

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 23 AUGUST 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. S Shortland
Mrs. M. Hersey
Mr. W Blunden
Mrs V. Upton
Mr C. Snowling

Also present: Mr John Jesson; Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).
Councillor C. Hersey; Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC)
14 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting).

Not present: Councillor Mr. R. Plass

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

176. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

176.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Plass, and the reason accepted.

177. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

177.1 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. She also declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(iii) 34 Dukes Road, as she has spoken about the matter at Mid Sussex District Council, and so would not take part in any discussion or vote concerning this item.

177.2 Councillor Gomme declared a personal interest in Agenda items 4(iii) 44 By Sunte, and 4(iv) 42 Finches Park Road as both are fairly close-by neighbouring properties. He therefore said that for these items he would hand the Chair to the Vice Chairman, and not take any part in the proceedings.

177.3 Councillor Upton later declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(iii) 44 By Sunte, as the agent for the application is a relative.

177.4 Councillors Upton and Hersey later declared a personal interest in Agenda item 7 (directional road signs to the Church), as both are members of the Church.

178. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 01 AUGUST 2016.

178.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 01 August 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

179.1 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, where necessary, for the benefit of those persons present with an interest in a particular application.

179.2 DM/16/2868 – LITTLE ROSSLYN, LEWES ROAD
REPLACE WOODEN FENCE WITH BRICK WALL.

Mr Jesson said that he thought that the application, particularly within the Conservation Area, was lacking in detail, and felt that it should not be decided until these deficiencies were resolved, and the plans are accurate.

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

179.3 DM/16/3059 – 33 WEST COMMON DRIVE
REMOVAL OF EXISTING DEEP SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND REPLACEMENT WITH NARROW SINGLE STOREY FULL WIDTH REAR EXTENSION. FRONT EXTENSION ABOVE GARAGE.

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

179.4 DM/16/3067 – 44 BY SUNTE
SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION.

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

179.5 DM/16/3081 – 42 FINCHES PARK ROAD
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION OVER EXISTING GROUND FLOOR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that as this was a similar proposal to extensions at neighbouring properties, it could be considered acceptable.

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

179.6 DM/16/3129 - HIGH BEECH, ROUNDWOOD LANE
PROPOSED NEW BRICK BUILT PIERS AND BLACK GALVANISED METAL GATES.

Mr Jesson noted that a number of neighbours had raised objections, but in the LPS's view, the proposal was acceptable.

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

179.7 DM/16/3166 - 47B COMPTON ROAD
APPLE (T1) - FELL. CHERRY (T2) - FELL.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council notes that this matter has already been determined by the planning officer.

179.8 DM/16/2937 – THE OLD FORGE, DENMANS LANE (WORLD OF COFFEES)
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE ON GROUND FLOOR FROM B1 TO C3 (RESIDENTIAL).

Mr Jesson expressed serious reservations about the proposal. He was not so much concerned about the conversion to domestic view, but the destination of this historic building in the long term. There was a concern that the work would undermine the essence of the listing. The velux window in the roof is not acceptable. Councillor Gomme read out the listing, and this made clear that the listing was all about the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

rare external appearance of the building, and any change to the roof would be bound to affect this. Councillor Hersey (who had led with Councillor Plass in the matter) said that she was not particularly happy with the proposal, despite the original recommendation, but would be guided by the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council notes the introduction of a new front window and velux-skylight, and since the proposal will have an adverse effect on what is cited as “the rare external appearance of the building, particularly as to the nature of the roof, the Council must object to the application on the basis that it fundamentally goes against the basis of the listing. We would also be concerned about the loss of another commercial unit.

179.9 DM/16/3165 – GLEBE HOUSE, 32 DENMANS LANE
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND DETACHED DOUBLE GARAGE.

The applicant stated that he had reduced the scale and size of the proposal, and so was hoping that it would be more acceptable. Councillor Hersey said that she wasn't convinced by the difference. Councillor Snowling said that he thought the proposed comments very fair, particularly as regards the addition of the garage.

AGREED RESPONSE: Whilst Lindfield Parish Council notes that the Planning application has been previously approved, it considers that the scale of the proposed application would significantly impact upon neighbouring properties - 13 The Glebe, and the Hayloft, and therefore object to the application as previously, being in breach of Policies B1(a) and B1(c) of the Mid Sussex Local Plan 2004.

179.10 DM/16/3202 – 23 SUNTE AVENUE
T1 BLUE CEDAR - REMOVAL OF TREE.

Mr Jesson agreed that the tree had to go.

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

179.11 DM/16/2827 – GREENBANK COTTAGE, BLACK HILL
EXISTING GARAGE TO BE DEMOLISHED, NEW GARAGE CONSTRUCTED, HEDGE AND TREES REMOVED WITH NEW ACCESS.

Mr Jesson said that he was a little concerned at the scale of the proposal, and the loss of some trees. However, he noted that it would be fairly invisible from the street. The applicant said that the trees would be replaced and replanted with better specimens. He had tried to keep the proposal in keeping with other neighbouring properties in the road. Councillor Snowling said that the size of the garage was not an impediment, and Councillor Hodgson agreed.

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

179.12 DM/16/3285 – 94 THE WELKIN
PROPOSED REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FENCE AND NEW FENCE TO ENCLOSE SHED.
WOODEN FENCE HEIGHT OF 2M.

Mr Jesson said that his concern is that the proposal would adversely affect the aesthetic value of the Welkin, as an open and light area. It is also the essence of the designation under the Neighbourhood Plan as an Area of Townscape Character, and this needed to be respected. The proposal has been moderated from the previous one, but it was considered that play space needn't be sacrificed in order to achieve it.

AGREED RESPONSE: As the proposal to fence off part of the planned open area between the side of the house and the footway alongside the carriageway would be detrimental to the street scene, the application should be objected to. Further, the application does not respect the recent designation of the area as an Area of Townscape Character under the recently made Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to preserve the open character of the Welkin.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 179.13 DM/16/3290 – CHANTRY COTTAGE, 121 HIGH STREET (LBC APPLICATION)
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR ORANGERY EXTENSION, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND EXTERNAL REDECORATION.

Mr Jesson had visited the property and noted that the oldest part of the building is the front. Given that the extension is to the rear, there will be no undue interference with the historic fabric of the building, and it fits in well. Therefore, the LPS has no objection.

AGREED RESPONSE: There are no objections to this application. However, Lindfield Parish Council recommends that the applicant should be required to lodge photographs showing the internal areas it is proposed to allow, with the Local Planning Authority, in order to have a permanent record of the work.

- 179.14 DM/16/3370 - CHANTRY COTTAGE, 121 HIGH STREET
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR ORANGERY EXTENSION, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND EXTERNAL REDECORATION.

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

- 179.15 DM/16/3342 – 56 BROOKWAY
LOFT CONVERSION WITH REAR DORMER.

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

- 180. 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.**

- 180.1 DM/16/1018 - 1 Old Orchard Close: To erect 2 no. wooden climbing frames 3m high. Amended site and block plans received 01.07.16 and 04.07.16 showing the removal of the climbing frame. The Deputy Clerk reported that the application had been approved by MSDC on 18th August 2016.

- 180.2 AP/15/0062 – Land north of Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath: Outline application for the approval of access details for the residential development of up to 40 dwellings with associated garaging, car parking, open space, landscaping, and the formation of access roads. The Deputy Clerk reported for the record, that the appeal against the refusal of planning consent by MSDC, has been allowed by the Secretary of State for the Department of Communities and Local Government following the recommendation of the Planning Inspectorate.

- 181. DM/16/1461 – THE PALMS, LEWES ROAD:** Extensions and alterations to a single storey, 3 bedroom dwelling, with attached garage to create a two storey 4 bedroom dwelling, with detached garage: Appeal reference AP/16/0056. After further consideration, and in view of the reservations expressed at the Committee meeting on 10th May 2016, notwithstanding the original planning response, it was **AGREED** to comment further to the Planning Inspectorate, that *“having reconsidered the matter at its Planning & Traffic Committee meeting on 23rd August 2016, Lindfield Parish Council would now wish to withdraw the previous representation it made, i.e. when the matter was first consulted on. The Parish Council would therefore now wish to support the planning reasons for refusal, as given by the planning officer in her response for this proposal, and so the Parish Council must now formally object to this application.”*

- 182. CAR PARK DIRECTION SIGNS TO ALL SAINTS CHURCH.**

- 182.1 This item is to consider a request from West Sussex County Council for Lindfield Parish Council to comment on the proposal for car park direction signs to All Saints Church, details of which are in the public domain.

- 182.1 Councillor Snowling said that he would not be happy to see more signs in the Conservation Area than are absolutely necessary. Signs tend to get put up and then left. Councillor Blunden thought that the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

existing signage was adequate. It was noted that there is the potential for some confusion over signage to the car park for the Church, and for the District Council owned car park at the Wilderness. It was generally agreed by members that proliferation of signs is not something to be welcomed.

182.2 It was therefore **AGREED** to respond "*We are concerned about the proliferation of more road signs in Lindfield, particularly in the Conservation Area. We take the view that the existing signage is adequate. We also note the need to ensure that there is no confusion over the use of the car park for the Church, and for the Mid Sussex District Council car park adjoining it, although in practice it is recognised that the use can sometimes become indistinct. We cannot therefore support the current proposals put forward by the Church.*"

183. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

183.1 Councillor Gomme referred to the answer he had received from the Solicitor to the Council at MSDC, confirming that under the reserved Parish Council speaking slot at District wide planning committee meetings, one representative from Lindfield Parish Council, in addition to a representative from Lindfield Rural Parish Council, would be able to speak at any planning applications, which affected both Parishes. The response still seemed a bit unclear, but Councillor Snowling felt that if there is *any* impact on Lindfield Parish Council, the ruling would apply. Councillor Christopher Hersey (MSDC), who had taken up the matter on the Parish Council's behalf, said that he would be happy to double check this with the officer concerned.

183.2 Councillor Hersey updated the Committee on the on-site meeting she had attended on 22nd August with Richard Speller from West Sussex County Council, Councillor Christopher Hersey (representing the Rural Parish) and the Deputy Clerk. This was to discuss the issues, and possible solutions for dealing with the problem of Town Hill (the stretch of the Ardingly road) leading down from Spring Lane to the dip. These issues were the overgrowth of vegetation serving to narrow the width of the road even further, and the lack of a footpath. Mr Speller confirmed that it was something that WSCC could take up, and fund. This would be from the Improvement Works Programme, and it may be that in due course, the Parish Council could agree to apply for funding under this programme. The Deputy Clerk was pursuing the options, prior to appropriate reports being taken to this Committee and full Council, for any formal decisions to be made. The matter would also need to involve the local County Councillor, Councillor Christine Field.

183.3 Councillor Shortland asked about the progress with the traffic survey/study. The Deputy Clerk reported that the consultant's report had unfortunately still not been received. However, the Clerk had had a telephone conversation with the consultant, in which he said that the issues were proving more difficult than he first thought, and that this was the reason for the delay. The Deputy Clerk said that he would hope to be able to report more fully at the next meeting in September.

The Meeting concluded at 8.50 p.m.