

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 18 MARCH 2014** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

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

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

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

Absent: Councillor Mrs V. Upton.

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

425. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

425.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Upton and the reason was accepted.

426. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

426.1 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 B, 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.

426.2 Councillor Chatfield declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(vii) as she was acquainted with the applicant, and so stated that she would neither speak nor vote in the matter.

427. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 25 FEBRUARY 2014.

427.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 25 February 2014. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

428. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION

428.1 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 in order to cater for those persons present wishing to speak to an application.

428.2 14/00618/TCA – LINDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE
T1 PINE – CROWN LIFT BY REMOVING THE 2 LOWEST BRANCHES AND REDUCE BY 25% BACK TO THE OLD GROWTH POINTS. T2 PINE – FELL. T4 PINE – REMOVE HEAVY LIMB GROWING OVER NEIGHBOUR'S PROPERTY. T5 AND T6 POPLARS – REDUCE CROWNS BY 25% CUTTING BACK TO GROWTH POINTS.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

- 428.3 14/00646/TCA – LINDFIELD BOWLING CLUB, LINDFIELD COMMON BOWLING PAVILION, BACKWOODS LANE
REMOVAL OF 1 SYCAMORE AND 2 ELM TREES.

The applicant stated that the trees had self-planted and were damaging the surrounding area. He confirmed that measures will be taken to screen the area from neighbouring properties. It was noted that this would help cover the Tree Warden's concern.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided that new suitable planting and screening is installed to shield the Bowling Club's storage area from their neighbours."

- 428.4 14/00627/FUL – HEATHERS, BRUSHES LANE
PROPOSED 2 STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS TO THE EASTERN BOUNDARY.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council notes that this application has since been invalidated, and will therefore defer comment pending receipt of a revised application."

Note: Councillor Snowling requested that as the application had already been looked at by himself and Councillor Hodgson, it was appropriate that the revised application be allocated back to them.

- 428.5 14/00658/LDC – 10 BROOK LANE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION. THIS IS AN APPLICATION TO ESTABLISH WHETHER THE DEVELOPMENT IS LAWFUL: THIS WILL BE A LEGAL DECISION WHERE THE PLANNING MERITS OF THE PROPOSED USE CANNOT BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT.

AGREED RESPONSE: "As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the development, Lindfield Parish Council can only respond that there are no reasons for legal, valid, objections as far as it is aware."

- 428.6 14/00722/TCA – 2 CHURCH CLOSE, FRANCIS ROAD
T1 CYPRUS TO BE REMOVED DUE TO WIND DAMAGE.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the removal of this tree in the garden of no.2 Church Close".

- 428.7 14/00726/FUL - 7 FRENCH GARDENS
ALTERATIONS, ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH EXTENSION AND CONVERSION OF REMAINING SECTION OF FORMER GARAGE INTO STUDY. MINOR WIDENING OF DRIVEWAY AND REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING NON-PERMEABLE SURFACE WITH PERMEABLE BLOCKWORK.

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

- 428.8 14/00513/FUL – POSTMASTERS, 34 HIGH STREET
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND CONSERVATORY. REPLACING WITH A DOUBLE STOREY EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REPLACE THE CONSERVATORY. ADDITIONAL WORK INCLUDES: DEMOLITION OF WALL TO WIDEN VEHICULAR ACCESS AND INSTALL NEW GATE; NEW SEMI-CIRCULAR PORCH AT FRONT ELEVATION; AND CHANGE OF FRONT DOOR PAINT COLOUR.

Mr Jesson expressed concern that the details of this application did not meet the particular requirements of Local Plan policy for applications in the Conservation Area (CA). The proposal was not sympathetic

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

with the surrounding area, and the scale of the extensions does not respect the locality. He agreed with the Parish Council's proposed comments about the new gate, and referred to the Village Design Statement, which sets out existing guidance on such matters. In brief, he considered this to be a rather unsatisfactory application.

The applicant stated that the proposal bore comparison with other properties, and that the materials chosen were designed to be in keeping with nearby houses, e.g. clay hung tiles to mirror no.36. In her view the extensions would also largely be hidden from view because they are at the rear of the existing building. She again thought that the paint colours were not out of keeping with other properties in the area, but would be happy to consider reverting to white. She also referred to the difficulties of vehicular access in and out of the property from the Lewes Road.

Councillor Blunden re-iterated the point about the gate design, and said that the Village Design Statement was a helpful document in this respect. The majority of gates in the area are of wrought iron. He also thought that the removal of the Beech trees would open up the whole area. He agreed with Mr Jesson about the inadequacies of the plans and documents in the application. Councillor Snowling said that the application did not appear to meet the strict requirements of applications in the CA, despite the best efforts of the applicant. Councillor Gomme said that the applicant had to be considered in two parts. One was the standard of the documentation, and the other was the serious concerns about the gate, and some aspects of the extension proposals.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council is of the view that particularly within the Conservation Area of Lindfield, the proposals for the additional work will have a serious impact on the street scene at this gateway into the High Street. The style of the proposed new gate is not appropriate to the setting of the Lewes Road, and has an overbearing and unnecessarily security conscious design. It will appear to be more of a barrier than a gate. The Council is also concerned that the new hedge and planting alongside the boundary with Masters and Son could have an adverse effect on the wall. The Council is also of the view that the colours chosen for the exterior paintwork, including the fascia boards, soffits and cladding, will be too prominent and will not blend in with either the street scene from the Lewes Road, or with the High Street itself. The Council would also point out that under local plan policy, the standard of drawings and detail for any planning application within the Conservation Area is especially high. In the Council's view, for example as to the treatment of the front elevation, the plans and drawings are entirely inadequate, and provide insufficient detail on which make a proper judgement. However, as far as the Council can ascertain from what has been provided, the Council would not object to the proposed extensions themselves provided that the materials and finishes match the existing building."

429. 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.

429.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that the planning application (14/00087/FUL) for the Witch Inn, that had been the subject of a long and controversial planning history, had finally been granted consent by MSDC subject to extensive conditions. A copy of the consent had been sent to all members of the Committee.

429.2 Councillor Hersey advised the Committee that the planning application (14/00141/FUL) for Lantern Cottage, Spring Lane, which had been recommended for refusal by the case officer at MSDC, had in fact been allowed by the Planning Committee. The Parish Council had previously expressed "no objections" to this application, and Councillor Hersey had spoken in favour of the application at MSDC's Planning Committee.

430. FOOTPATH CREATION ORDER – BRUSHES LANE

430.1 The Deputy Clerk reported on the background to the matter, and referred to the consultation papers that had been sent by West Sussex County Council. The Parish Council was being consulted on a Public Footpath Creation Order (ref: CC3/10028/TM) under section 26 of the Highways Act 1980 relating to the path leading from Brushes Lane down to the corner of the Wilderness Field. The details had been

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

forwarded to Members and posted on the Noticeboard. It was noted that the legal officer at WSCC had sent a full and detailed explanation of the proposal, and had confirmed that there were no plans to do anything with the footpath, which might affect its existing rural setting. Members also noted that the Order would help with future issues along the footpath, such as clearance of obstructions, and that the Parish Council therefore had no reason to object to the making of the Order. Indeed, the view was that it should be supported.

- 430.2 It was therefore **resolved** that the Deputy Clerk be instructed to write to WSCC to confirm that the Parish Council had no objections to the Order and that it would wish to support it. The letter should also contain confirmation of the Deputy Clerk's previous request that the Parish Council be consulted on any proposals for the footpath, which might come forward in the future.

431. HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN COUNCIL'S (HHTC) DRAFT NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

- 431.1 The Chairman confirmed that he and the Deputy Clerk had recently met in order to consider, and draft a response to the formal consultation on Haywards Heath Town Council's draft Neighbourhood Plan. This draft had been circulated to Members, but for the benefit of everyone present, the Chairman read out the draft response. Councillor Snowling said that he thought the proposed response, which was supportive of the Plan, was entirely appropriate in the circumstances, and that it should be sent to HHTC with the Committee's approval. This view was supported by other Members.

- 431.2 It was therefore **resolved** to approve the response and to send it to the Town Clerk at HHTC, as soon as possible.

432. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 432.1 Councillor Snowling informed the Committee for information, that Lindfield Rural Parish Council was involved in the naming of the Gravelye Lane/Lyoth Lane housing development, and the soon to be constructed estate roads within the site. He said that the developer was putting forward some very interesting suggestions, including references to some Lindfield High Street place names.

The Meeting concluded at 8.32 p.m.