

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 21 JULY 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
Mrs. M Hersey
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mr. C Snowling
Mrs. V Upton
Mr. R Plass
Mr. S Shortland

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Councillor C. Hersey (MSDC)
2 members of the public

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

Absent: Mrs. E Hinze, and Mrs. J Durrant.

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

027. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

027.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Hinze, and the reason accepted.

028. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

028.1 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, 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.

028.2 There were no other declarations of interest.

029. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

029.1 Mr Jesson informed the Committee that three Parish Councils had so far considered the Traffic Regulation Order being proposed, in order to introduce weight restrictions for HGVs, and all had come out in support – see the minutes of Lindfield Parish Council meeting held on 16th July 2015 for further information. He also reported that Worth Parish Council's sub-committee was similarly recommending support for the TRO to its Council. He considered therefore that good progress was being made.

030. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 30 JUNE 2015.

030.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 30 June 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

031.1 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.

031.2 DM/15/2476 - THE TURRET HOUSE, OLD PLACE, HIGH STREET
SECONDARY INTERNAL DOUBLE GLAZING FOR 2 NO. DORMER WINDOWS, 1 SMALL HIGH WINDOW, AND 1 BATHROOM WINDOW ON GROUND FLOOR AND 2 LANDING WINDOWS ON THE FIRST FLOOR. ALSO, REBUILDING, REPOINTING TOP COURSES OF ONE MAIN CHIMNEY.

The Deputy Clerk informed the Committee that the application had only just been validated, because it was not complete, and therefore had not to date, been put up on MSDC's planning web page. It was noted that it was possible to comment from what paper plans there were, even if only provisionally, but it was agreed that the matter should be deferred, pending the receipt of the complete information. Councillor Gomme asked the Deputy Clerk to respond to MSDC accordingly, and to ensure that once the new date for comment was known, the Parish Council was kept fully informed.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has been advised that this application has, as at the date of the meeting, only just been validated. It was therefore decided to defer consideration of the application, pending receipt of the further information."

031.3 DM/15/2525 – POND VIEW, 10 HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: "As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed development, we can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware."

031.4 DM/15/2629 – 1 CHESTNUTS CLOSE (WYCHWOOD)
T1 SCOTS PINE - CROWN LIFT BY REMOVING THREE LOWEST BRANCHES OVERHANGING ROOF, GARDEN AND DECKING AND ONE BRANCH OVERHANGING ROAD.

The applicant set out the background to the application, and said that the tree was causing problems to his garden, the property, and the road. This was in respect of blocked gutters, and roosting birds, with the associated mess. He said that the tree was detracting from his enjoyment of the garden. He also said that he disagreed that the tree had any visual amenity.

Councillor Hersey said that she had every sympathy with the applicant, but that there were no sound planning reasons, which might justify the Parish Council being able to approve the application. She also pointed out that the Parish Council was simply a statutory consultee in the process, and that the actual decision would ultimately be made by MSDC. Councillor Plass said that he stood by the proposed comments.

As this was potentially a contentious matter, the Chairman called for a vote by way of a show of hands, and the proposed response was agreed by the Committee unanimously (although the Chairman did not vote).

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council believes that the proposed work is excessive, and there will be little of the tree left, if it is done. The tree will look rather out of place and unbalanced. There appears to be no reasonable planning grounds for these particular proposals, and so the Council cannot therefore support them. In addition, the Tree Warden has commented that he sees no reason for the work, and that the tree is rather sparse already."

031.5 DM/15/2711 – 31 EASTERN ROAD
DEMOLITION OF STORE ROOM AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

032. 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.

032.1 DM/15/1686 and DM/15/1684 – 3 Pelham Place Cottages, Black Hill, for proposed single storey rear extension and internal alterations: the Deputy Clerk reported that the two applications, both FUL and LBC, have been refused by MSDC on 20th July 2015, as the extension is considered inappropriate to the design of the existing building, and will as a result, fail to preserve the character and appearance of the conservation area.

033. BUDGETARY MATTERS.

033.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, which set out the Committee's budget progress for 2015/16. All payments up to 30.06.15 were recorded. However, it was noted that there were in fact none to report for this period.

033.2 **NOTED:** that there had been no payments in the period 01.04.15 to 30.06.15 in the current financial year, from the P&T in-year budget for 2015/16.

033.3 The Deputy Clerk also reported that at its meeting on 16th July 2015, the Council had agreed to reduce the Committee's designated reserve for professional fees and the Neighbourhood Plan, from £53,990.06 to £15,000. This was part of a package to ensure that the Council's designated reserves reflected the available funds. It was also noted that there was still the separate designated reserve of £20,000 for the traffic survey/study.

033.4 Councillor Shortland asked about progress with regard to the traffic survey, and the Deputy Clerk responded by saying that having now heard from West Sussex County Council with some suggested firms and organisations, in order to improve the contractors' list, it was hoped that the Parish Council would be going out to tender in the next week or so.

034. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

034.1 Councillor Blunden said that it was important that in certain instances (such as the refurbishment currently being carried out in the High Street), building works being done over an extended period of time, in accordance with an existing planning consent, should be periodically monitored, in order to ensure compliance with the relevant permission. Retrospective applications for areas where the applicant had deviated from the current consent, also needed to be guarded against. Councillor Hersey said that she was aware of this occurring previously in regard to other examples.

The Meeting concluded at 8.16 p.m.