

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 1 JULY 2014** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present: Parish Councillors: Mrs. M. Hersey (Vice Chairman)
Mr. M. Amor
Mrs. J. Chatfield
Mr. S. Hodgson
Mr C. Snowling

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

In attendance: Mrs. C. Irwin (Clerk).

Absent: Councillors Mr. W. Blunden, Mr. A. Gomme (Chairman) Mrs. V. Upton

In the absence of Councillor Gomme, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Hersey chaired the meeting.

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

465. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

465.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blunden, Gomme and Upton and the reasons were accepted.

466. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

466.1 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.

467. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

467.1 Application 13/01725/DCOND - Compton House. Mr. Jesson referred to the decision notification for this application and noted that the planning application for discharge of conditions had not been published in the weekly lists issued by MSDC. Had he been aware of the application, which related to planting and landscaping to the rear of the building, he would have raised objections as he considered that the proposal was not compliant with the spirit of the conditions set out in the main planning approval.

467.2 Application 14/00627/FUL - Heathers, Brushes Lane. Mr. Jesson referred to his correspondence with the Deputy Clerk on the matter of the new access to the property on Brushes Lane. He called into question the statement in the Planning Officer's report, seemingly made on a technical argument, that the new access had been made under permitted development and for this reason it did not form part of this planning application. He contended that the application did in fact include this access and its consequences should have been of interest to the Planning Officer. Mr. Jesson suggested that the Council may wish to consider this and make representations to MSDC.

468. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 10 JUNE 2014.

468.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 10 June 2014. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

469.1 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.

469.2 THE GARAGE BETWEEN 52 AND 53 MEADOW LANE DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE AND ERECTION OF TWO STOREY DWELLING.

Mr. Jesson raised two principal objections to this revised application. Although there had been some marginal improvement, with the reduced height, LPS considered that there was still a potential for overlooking at the rear and that the application did not comply with Local Plan policy B1 sub- clauses (a) and (c) in terms of respect for the locality and spacing around the buildings.

The applicant's representative stated that points raised on the previous submission, regarding the balcony at the rear (which had been removed from the current plan) siting of bins and the height of the building, had been addressed. The plot was 15' wide and 200' in length with the proposed dwelling to occupy around 10% of the site. There were several other examples of narrow dwellings in Lindfield (eg. Francis Road, Alma Road and Spring Lane) some of which were only 12' wide. The deeds for the plot with garage purchased in 2012 stated that the site had been sold in 1952 with rights to build a dwelling-house on the site and connect to all services. The plans had been designed with a modern twist without spoiling the street scene and in his view this was a good design and sustainable development.

During discussion it was noted that the site plan had not been included in the copies of the plans provided to the Parish Council, without which it was difficult to evaluate the situation on the ground. It was noted that the reference in the 1952 transfer document to the rights to build a house on the site probably did not refer to formal permission from the Local Authority. It was generally felt that this dwelling would be intrusive between two bungalows and Members agreed with the comments made on behalf of LPS.

AGREED RESPONSE: "At the meeting of Lindfield Parish Council's Planning and Traffic Committee on 1 July 2014, it was noted that this Meadow Lane property is not numbered. It was also noted that paper copies of the plans for this application did not include the site plan, which would have enabled the Committee to evaluate the space between the proposed dwelling and neighbouring properties".

Nevertheless this proposed dwelling appears to be an overdevelopment of the site and the Parish Council is unable to support the application on the grounds that the proposed building would be overbearing on the two bungalows on each side, and would cause a loss of light. It would therefore be unneighbourly and out of keeping with the street scene, in conflict with Local Plan Policy B1 (a) and (c) in terms of respect for the character of the locality, particularly the neighbouring buildings and the spacing between this and the adjacent buildings ."

469.3 14/01935/LBC – THE MANOR HOUSE, 85 HIGH STREET REPLACEMENT OF PEDESTRIAN AND VEHICULAR ENTRANCE GATES AND POSTS.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council would support this retrospective application, for the gates to be left as they are and not painted."

469.4 14/01951/FUL – 19 FINCHES PARK ROAD PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO CREATE NEW KITCHEN BREAKFAST ROOM.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application as long as matching materials and finishes are used."

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 469.5 14/02058/LDP – VORES OAK, LEWES ROAD
PROPOSED 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 comment that there are no reasons for objection on legal, valid grounds as far as it is aware.”

- 469.6 14/01925/FUL – HEATHERS, BRUSHES LANE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY ORANGERY EXTENSION.

Mr. Jesson commented that although the proposal was clear from the drawings, the abbreviated description was not adequate to alert interested parties to what was being proposed. LPS had no objection in principle, but considered that there was insufficient detail about the materials which he suggested should be taken as reserved matters so as not to delay approval.

AGREED RESPONSE: “There are no objections to this application. However we would respectfully suggest that the materials, which are not sufficiently well specified, should be taken as reserved matters”

470. 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.

- 470.1 There were no matters of significance for the Committee to note.

471. RAPID CHARGE POINTS – ELECTRIC CARS.

- 471.1 The Deputy Clerk had forwarded to Members a circular email, dated 19 June, from David Room, Sales Manager of Electromotive, regarding a Government initiative to provide “rapid charge points” to enable electric car drivers to make longer journeys. It stated that Kent, Surrey and East and West Sussex County Councils had been successful in securing funding for approximately 50 of these units and locations were being sought which had to meet a set of five criteria. Councillor Gomme had asked for this to be included on the Agenda for Members to consider whether Lindfield should seek to provide a suitable location, in consultation (as necessary) with landowners, for the installation of one of these points.

During discussion it was **NOTED** that there were still very few all electric cars in the area, but it was acknowledged that their numbers were likely to increase over time. Other charge points in the area appeared to be mainly used for the vehicles used by Council personnel such as parking attendants. It was considered debatable as to whether the Council should support the provision of a charge point and then assess the demand or rather to wait until there was a known demand and respond then. It was **AGREED** to defer making a decision, pending further information on the likelihood of demand in this part of Sussex (recognising that those who would use it would include visitors from outside Lindfield) and confirmation as to the arrangements for metering the energy used. It was suggested that enquiries could be made through MSDC and the Clerks of other Parish and Town Councils.

472. PLANNING & TRAFFIC COMMITTEE BUDGET PROGRESS 2014/15: TO REVIEW PAYMENTS MADE FROM 01.04.14 TO 31.05.14.

- 472.1 **NOTED:** there had been no expenditure to date during the current financial year from the P&T in-year budget totalling £40,200.00 or from the reserves of £34,490.00.

473. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 473.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.35 p.m.