

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 19 APRIL 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

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

Also present:

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

Not present:

Mrs J. Durrant

In attendance:

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

In the absence of the Chairman, Councillor Gomme, Councillor Hodgson as the Vice Chairman of the Committee took the Chair for this meeting.

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

129. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

129.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Gomme, and the reason accepted.

130. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

130.1 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.

130.2 Councillor Blunden declared a personal interest in item 4 (xi) - Fullingmill Farm, as the applicant is a friend.

130.3 Councillor Hodgson declared a personal interest in item 4 (iv) – 1 Portsmouth Wood, as he lives nearby in Portsmouth Wood Close.

130.4 Councillor Plass declared a personal interest in item 4 (xi) – Fullingmill Farm, as he helps organise a running event, which uses the public footpath in question.

130.5 Councillor Upton declared a personal, non-prejudicial interest in item 4 (viii) – 51 Luxford Road, as she lives in this road.

131. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 29 MARCH 2016.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

131.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 29 March 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

132.1 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.

132.2 DM/16/1178 – 29 DUKES ROAD
PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR GARAGE EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR DORMER WINDOW PROJECTION.

Mr Jesson observed that the pitch of the roof over the garage is different to the existing, and although not a reason in itself to object, it was another issue to be added to the others. Councillor Snowling said that the additional comments proposed in the response, should be deleted, as this might make any future consideration of a new proposal difficult.

AGREED RESPONSE: The current gap between the buildings is not unreasonable, but it is noted that the culmination of the proposals both at no 28 and 29, will reduce this significantly. We do therefore have objections to the garage extension going forward. We also take the view that the extension breaches the current building line in the road, which will have an adverse effect on the street scene, contrary to Local Plan policy. We cannot therefore support the proposal as the plans stand.

132.3 DM/16/0119 – CHIMNEY CORNER, HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY GARDEN ROOM EXTENSION, DECKING AND SCREEN WALL (AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 22 FEBRUARY 2016, AMENDED DESCRIPTION TO INCLUDE DECKING AND SCREEN WALL 29 MARCH 2016).

Mr Jesson noted that this application, in one form or another, kept coming back, and it would be nice to see the matter resolved once and for all.

AGREED RESPONSE: As previously, we note that the height of the proposed extension has been by approximately 750mm. However, in view of the as yet unresolved concerns of the neighbouring property, objections are maintained in terms of the loss of outlook and amenity due to the height of the proposed extension, all of which are contrary to local plan policy. We also have concerns about the proposed decking, as this can often attract vermin.

132.4 DM/16/1030 – WHITESANDS, LEWES ROAD
VEHICLE CROSSOVER TO FRONT OF HOUSE AND 2M FENCE TO SIDE BOUNDARY NEXT TO PAVEMENT.

Mr Jesson thought that the proposal for the tall fence was not satisfactory, as this would be to the detriment of the character of the area. It would particularly effect, the open, gateway appearance of the entrance to Noahs Ark Lane. He said that he was less concerned about the vehicle crossover.

AGREED RESPONSE: We note that there are discrepancies on the planning application. However, we feel that we cannot support this application, as it would change the street scene in this area, contrary to Local Plan policy. The property is situated at the gateway to Noahs Ark Lane, and this proposal will adversely affect the open aspect of this part of Lindfield.

132.5 DM/16/1088 – 1 PORTSMOUTH WOOD
TO ERECT A 1.8M HIGH FENCE TO WEST BOUNDARY OF PROPERTY BEHIND EXISTING YEW HEDGE (FENCE TO BE REMOVED ONCE HEDGE IS ESTABLISHED).

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

In view of his declaration of interest and intention to leave the room for the duration of the discussion of this application, Councillor Hodgson called for nominations to the Chair for the conduct of this item. Councillor Snowling proposed Councillor Blunden, and this was seconded by Councillor Plass. Accordingly Councillor Blunden was unanimously elected to the Chair for this one item. Councillor Hodgson subsequently left the room.

A resident spoke against the application, and said that the road was in an area of Townscape Character under the Neighbourhood Plan. He urged the Parish Council to recognise that the proposal is inappropriate. Mr Jesson said that the character of the area was important in its own right, and this will be damaged by the current proposal. He also queried when the fence would be moved, as there was no timetable given for this. The applicant reiterated that the fence is a temporary measure, and the proposal was to improve the safety and security of the garden as a child's play area. He said that there were similar fences nearby. Councillor Snowling said that whilst he could understand the sentiments behind the proposal, he did share Mr Jesson's concerns.

AGREED RESPONSE: We do not feel able to support this application, as it would have a detrimental effect on the street scene contrary to Local Plan policy. Whilst understanding the needs of the applicant, the character of this part of Lindfield, which is an area of Townscape Character within the newly made Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, is important in its own right, and should be protected.

- 132.6 DM/16/1253 – 20 WEST COMMON DRIVE
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY AND REPLACEMENT GROUND FLOOR STRUCTURE AND PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH.

AGREED RESPONSE: There are no objections to this application.

- 132.7 DM/16/1263 – ALLENS WALL, BLACK HILL
ERECTION OF NEW DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE WITH SUBSEQUENT DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE.

Two near neighbours spoke against the application, citing reasons of design, the effect on the amenity, the effect on the outlook, and the setting of the neighbouring listed building (Little Pelham) within the Conservation Area. Mr Jesson said that he thought it was a serious omission that the application had not taken into account the Village Design Statement. No topography detail had been included, and so it was difficult to judge what the height of the new building would be. However, it seems clear that it will be bigger and taller, and so the outlook issue into and out of the Conservation Area, will be even greater. The LPS must therefore object to the proposal. The applicant stated that the present building could be considered ugly and decrepit, and the best solution was in fact to build a new house. Even though the position has moved, the footprint has been kept the same, and efforts have been made to mitigate the neighbours' concerns. Councillor Snowling agreed that it was not an attractive building, but expressed doubts as to whether this was the right solution in the right place. There was particular concern about the need to protect the wall (which is believed to be listed), and Councillor Hersey felt that the new building will come very close to the wall, and this could add an unwelcome effect.

AGREED RESPONSE: We cannot support this application, because it appears that it will have an adverse effect on the setting of the adjacent listed building. It is therefore unneighbourly. We also found it difficult to judge the height of this building in relation to the existing. We would also have concerns about the need to protect the nearby wall, which is a listed structure, but which is not, the Parish Council believes, in the applicant's ownership. We particularly note that the lane is very narrow, and there is a concern about the access of construction/delivery vehicles. Principally therefore, the proposal does not meet the objectives of policy B1 and B10 of the Local Plan 2004.

- 132.8 DM/16/1268 – 76 BROOKWAY
VELUX WINDOWS FOR LOFT CONVERSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: There are no objections to this application.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 132.9 DM/16/1353 – 51 LUXFORD ROAD
PROPOSED TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: There are no objections to this application.

- 132.10 DM/16/1434 – LITTLE PELHAM, BLACK HILL
REMOVE FLAT ROOF EXTENSION AND REPLACE WITH SINGLE STOREY PITCHED ROOF EXTENSION. REPLACE EXISTING SIDE ACCESS DOOR WITH SASH WINDOW.

Mr Jesson said that the setting of the building was not compromised, and so the LPS found the proposal entirely acceptable.

AGREED RESPONSE: We have reviewed the listing and consider that the current downstairs toilet is not one of the reasons for the listing, but is in fact a later extension. Therefore, as we consider that the proposed replacement extension will enhance Little Pelham, we have no objections to this application.

- 132.11 DM/16/1435 (LBC) – LITTLE PELHAM, BLACK HILL
REMOVE FLAT ROOF EXTENSION AND REPLACE WITH SINGLE STOREY PITCHED ROOF EXTENSION. REPLACE EXISTING SIDE ACCESS DOOR WITH SASH WINDOW.

AGREED RESPONSE: See as above.

- 132.12 DM/16/1310 – FULLINGMILL FARM, SPRING LANE (IN THE RURAL PARISH)
ENGINEERING WORKS USING IMPORTED INERT FILL TO RAISE GROUND LEVEL TO HISTORIC LEVELS AND ALLOW THE RE-OPENING OF PUBLIC FOOTPATH 27LR.

In accordance with their declarations of interest, Councillors Blunden and Plass left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.

Mr Jesson said that it was important that the safeguards, which the applicant had agreed to provide in the application, should be enshrined in planning conditions. Councillor Hersey agreed, and said that the conditions would be important for the proper implementation of the proposal. Councillor Snowling said that his concern was that there was no end date given for the cessation of the activity. Councillor Shortland said that he didn't think the vehicle movement figures matched up in terms of the daily and overall projections, and so needed checking. Councillor Snowling moved that the Parish Council raise no objections in principle, provided that appropriate conditions (as had been discussed and appear below in the response) were attached to any consent granted.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council raises no objections in principle to this application, provided that appropriate planning conditions are attached to the statements made by the applicant governing (i) wheel washing and road cleansing, (ii) warning signage, (iii) restrictions on the number of HGV movements per day, (iv) restrictions on times of delivery and working, and finally, the Planning Authority must impose a condition, in discussion with the applicant, setting a fixed end date for the cessation of the delivery of the inert fill to the site.

- 133. 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.**

- 133.1 DM/16/0581 – 7 Denmans Lane (Application for the demolition of a garden wall, addition of paved area to front garden, and dropping of the kerb): **NOTED:** that although the Planning and Traffic Committee had raised no objections to this application at the meeting on 08 March 2016, MSDC had refused permission on 13 April 2016, as the application failed a number of policies in the 2004 Local Plan, particularly as regards the appearance and effect on the Conservation Area.

- 134. PARISH COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO PLANNING APPLICATION DM/16/1012.**

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 134.1 At the last Committee meeting held on 29th March 2016, the response to the above application (being land to the east of Gravelye Lane: outline planning application for residential development with some matters reserved, comprising the erection of up to 130 no. dwellings, together with some vehicular and pedestrian access, public open space, car parking and landscaping) was, in view of the time constraints involved, delegated to the Clerks under the Parish Council's Standing Order procedure.
- 134.2 The Deputy Clerk reported that the agreed response had been duly approved and submitted to MSDC on 12th April, and a copy sent round to all members. This response is now available for public viewing on the MSDC website for the planning application concerned, but is appended to these minutes for reference purposes.
- 134.3 The response was duly noted and confirmed.

135. DONATION TO SUSSEX BIODIVERSITY RECORD CENTRE.

- 135.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that although no fee was payable, it had been suggested that the Parish Council agree a donation of £50 to the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre for updating the Desktop Biodiversity report, used to inform the neighbourhood planning process, and which in the context of planning applications and the Neighbourhood Plan, and for Lindfield Parish Council generally in terms of its decision making, is a useful document and should be updated.
- 135.2 Accordingly, it was **RESOLVED** to make a donation of £50 to the Centre, the expenditure being in accordance with s.137 of the Local Government Act 1972.

136. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 136.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.50 p.m.