

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 24 FEBRUARY 2015** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

**Present:** Parish Councillors: Mr. A Gomme (Chairman)  
Mr. M. Amor  
Mr. W Blunden  
Mrs. M Hersey (Vice Chairman)  
Mr. C. Snowling  
Mrs. V. Upton  
Mrs. J Chatfield  
Mr S. Hodgson

**Also present:** Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS). Councillor C. Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council).  
3 members of the public (for part of the meeting only)

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

**Absent:** None.

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

### **550. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

550.1 There were no apologies for absence.

### **551. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

551.1 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.

551.2 Councillor Blunden declared that he had a personal, potentially prejudicial interest in item 4 (ix) on the Agenda (The Old Fire Station, Lewes Road) as he was the Chairman of the King Edward Hall Management Committee, and the KEH was the applicant in the matter. He therefore said that he would leave the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.

551.3 Councillor Snowling also declared that he had a personal, potentially prejudicial interest in item 4 (ix) on the Agenda (The Old Fire Station, Lewes Road) as he was a Trustee of the King Edward Hall, and the KEH was the applicant in the matter. He therefore said that he would leave the room for the duration of the discussion of this item. He also declared a personal interest in item 4 (iii) on the Agenda (2 Pine Cottages, Pondcroft Road) as the applicant was a near neighbour of his.

### **552. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 3 FEBRUARY 2015.**

552.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 3 February 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

553.1 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.

553.2 DM/15/0074 – 215 THE WELKIN  
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND CONSTRUCTION OF TIMBER FRAME, TILE HUNG, REAR DORMER TO CREATE ROOM IN ROOF.

Mr Jesson said that the rear elevation is forward of all the others in the road, and that this is also a “forward” dormer. As such, these proposals could not normally be supported.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed development, the Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as it is aware.”

553.3 DM/15/0227 – 4 SUMMERHILL GRANGE  
OAK (T1) – FELL AND GRIND. HORSE CHESTNUT (T2) – FELL AND GRIND. FIVE NO. MAPLES (T3) – FELL AND GRIND.

Mr Jesson said that he supported the Parish Council’s proposed comments, but noted once again, that the application lacked any kind of expert arboriculture report or survey in support of the proposed works.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council objects to the felling of the Oak (T1) because it is not causing any problems, and so the reasons for the proposed action are not clear; the Parish Council does not object to the felling of the Horse Chestnut (T2) due to disease; the Parish Council has no objections to the felling of the cluster of five Maples (T3) in order to prevent overcrowding.”

553.4 DM/15/0295 – 2 PINE COTTAGES, PONDCROFT ROAD  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING EXTERNAL WC, UTILITY ROOM AND KITCHEN TOGETHER WITH FIRST FLOOR BATHROOM. CONSTRUCTION OF TWO STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSION WITH NEW SIDE ENTRANCE AND STORM PORCH CANOPY.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS welcomed this proposal. The extension will be large, but involves the removal of some of the less attractive features of the property, and so represents a good balance.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council has no objections to this application.”

553.5 DM/15/0305 – THE HIGHWAY VERGE FROM AND TO THE FRONT OF, NOS 5 TO 11 HIGH STREET  
T1 LIME. CROWN LIFT 6 METRES OVER THE CARRIAGEWAY AND 3 METRES OVER THE FOOTWAY, REMOVE BASAL AND EPICORMIC GROWTH. T2 LIME. WORK AS ABOVE AND ALSO INCLUDE CUTTING BACK ALL GROWTH OVERHANGING THE ADJACENT PRIVATE PROPERTY.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council has no objections to this application.”

553.6 DM/15/0115 – 50 BY SUNTE  
ASH T35. CROWN LIFT TO HEIGHT OF SEVEN METRES TO LOWEST LATERAL LIMB. REMOVE LATERAL LIMB OVERHANGING HOUSE TO JUNCTION WITH MAIN STEM. CROWN REDUCE BY 50% BACK TO PREVIOUS PRUNING POINTS.

Mr Jesson noted that the tree is very close to the building, so the LPS would support the application.

Members noted that the wording of the application was different to the wording in the planning officer’s description, and wondered if the application shouldn’t have been re-advertised. It was felt that the Committee had to deal with the application as set out in the papers before it. The Deputy Clerk read out a response from the planning officer, but it was agreed to alter the proposed response in order to refer to the “discrepancy”.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “In respect of the wording in the application itself, the Parish Council raises no objection to the works proposed in this application. However, the Council notes that the wording in the consultation document differs from the application, but confirms that this would not in any event, alter the Parish Council’s response.”

553.7 DM/15/0442 – 57 DENMANS LANE

SINGLE STOREY REAR 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:** “The Parish Council has no objections to this application, but as this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the proposed development, we would confirm that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as it is aware.”

553.8 DM/15/0272 – CARRIERS COTTAGE, LEWES ROAD

INTERNAL ALTERATIONS, TO INCLUDE REPLACING 1 NO. EXISTING FIREPLACE, RELOCATING A BATHROOM, REMOVING AN INTERNAL MODERN WALL, INSTALLING AN ENSUITE AND INSTALLING A NEW PARTITION WALL.

Mr Jesson said that these proposals were very much in the nature of restoration rather than change, and that the application for this listed building, should therefore be welcomed and supported.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council has no objections to this application.”

553.9 DM/15/0391 – 5 APPLIEDORE GARDENS

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson expressed similar concerns about the bulk and scale of the extension, and said that the proposal would mean the loss of a unit of that particular style of housing stock.

The applicant stated that the proposal compared favourably with other similar extensions in the road, and said that the building line would not be adversely affected.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council does have some concerns about the bulk and scale of the extension, but these are not sufficient for any planning objections to be raised. For the avoidance of any doubt, matching materials and finishes should be used.”

553.10 DM/15/0437 – OLD FIRE STATION, LEWES ROAD

THE MODIFICATION, EXTENSION AND REFURBISHMENT OF THE OLD FIRE STATION INCLUDING DEMOLITION AND REPLACEMENT OF THE LEAN-TO, CREATION OF A FIRST FLOOR LEVEL WITHIN THE ROOF SPACE INCLUDING A MANSARD DORMER, CONSERVATION ROOFLIGHTS AND A DEDICATED STORAGE AREA FOR WASTE COLLECTION.

Mr Jesson noted that the provision of a mansard dormer meant that the LPS thought this was an acceptable application. He noted that the treatment of the windows would in fact be respecting the Conservation Area, and if that was indeed the case, then the LPS would raise no objections. All the other concerns could be dealt with as reserved matters.

After discussion by Members, and studying the plans, it was generally felt that the revised proposal was acceptable, and that provided the work respected the Conservation Area, and that appropriate materials were used (and that these should all be dealt with as reserved matters) then no objections would be raised. Councillor Hodgson therefore moved the below response, which was unanimously agreed.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “The Parish Council raises no objections in respect of this revised more detailed application, but the use of materials and finishes needs particular attention in order to preserve as far as possible the setting of this building within the Conservation Area, and its historical significance. These should therefore be treated as reserved matters by the Planning Authority.”

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Note: In accordance with their declarations of interest above, both Councillors Blunden and Snowling left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.

- 553.11 DM/15/0440 – 1 BECKWORTH CLOSE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION BETWEEN EXISTING HOUSE AND EXISTING GARAGE.

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

- 554. 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.**

- 554.1 14/03955/FUL: Land r/o 67 Sunte Avenue, **NOTED:** that the application for 2/3 bed semi-detached chalet bungalows had been approved by MSDC on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2015, subject to a range of planning conditions, some of which had reflected the Parish Council's input at the consultation stage .

**555. ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 555.1 The Chairman mentioned that he would be attending, along with the Deputy Clerk, an update session on the District Plan at MSDC's offices on Friday, 27<sup>th</sup> February 2015.

The Meeting concluded at 8.30 p.m.