already extended dwelling. The proposal does not take into consideration the scale, siting, and height of the extension in relation to the adjacent properties, and so is contrary to policy B1 of the Local Plan."

- 560.9 DM/15/0837 – 22 CHESTNUTS CLOSE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY FRONT AND REAR EXTENSIONS.

Mr Jesson thought that the proposal will change the character of the property quite a lot, but accepted that this may not be a strong enough planning reason for objecting.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this application, subject to matching materials and finishes being used."

561. 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.

- 561.1 14/04637/COU: 44A High Street (former Bookstop), **NOTED:** that the application for change of use of the premises from A1 (shop) to a dual use of B1 (Business) and D1 (non-residential institution) had been approved by MSDC on 5th March 2015, subject to a number of planning conditions, which included restrictions on times of operation (not on Sundays or Public/Bank holidays or at any time otherwise than between the hours of 08:00 – 19:00 Monday to Friday and 09:00 – 13:00 Saturdays).

562. NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.

- 562.1 Councillor Gomme, as Chairman of the Steering Group, reported that the consultation period for comment back to MSDC, following formal submission of the Plan to MSDC, ends on 26th March 2015. After that, the Steering Group would need to discuss any input and comments with MSDC. The Plan would then go forward to formal examination, and the Steering Group is in discussion regarding the appointment of an appropriate examiner.

563. TRAFFIC SURVEY/STUDY IN THE PARISH.

- 563.1 Councillor Gomme introduced the item, and referred to the papers that had been circulated to Members. He said that a number of very helpful comments had been received from other parties consulted on the draft brief, e.g. the LPS. These comments would enhance and strengthen the brief. This was especially so with the heavy vehicle/lorry movement issue discussed at minute 558.1 above.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 563.2 At the invitation of the Chairman a number of people spoke from the floor, and Mr Jesson particularly commented that the traffic issues also needed to be seen in the context of a County-wide matter. WSCC should be encouraged to support what the Parish Council is doing, and the parties should seek County-wide Agreements on traffic management.
- 563.3 Councillor Snowling, supported by Councillor Hodgson, said that it was important that the traffic survey/study should not delay the Parish Council's need to deal with the weight/width restriction issue discussed at minute 558.1. This should be dealt with as a separate matter, and it needs to come back as a specific Agenda item, to a future meeting of the Committee before the end of the current term (given the elections in May). It was noted that the petition will need to have been received by then.
- 563.4 Councillor Blunden cited the example of the Backwoods Lane yellow lines, where a TRO had been satisfactorily achieved.
- 563.5 Accordingly, it was **AGREED** that the brief be approved, subject to the inclusion of the appropriate amendments and enhancements as discussed, and that delegated authority be given to the Clerk/Deputy Clerk to finalise the document in consultation with Councillor Gomme, prior to it going forward to the Council for approval.
- 564. PLANNING & TRAFFIC COMMITTEE BUDGET PROGRESS 2014/15: TO REVIEW PAYMENTS MADE FROM 01.12.14 TO 31. 01.15.**
- 564.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, and indicated that the spread sheet in fact included payments up to 28.02.15.
- 564.2 **NOTED:** that there had been a payment of £1,063.33 in respect of the Neighbourhood Plan, in the period 01.12.14 to 28.02.15 during the current financial year, from the P&T in-year budget.
- 564.3 It was further noted that the ongoing Committee's budget for 2015/16 was important, because there could be costs arising from the formal examination stage of the Neighbourhood Plan.
- 565. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**
- 565.1 Councillor Gomme mentioned that he had attended, earlier today, the workshop on Haywards Heath Town Council's Traffic survey. The study had concentrated on cycle routes and pedestrians, and the conclusions and recommendations coming back from the study did not seem to be particularly conclusive. Traffic flows and statistics were not greatly in evidence. It was possible that a 20 mph speed restriction be implemented for Haywards Heath's Town Centre. The point was made that both in respect of Haywards Heath's and Lindfield's issues, traffic needs to be encouraged to use the main routes provided for them (such as the Haywards Heath relief road), and discouraged from using less appropriate alternatives.

The Meeting concluded at 8.58 p.m.