

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 21 JUNE 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mr. C Snowling
Mr. R. Plass
Mr. S Shortland
Mrs. M Hersey (from 8.19 p.m.)

Also present: Councillor John Dumbleton, Chair of Lindfield Rural Parish Council

Not present: Councillors Mr. W. Blunden, Mrs V. Upton.

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

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

154. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

154.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blunden, Upton, and Hersey (although as stated above, Councillor Hersey attended the meeting subsequently), and the reasons accepted.

155. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

155.1 Councillor Hodgson declared a personal interest in application DM/16/2333 – Land at Barrington Close (item 4xi) on the Agenda) as he lived fairly close to the proposed development site.

155.2 On arrival at the meeting, Councillor Hersey stated for the record, 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.

156. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 31 MAY 2016.

156.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 31 May 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

157.1 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. The comments of the Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) were also read out, as Mr John Jesson, who normally attends the meetings on behalf of the LPS, was unable to be present. It was also agreed to alter the order of the Agenda, where necessary, for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

157.2 DM/16/2098 – 45 SUNTE AVENUE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

LPS: No objections in principle, but facing brickwork should be specified to match existing.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, but there should be a condition requiring that the facing brickwork should match the existing.

- 157.3 DM/16/1971 – 31 PICKERS GREEN
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SUN ROOM AND REPLACE WITH A TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

- 157.4 DM/16/2256 – EVERYNDENS, 109 HIGH STREET
EVERGREEN MAGNOLIA GRANDIFLORA (T1) – FELL.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. The Tree Warden observes that the tree appears to be dying back.

- 157.5 DM/16/0633 – 3 FREDERICK COTTAGES, LEWES ROAD
REPLACEMENT OF FRONT AND BACK DOORS.

LPS: The materials as set out in the application form are considered acceptable. The additional specification with references to the type of timber and to the use veneers and MDF contradicts this, and should be withdrawn. The colour is not clearly specified. A colour card shows an acceptable colour. The application refers to two colours. This needs clarification perhaps as a reserved matter as this site is in a Conservation Area and is part of the setting of Listed Buildings.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, and the materials set out in the application form are acceptable. However, the additional specification with references to the type of timber and to the use of veneers and the MDF, contradicts this, and so should be withdrawn. The colour is not clearly specified, although a colour card shows an acceptable colour. It is noted that the application refers to two colours. This needs clarification perhaps as a reserved matter, as this site is in a Conservation Area and is part of the setting of the Listed Buildings.

- 157.6 DM/16/1263 – ALLENS WALL, BLACK HILL
ERECTION OF A NEW DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE WITH SUBSEQUENT DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED DWELLING AND GARAGE (ADDITIONAL PLANS AND AMENDED SUPPORTING STATEMENTS RECEIVED 26 MAY 2016).

LPS: The additional information serves to confirm just how inappropriate the new house proposed is in terms of the site and its neighbours. It is contrary to the Lindfield Parishes Neighbourhood Plan and the Lindfield Village Design Statement referenced by it and should be refused.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council concludes that this application has not changed significantly enough for it to be able to support the proposal. The comments would therefore be as previously, and which for the avoidance of doubt are repeated: "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." However, in addition we note that the proposal does not meet the objectives and requirements of the now made Lindfield Neighbourhood Plan, or the Lindfield Village Design Statement.

- 157.7 DM/16/1950 – 2 BARRINGTON CLOSE
SINGLE ROOM REAR EXTENSION.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

- 157.8 DM/16/1982 – FROYLS, 125 HIGH STREET
SILVER BIRCH (01) - CROWN REDUCTION OF 3M. HOLLY TREES (2 AND 3) - CROWN REDUCTION OF 1.5M. CONIFER (4) - FELL. MULBERRY (5) -CROWN REDUCTION OF 1.5M.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. The Tree Warden observes that the Conifer removal will create space for a beautiful tulip tree to develop. The same applies to the holly trees, one overhanging the neighbour's garden, and smothered in ivy.

- 157.9 DM/16/2263 – 94 THE WELKIN
BUILDING OF A SMALL BUTTRESS WALL ON THE SOUTHERN PERIMETER OF THE GARDEN IN ORDER TO LEVEL SOME AREAS OF THE SLOPE. NEW FENCING ON TOP OF THIS WALL. AN EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING FENCING TO ENCLOSE THE SOUTH-WEST AREA IN FRONT OF THE KITCHEN FOR A SAFE AND CHILD FRIENDLY GARDEN AREA.

LPS: Although the Society understands the purpose of this proposal, we find it contrary to the Lindfield Parishes Neighbourhood Plan and the Lindfield Village Design Statement referenced by it in terms of retaining the openness and essential character of The Welkin. The fencing proposed would be an alien feature.

Councillor Snowling noted that the application was inconsistent in that the description of the proposal said one thing (extension of existing fence), whilst the drawings appeared to show a replacement. In other respects he supported the comments of the LPS. Councillor Plass said that he agreed that this was the case, but that having visited the site, he felt it was clear that the proposal was to replace the existing fence, but with a retaining wall at the base, as part of the new feature. His view was therefore that it would make little difference to the landscape as currently exists. Councillor Hersey said that she would have had similar concerns, but these were allayed having also visited the site. Nonetheless Councillor Snowling said that the plans are misleading, and that it was important to get them right. He therefore moved the response as appears below. On a show of hands, 3 members voted for the motion, and 3 abstained. The proposal was therefore carried.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council cannot determine this application, because there appears to be a contradiction between the wording to describe the application, and the plans. For example, the description talks about an “extension of the existing fence” but it is unclear where this is proposed. On the other hand, the plan indicates that it may simply be a replacement at the same height as the existing fence, with a retaining wall at the base. Therefore, the Parish Council cannot support the application in its present form.

- 157.10 DM/16/2271 – 48 SAVILL ROAD
MONO PITCHED ROOF ADDED OVER THE EXISTING MAIN ENTRANCE, ALTERATION TO FRONT STEPS AND ADDITION OF GLASS BALUSTRADE, TOGETHER WITH PROVISION OF 2 NEW PARKING BAYS.

LPS: The Society finds these proposals would not be consistent with maintaining the essential character of the street in terms of the loss of green space and the unwarranted number of car parking and garaging spaces, and cannot but be concerned that this is a pre-cursor to altering the garage accommodation to habitable space after the refusal of earlier schemes.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has concerns over the effects of the proposal on the appearance of the street scene in this area, and we consider that the outcome will be unneighbourly because the proposal does not respect the character of the locality. We conclude therefore that the proposal does not meet the objectives of Policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004, and so we cannot support this application.

- 157.11 DM/16/2378 – 44 BROOKWAY

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

T1 - OAK TREE - LIFT CANOPY OVER THE GARDEN OF NO. 43 BY APPROXIMATELY 6 METRES. THIN THICKER PARTS OF CANOPY BY 15%.

LPS: The removal of six lower limbs as proposed seems rather more than essential management and would like to ensure the work proposed is adequately justified.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. The Tree Warden observes that no. 43 has applied for this work, because there is a row of Oaks along the back fences. The pruning of this Oak will create room for the ones on either side.

157.12 DM/16/2333 – LAND PARCEL AT 533977, 125951 BARRINGTON CLOSE (IN LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL)

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF 49 NO. ONE, TWO, THREE, FOUR AND FIVE BEDROOM DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3) WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, LANDSCAPING AND ACCESS. ALL MATTERS TO BE RESERVED APART FROM ACCESS.

(i) Mr John Dumbleton said that it was not the intention of the Rural Parish Council to hold a public meeting, but that it would be delivering flyers about the application to those neighbouring properties likely to be most affected. It was noted that most of these fall in fact within this Parish. The Rural Parish has not yet agreed its response to MSDC, but was seeking an extension of time to the deadline date of 1st July 2016. He mentioned that residents in the area are being very helpful, and will volunteer for leaflet deliveries where needed, and in terms of providing the evidence regarding the flood risk concerns. Councillor Snowling recalled that the flood risk issues were well known to MSDC and had generated a lot of previous correspondence with residents. He also asked the Clerk/Deputy Clerk to double check the Parish boundaries in order to be certain that no part of the application site fell within this Parish. It was noted that the Lindfield Preservation Society had suggested that the Rural Parish commission an independent analysis of the applicant's Ground Investigation report. He asked that a copy of the email be sent to him, but thought that in principle, this was something that could be agreed by the Rural Parish.

(ii) It was **AGREED** that because of the possible effects of the development on this Parish, it would be appropriate for the Committee to make a contribution from its budget, towards the costs of preparing the flyer, and in respect of the costs of the independent report (as above) should the Rural Parish decide to commission one.

(iii) In accordance with Standing Orders, it was **AGREED** to delegate to the Clerk/Deputy Clerk the task of finalising the Parish Council's response to the application, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, but that it would be based on the heads of response, which the Deputy Clerk had prepared and circulated to the Committee prior to this meeting. This document is available as a background paper.

158. 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.

158.1 DM/16/1030 – Whitesands, Lewes Road. Vehicle crossover to front of house and 2m fence to side boundary next to pavement. This application was approved by MSDC on 13th June 2016, subject to conditions. These are that within 6 months of works starting, the existing vehicular access onto Noahs Ark Lane should be physically closed, the details to be the subject of prior approval with LPA. No development to take place until details of hard and soft landscaping approved and carried out. Any trees or plants that die within five years from completion of the development are to be removed and replaced in the next planting season with similar size and species.

158.2 The Parish Council has been served with a copy of an Order and Notice relating to a Tree Preservation Order being sought by MSDC on three Birch trees at 1, Portsmouth Wood. The Order is dated 15th June 2016.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

159. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 159.1 Councillor Gomme reported that the consultant advising the Parish Council on the Traffic Survey and Study had just reported his interim findings, and requested that the Deputy Clerk put a copy of this update on the Parish Council's website, so that interested parties can see the latest position.
- 159.2 Councillor Hersey said that in respect of planning application DM/16/1263 for Allens Wall (see above) she had been asked in her capacity as District Councillor to call the application in for a Planning Committee decision. On the basis that the Parish Council was objecting to the application, and the item was on the Agenda, it was **AGREED** that this action would command the support of the Parish Council.
- 159.3 Councillor Hersey notified the Committee that there is to be a pre-planning application meeting at MSDC, regarding a proposal to redevelop the former Tavistock and Summerhill School site for up to 22 dwellings. It was noted that this would include a proposal to demolish the main school building. Councillor Snowling said that he hoped that this might lead to an opportunity of reopening up the access to West Common.

The Meeting concluded at 8.43 p.m.