

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 25 OCTOBER 2016** in the United Reformed Church, High Street, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. A. Gomme (Chairman).
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman).
Mr. S Shortland.
Mr. R Plass.

Also present:

Mr John Jesson; Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).
19 members of the public present (for all or parts of the meeting).

Not present:

Councillors Mr. C Snowling, Mrs. V Upton, Mrs. M Hersey, and Mr. W Blunden

In attendance:

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the United Reformed Church.

200. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

200.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Snowling, Upton, Hersey, and Blunden, and the reasons accepted.

201. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

201.1 There were none declared.

202. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 03 OCTOBER 2016.

202.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 03 October 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

203.1 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.

203.2 DM/16/3885 – 7 DENMANS LANE
PROPOSED PART DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING GARDEN WALL, PLANT A NEW HEDGE AND WITH THE ADDITION OF A PAVED AREA FOR A PARKING SPACE.

Mr Jesson said that he thought that the front boundary wall was just outside the Conservation Area. He felt therefore that the proposal was perfectly satisfactory, and that the LPS could support it.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this second application. Indeed, the current application goes a long way to achieving the objective, while maintaining the character of the area.

203.3 DM/16/3901 – 16 FINCHES GARDENS

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

PROPOSED REAR DORMER LOFT CONVERSION AND FRONT VELUX WINDOWS. 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: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, and we are pleased to see that matching materials are being specified.

203.4 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 DWELLINGS).

Mr Jesson noted that the proposed density is higher than in respect of neighbouring properties. He felt that this had therefore led to a number of compromises with regard to the proposal. This was clear in terms of the lay out, the small garden provision, and the front parking for the pairs of semi-detached dwellings. There would be difficulties in cars leaving the site, and there was a potential road safety issue. He noted that there would be a loss of mature trees on the southern part of the site. He felt that the comments in the applicant's planning statement about the District Council's planning position, and the effects of the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan were not helpful. The LPS did not object in principle with developing the site, but there were significant issues with regard to this particular proposal.

A number of speakers then spoke against the application, mainly on the grounds of the road safety issue, and especially the additional dangers that pedestrians, particularly school children, will be exposed to, the design and density concerns, and that the development will have an overbearing effect on the neighbourhood. It was felt that the development will ruin the look of the area, and will be unneighbourly in terms of excessive "living" noise, and possible overlooking.

The architect for the applicant then spoke in support of the application, and went through what he considered to be its merits. He said that the density was less than the MSDC recommendation for a plot of this size. He thought that development would enhance the area. He pointed out that building distances and garden provision are in excess of nationally accepted standards. The applicant was addressing the highways issues with West Sussex County Council, and providing sight line drawings. The highways safety audit did not show any significant concerns. The applicant's agent said that that the scheme had reflected the pre-application advice received from MSDC. He noted that planning policy requires the maximisation of the use of any site. He felt that the scheme was relatively modest and in keeping.

Councillor Shortland said that he thought it difficult to object, as in the main, the proposal is in accordance with planning policy and the Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor Plass said that he stood by the proposed comments, and that in principle, the application was a reasonable use of the site. Councillor Hodgson said that whilst he agreed it was difficult to raise objections in principle, the matter was not as clear cut as the Parish Council's proposed response is suggesting. He felt that there were some significant planning reservations, and that he could agree with the suggestion that the proposal did in fact represent an over development of the site. The highways issues that had been raised by members of the public, were especially relevant and should not be overlooked. In the light of these comments both Councillors Shortland and Plass said that they agreed that these reservations should be built into the Parish Council's response. Councillor Gomme therefore asked the Deputy Clerk to draft an amended response accordingly.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council acknowledges that this application conforms in the main, with both planning policy and the vision of our "made" Neighbourhood Plan, and its design fits in reasonably well with the existing housing in Backwoods Lane. However, whilst the Parish Council does not of course have any objections in principle to the redevelopment of this site, there are a number of significant concerns, which will need to be considered. One is that, whilst there does appear to be adequate on-site parking provision for both residents and visitors, there could be an on-street parking

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

problem, which will exacerbate the road traffic concerns along this part of the road. Another more important aspect is the road safety issue of vehicles leaving the site, and coming into conflict with pedestrians on the bend, particularly in terms of the heavy usage by school children of this part of the road. As such, the proposal cannot be said to meet the objectives of policy T4 of the 2004 Local Plan. The Parish Council understands that West Sussex County Council Highways has requested the applicant to carry out further work in this connection, and the Parish Council wishes to support that request. Certainly, the application should not be approved until this concern is properly addressed by condition if necessary, and even if this means that road safety improvement measures need to be implemented. Finally, whilst the Parish Council accepts "industry standards" for the provision of housing, there is a concern that in this part of Lindfield, and with the historic significance of the site, the proposal does represent overdevelopment, contrary to policies B1 and H2 of the 2004 Local Plan.

- 203.5 DM/16/4064 – THE BENT ARMS, HIGH STREET
BIRCH (T1) REDUCE BY 3M. ASH (T2) REDUCE BY 2M. BEECH (T3) REDUCE BY 2M. WILLOW (T4) REDUCE BY 2M OVER CAR PARK. OAK (T5) REDUCE BRANCHES OVER ROAD BY 2M. BIRCH (T6) REDUCE BRANCHES OVER ROAD BY 2M. OAK (T7) REMOVE LOWER LIMB OVER THE ROAD.

It was agreed to include the Tree Warden's comment as set out below.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, but the Tree Warden as pointed out that it should say "reduce Crown for "T1-4". Otherwise it will lead to very unsightly shapes.

- 203.6 DM/16/3968 – 34 DUKES ROAD
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION EXTENDING BEYOND THE REAR WALL OF THE ORIGINAL HOUSE BY 5.6M, TO A MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF 4.0M AND THE HEIGHT OF THE EAVES TO 3.00M.

Mr Jesson noted that the definition of neighbours for consultation for this type of permitted development application is imprecise, and seems to be left to the discretion of MSDC to decide. It was accepted that of course immediate next door neighbours should be included, but where the effects of particular proposal went wider than that, MSDC should consider extending the definition to others who could have a valid interest.

MSDC had clarified that the Parish Council's comments are not invited, as this is a neighbour only consultation.

- 203.7 DM/16/4082 – 42 BACKWOODS LANE
PROPOSED PORCH. REPLACEMENT WINDOWS AND RENDER TO THE FIRST FLOOR OF THE FRONT ELEVATION. FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO THE REAR. ALTERATIONS TO THE FENESTRATION TO SOUTH WEST FLANK ELEVATION.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS does not have any objections in principle. The applicant said that because of family requirements, the property (which is currently a 3 bed house) needs to be extended. The idea was to make better use of the space, and he said that the proposal would include the use of obscured glass in the windows to reduce any overlooking issues.

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

- 203.8 DM/16/4088 – 19 EASTERN ROAD
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW REAR DORMER, CONVERSION OF EXISTING HIP END TO GABLE AND CONVERSION OF EXISTING ROOF SPACE. 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.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate for the development, Lindfield Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware, but that if the application is to be approved, matching materials should be used.

- 203.9 DM/16/4157 – WOODLAND STRIP TO THE REAR OF 27 PORTSMOUTH WOOD CLOSE, OFF HIGH BEECH LANE
REDUCE BOUNDARY OVERHANG BY BETWEEN 3-5 METRES, CUTTING BACK TO GROWTH POINTS FOR SHAPE.

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

- 203.10 DM/16/4203 – 1 FINCHES GARDENS
OAK (T2) REDUCE ENTIRE CANOPY BY 1-2M.

This application has been withdrawn - 10.10.2016.

- 203.11 DM/16/4208 – 22 FINCHES GARDENS
OAK (T3) REMOVE LIMB WHICH CONTAINS DEAD WOOD AND IS OVERHANGING 22 FINCHES GARDENS.

This application has been withdrawn - 10.10.2016.

- 203.12 DM/16/4132 – SWAN COTTAGE, 3 PONDCROFT ROAD
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ELEVATIONAL AND ROOFLINE ALTERATIONS TO THE DETACHED GARAGE TO CONVERT INTO ANCILLARY HABITABLE SPACE.

Mr Jesson noted that the property is within the Conservation Area, and that therefore the colour to be used for the exterior is an issue. There was no reference to it in the application, and so should be taken as a reserved matter. It was agreed to include these comments in the Parish Council's response.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council does have three concerns with regard to this this application. Firstly, the loss of parking, which will result. Secondly, the effect on the appearance of the street scene, and the fact that use of matching materials will not alleviate this issue. Thirdly, we believe that this proposal will create an over development of this limited site. These are all contrary to relevant policies in the 2004 Local Plan. In the Parish Council's view, approval will not enhance the street scene, or the Conservation Area, but if the application was to be approved, it is noted that exterior colour is not specified, and this should be a reserved matter in order to mitigate the effects of the proposal mentioned above.

- 203.13 DM/16/4233 – OLD DAIRY COTTAGE, 1B BACKWOODS CLOSE
ASH (T1) REDUCE LOWER LIMBS OVERHANGING INTO NEIGHBOUR'S GARDEN BY 1-2M.

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

204. **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.**

- 204.1 DM/16/1787 – Site opposite 1 Grahams Cottages, Spring Lane: Demolition of residential garage/ancillary accommodation and the erection of a 1–bed dwelling house with associated landscaping. The Deputy Clerk reported that the application, which he had previously reported as having been refused by MSDC, has gone to appeal at the Planning Inspectorate under reference number APP/D3830/W/16/3158930. The deadline for making any further representations is 24th November 2016. However, the Committee indicated that it would stand by its original comments (see minutes of meeting held on 31st May 2016) and would not therefore be making any further representations to the Planning Inspectorate.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

205. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

205.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.44 p.m.