

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 25 APRIL 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

**Present:**

Parish Councillors: Mr. S Hodgson (Chairman)  
Mr. W Blunden  
Mrs. M Hersey  
Mr. R Plass  
Mrs. V Upton

**Also present:**

Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).  
Mr. C Hersey, Councillor MSDC  
Mr. A Lea, Councillor MSDC  
25 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting.)

**In attendance:**

Mr. I. McLean (Planning Administrator).

**Not present:**

Mr. C Snowling.

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

**274. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

255.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Snowling, and the reason accepted.

**275. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

275.1 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. Councillor Hersey also declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(i) (White Horse Inn) as, in her capacity as MSDC Ward Councillor, she has called the application in to be heard at an MSDC Planning Committee meeting. She said therefore that she would not speak to the item.

275.2 Councillor Blunden declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in Agenda item 4(i) (White Horse Inn) as he is the Chairman of the King Edward Hall (KEH) Management Committee, and an officer of the Lindfield Club (within the KEH), the KEH being situated next door to the application premises. He said that he would therefore leave the room for the duration of the discussion of the item.

275.3 Councillor Upton declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4(x) (47 Luxford Road) as she lives in the same road, and is a near neighbour to the subject property.

**276. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 03 APRIL 2017.**

276.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 03 April 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

277.1 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.

277.2 DM/16/4857 – WHITE HORSE INN, 22 HIGH STREET  
CHANGE OF USE TO RESTAURANT AND RETROSPECTIVE CONSENT FOR A SIDE EXTENSION AND ROOF MODIFICATIONS.

Mr Jesson and Mr Kennedy for the LPS spoke against the proposal on a number of planning grounds, and said that if the application was to be agreed, it would need to be the subject of very stringent and rigorous planning conditions. It was also reported that the record of compliance with both planning and licensing at another establishment in the applicant's ownership, had not been good. Members of the public expressed concerns about noise transmission, deliveries and waste collections, parking and traffic issues, outside smoking, the extent of the licensed area, and the possibility of a takeaway service. Another member of the public referred to those elements of the building that had not been consented, and that these needed to be either regularised or enforced. It was noted that there should be a condition that requires the applicant to maintain the provision of at least the 18 car parking spaces set aside in the application.

Councillor Plass said that he was particularly concerned about the car parking issue, and pointed out that to rely on other car parking areas around Lindfield was wholly unrealistic. For example, use of the Common car parks is supposed to be for users of the Common only. Councillor Hodgson said that all the points coming from the floor were well made, and that he proposed therefore that the Clerk be asked to build them into the Parish Council's response, which should then be approved by the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Committee under the provisions of Standing Orders. This was agreed by the Committee.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council breaks down its comments into three parts:-

(1) By its very nature this application does not adequately address the previous concerns raised by the Parish Council in the response to the original application. For the record, this response is repeated as follows: *"The White Horse is within the Conservation Area, in a very prominent area, opposite the Pond. Lindfield Parish notes that alterations to the roof line will alter the perspective dramatically. The Parish Council notes the plans, which formed a part of the decision letter dated 11 December 2013, as compared with what has been carried out to date. The consented change to the rear extension roof from flat to a hipped feature was seen at the time as an improvement. However, the height has been substantially increased relative to the consented plans, making the roof now higher than the roof of the main building, and an inappropriate and bulky feature when viewed from the High Street. It is also noted that the single storey side extension nearest the King Edward Hall has also not been built to the consented plans, in particular that the roof substantially overhangs the twitten. The southern end also projects further the consented plans. It is also noted that the twin roof lines of the rear extension rise above the main building roof line at the northern end, and that no details of the kitchen extraction ducts are shown on the plans of the rear elevation. Such extraction ducts are an important element of this class of buildings in Conservation Areas. These were clearly set out in the consented plans, but are absent from the application set. It is also noted that the very appropriate, sympathetic fenestration in the rear elevation in the consented plans, is not detailed in the present application and that omission should be dealt with as it could allow more inappropriate doors and windows to be installed. Therefore, we cannot support this retrospective application at the present time."* It is also noted that there is still no drawing to show the proposed extraction units. In terms of the opening hours, the Parish Council would want to see the same condition as was imposed on the original 2013 planning consent - namely that a condition is applied stipulating the opening hours of 12pm–midnight, in order to safeguard the amenities of local residents under policy B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan. The Parish Council does not see any reason why a similar condition should not be imposed in this case, as it was clearly felt appropriate by the planning officer before, and given that nothing has materially changed. (2) In terms of those areas that the application seeks to clarify, the proposed treatment of the windows is not acceptable, and does not accord with the aims of the Conservation Area, contrary to policies B12 and B15 of the 2004 Local Plan. The proposal for the change of use to a restaurant clearly demonstrates a much larger and

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

intensive use of the site, and yet the parking proposals are wholly inadequate. It is proposed to provide 18 visitors car parking spaces on-site, with unlike in the previous application, no provision for staff car parking. It is not acceptable for the applicant to seek to rely on general car parking in and around Lindfield to the possible detriment of other outlets. For example, the rules on the use of Lindfield Common require that parking in these areas is strictly for the use of those persons using the Common. It is also very likely that the limited car parking provision for other properties, principally the King Edward Hall adjacent to the White Horse, will be seriously affected. The proposals therefore fail to meet the objectives of policies T4 and T5 of the 2004 Local Plan. (3) In view of the above, the Parish Council maintains its strong objections to the application, but is concerned to ensure that if the Planning Authority is minded to grant consent, then a number of matters need to be controlled by the attachment of strict conditions, as are applied to other similar commercial premises. These are (i) for ensuring that unreasonable disturbance is not caused to nearby residents regarding deliveries and collections of waste, (ii) the location of bins and storage must be in appropriate areas, (iii) that as a very minimum the current proposal for the parking of 18 cars on site should be maintained at all times, and cannot be altered, or revised, (iv) that use of any outside areas should cease at 10.00 p.m. in order to control excessive external noise, (v) that all windows and doors should be kept closed during periods of live entertainment, when external noise and music is likely to be at its loudest, (vi) that proper and measured control of smells and odours should be provided and that these must be to the satisfaction of the Environmental Health Department, (vii) that cigarette receptacles are provided in appropriate areas outside the premises, and that the front area will be cleared and swept at the end of each evening, (viii) that without express approval from the Planning Authority, the provision of a takeaway service will not be permitted.

277.3 DM/17/1189 – 6 THE GLEBE

ASH - REMOVE. HOLLY - REDUCE TO MAIN FORK AND REDUCE MINOR GROWTH BELOW TO ENCOURAGE BUSHINESS. AMENDED DESCRIPTION.

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

277.4 DM/17/1206 – 39 COMPTON ROAD

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that it would be especially important within the Conservation Area, to ensure that the brickwork detail in the proposal matches the existing.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council notes that a considerable amount of the work has already been done, but in any event, it has no objections to this application, provided a condition is attached, which requires the brickwork detail to match the existing dwelling-house.

277.5 DM/17/1285 – 20 OAK BANK

REAR FIRST FLOOR ADDITION.

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

277.6 DM/17/1298 – 2 SHENSTONE

LOUNGE EXTENSION AT GROUND LEVEL, EN-SUITE DORMER EXTENSION AT FIRST FLOOR LEVEL AND TIMBER DECKING.

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

277.7 DM/17/1327 – 44 FINCHES GARDENS

SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TO FORM UTILITY ROOM.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council observes that it seems as though the work may already have been completed, at least externally, but in any event, there are no objections to this application.

277.8 DM/17/1351 – 22 BLACKTHORNS

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

DEMOLITION OF EXISTING GARAGE / CONSERVATORY / SHED AND ERECTION OF NEW TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE AND REAR, AND SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to materials and finishes matching the existing dwelling house.

- 277.9 DM/17/1361 – 19 EASTERN ROAD  
PROPOSED PART TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FULL WIDTH REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that it would be important to ensure that the brick work detail in the proposal matches the existing.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to materials and finishes matching the existing dwelling house, particularly as regards the need to match the brickwork detail.

- 277.10 DM/17/1383 – 33A APPLIEDORE GARDENS  
PROPOSED DROPPED KERB AND PERMEABLE PAVING TO FORM DRIVEWAY IN FRONT GARDEN.

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

- 277.11 DM/17/1381 – 47 LUXFORD ROAD  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to materials and finishes matching the existing dwelling house.

- 277.12 DM/17/1492 – 24 MEADOW DRIVE  
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION (OVER EXISTING SINGLE STOREY FLAT ROOF HALLWAY) TO PROVIDE ENLARGED THIRD BEDROOM.

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

- 277.13 DM/17/1496 – LAUREL COTTAGE, 53 SUNTE AVENUE  
LOFT CONVERSION. 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, we can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware.

- 277.14 DM/17/1520 – 18 CHESTNUTS CLOSE  
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

- 277.15 DM/17/1573 – LITTLE SPINDLES, BLACK HILL  
T1: PALE GREEN CONIFER - FELL. T2: CONIFER - FELL. T3: WILLOW - FELL.

It was noted that the trees do not have Tree Preservation Orders on them.

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

278. **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.**

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 278.1 DM/16/3964 – Backwoods, 44 Backwoods Lane: Proposed demolition of an existing dwelling, annexe and outbuildings; and erection of 2 pairs of semi-detached dwellings and 1 detached dwelling, with associated landscaping (erection of 5 units). The Deputy Clerk reported that this application, which had been refused by MSDC on 19<sup>th</sup> December 2016 (as previously reported), had gone to appeal under MSDC reference AP/17/0017 and Planning Inspectorate reference APP/D3830/W/17/3171478. Further representations are invited by 12<sup>h</sup> May 2017.
- 278.2 It was pointed out by member of the public present that there were some misleading statements in the applicant's statement of appeal, and that these needed to be rebutted. The Parish Council should, if it could, reinforce its objections to the Planning Inspectorate (PI), and it was therefore **AGREED** to delegate the drafting of a further submission to the PI, to the Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of this Committee under the provisions of Standing Orders.
- 279. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**
- 279.1 There was no other business raised on this occasion.

The Meeting concluded at 8.51 p.m.