

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 18 JULY 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

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

Also present: Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Councillor C Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council)

In attendance: Mr. I McLean (Planning Administrator)

Not present: None.

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

311. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

311.1 None received, as all Members are present.

312. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

312.1 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.

313. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 27 JUNE 2017.

313.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 27 June 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

314.1 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.

314.2 DM/17/2472 – 65 SAVILL ROAD
T2 OAK - FELL (DESCRIPTION AMENDED 20.06.17)

Mr Jesson commented that despite the request set out in the application form, no substitute tree had been offered as a replacement.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. The tree is dead and so needs to be felled.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 314.3 DM/17/2483 – 11 DUKES ROAD
T1 ELM - FELL. G1 SELF SOWN SYCAMORE - REMOVE.

Mr Jesson made the same point as above.

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

- 314.4 DM/17/2575 – 107 HIGH STREET
ASH - (T1) FELL. SYCAMORE (T2) FELL.

Whilst it was noted that this application has already been decided, Mr Jesson was of the view that these trees are the subject of Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs), despite the fact that the Tree Officer has indicated that they are not. Members also expressed concern at the inference in the Tree Officers report that “unfortunately, in this case, representations carry no weight due to the fact that this is a notification of intention to fell. Similarly, replacement trees may not be required as a condition.” Although unclear at one point, it was also noted that the owner of the trees does want them felled. The Planning Administrator will pursue the issues raised with the Tree Officer.

Note: This application has already been decided by MSDC on 17th June 2017 (no objections). However, there is an issue regarding whether or not the trees are the subject of existing TPOs. Nonetheless, the comments of the Parish Council were read out as follows “Our view is that as the two trees are very prominent in that part of the Village clear indication of the possible risk of collapse should be provided, showing that alternative treatment short of felling is not possible. These are massive trees and it is not obvious either way about keeping them. The Ash has canker. It is not going to improve, but it is not a danger. The Sycamore could do with the two larger outside stems removed and the smaller ones left”.

- 314.5 DM/17/2606 – DARENTH, 47 HICKMANS LANE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

- 314.6 DM/17/2636 – 11 FRANCIS ROAD
(T1) ORNAMENTAL CHERRY TREE - REDUCE CROWN BY 5 METRES.

Mr Jesson thought that 5 metres was a lot, but otherwise had no objections.

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

- 314.7 DM/17/2461 – 40 HIGH STREET
REPLACEMENT OF TWO AWNINGS PROVIDING SHADING TO THE TWO FRONT WINDOWS.

Mr Jesson said that there was no concern over the awnings themselves, but it needed to be considered whether the nature of the proposed advertisements on them, could have an adverse effect on the Conservation Area, or on adjoining listed buildings. It was noted however, that this part of the application is expected by way of a separate advertisements application, and so would be looked at further in due course.

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

- 314.8 DM/17/2462 (LBC) – 40 HIGH STREET
REPLACEMENT OF TWO AWNINGS PROVIDING SHADING TO THE TWO FRONT WINDOWS.

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

- 314.9 DM/17/2716 – 13 FRANCIS ROAD
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING WINDOWS AND RENDER.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson said that he agreed with the proposed comments of the Parish Council, but noted that the only problem is policy B12 of the Local Plan, which clearly resists replacement windows using UPVC frames. It was noted that over time MSDC have been taking a more relaxed attitude towards this issue, as the technological nature of such frames, improves, and indeed the policy proposed in the emerging District Plan is much less prescriptive. Members thought that in a mix of existing frames, it would be difficult to try and force the owner to go back to wood.

AGREED RESPONSE: Whilst Lindfield Parish Council understands that the proposed window replacement is not as per the original, the intended window is much improved on the existing and represents a good modern alternative. Therefore, we have no objection. Regarding the render, it is in a poor state of repair, so provided it is repaired in a sympathetic way and coloured in a similar way, there are no objections either.

315. 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.

315.1 DM/17/2157 - Lindfield Cricket Club, Lindfield Common, Backwoods Lane: Proposed 8x Soundtex acoustic quilts to be attached to the rear and side of the cricket nets. Quilts are to be hung on the metal cage surrounding the nets and are to be in-situ April-August each year. It was reported that this matter has been referred to MSDC's Planning Committee A on 20th July 2017. The officer's report recommends that permission be granted, subject to conditions. Councillor Hersey mentioned that it had been referred to Committee, because MSDC owns the land on which the Club is situation (i.e. Lindfield Common.)

315.2 DM/17/1873 – Land opposite 1 Grahams Cottages, Spring Lane: Demolition of residential garage / ancillary accommodation and the erection of a 1 one bed dwelling with associated landscaping. It was reported that as for the previous application, this application had been refused by MSDC on 12th July 2017 on the grounds that the development is located within the Countryside Area of Development restraint outside the built up boundary of Lindfield. It is considered unsustainable, and harmful to the Lindfield Conservation Area. It is out of keeping with the rural character of the area. There is also an adverse impact on surrounding trees.

316. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

316.1 No other items of business were raised on this occasion.

The meeting concluded at 8.21 p.m.