

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 26 JANUARY 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

**Present:**

Parish Councillors: Mr. A Gomme (Chairman)  
Mr. W Blunden  
Mrs. M Hersey  
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)  
Mr. C Snowling  
Mrs. V Upton  
Mr. R Plass  
Mr. S Shortland

**Also present:**

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

**In attendance:**

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

**Absent:**

Mrs. J Durrant

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

**097. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

097.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Durrant, and the reason accepted.

**098. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

098.1 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.

098.2 Councillors Blunden, Gomme, Upton and Hersey declared personal interests of a minor nature, in Agenda item 5(i) Lindfield Primary School, as they all had connections to the School, either in the past or currently. It was noted that depending on the nature of the interest, individual Councillors could still speak and vote in the matter.

**099. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.**

099.1 A representative from Reside Developments, Mr Andrew Munton, referred to the development proposal for the land to the east of High Beech Lane. He said that the developer wanted to work closely with the community, and they were currently carrying out a process of local consultation. The developer believes that this is a sustainable site, and could accommodate 47/48 dwelling houses, of which 40% would be affordable housing. The proposal was therefore a mix of private and affordable homes, of which there would be 1-2 bed properties. The developer is working with a registered social landlord, Affinity Sutton. Mr Munton confirmed that the access to the site would be off High Beech Lane, which West Sussex County Council has approved in principle, but that there would also be pedestrian access provided via Portsmouth Wood Close. The developer is aware of the surface water and flooding issues with the site, and the surrounding areas, but believes that the proposal would lead to improvements, as it was working with a technical consultant in order to address the problems and provide the solutions required. He said that there had been a number of ecological surveys on the land, which had not produced any wildlife

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

issues, except for the presence of dormice in the hedgerows. However, the intention is not to disturb the hedgerows.

A member of the public stated that she did not believe that there were no ecological issues, and referred to a range of wildlife and bird species that were present on the site.

Councillor Gomme thanked Mr Munton for his comments on the development proposal.

### 100. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 05 JANUARY 2016.

100.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 05 January 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

101.1 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.

#### 101.2 DM/15/5044 – LINDFIELD PRIMARY SCHOOL, SCHOOL LANE ERECTION OF ELECTRONIC AUTOMATED ENTRY/EXIT BARRIERS TO SCHOOL CAR PARK.

(In view of Councillor Gomme's declaration of interest above, the Vice Chairman, Councillor Hodgson took the Chair for this item, and in accordance with their declarations of interest above, Councillors Gomme, Blunden, and Upton took no part in this item, and did not vote.)

Mr Jesson stated that the LPS had concerns about the nature of the barrier in terms of colour and style. When the barrier is open it will be very prominent and visible within the Conservation Area. The LPS feel that this is the wrong choice of barrier, and that there are more appropriate alternatives. However, the LPS do very much sympathise with the aim behind the barrier, but take the view that this particular proposal should not be supported.

Councillor Snowling expressed similar concerns, and agreed that the proposal was unsympathetic to the setting of the Conservation Area. He felt that it would be visible, and that even if it was within a fairly modern school setting, the Conservation Area should be respected. Councillor Plass said that he didn't think the barrier would be too intrusive, and would be well shielded within the grounds. Councillor Shortland said that he thought that the safety and security reasons behind the installation of the barrier, should be an important considered, and that overall, he had no objections. Councillor Hersey said that she was in agreement with Councillor Plass, as the school setting was itself quite modern.

Under Standing Orders, Councillor Snowling formally proposed that the Parish Council should object to the application on the grounds of unsuitability, and this was seconded by Councillor Hodgson. It was duly put to the vote, and on a show of hands, 2 votes were recorded in favour of the motion, and 3 against. It was therefore declared lost. The recommended response (as set out below) was then put to a vote, and on a show of hands, 3 votes were recorded in favour of the recommendation, and 2 against. The recommendation before the Committee was therefore carried.

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

101.3 DM/16/0028 – LITTLECOTE HOUSE, 28 COMPTON ROAD  
R1 - ROW OF BEECH REDUCE IN HEIGHT BY 3.0M. T1 - ASH REDUCE BY 2.5M. T2 –  
LIQUIDAMBER REDUCE BY 2.5M. T3 - BEECH REDUCE BY 2.5M. T4 - BEECH REDUCE BY 2.5M.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

101.4 DM/16/0023 – LAND OPPOSITE 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE  
CONVERSION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGES TO A SINGLE ONE BEDROOM DWELLING.

Mr Jesson said that he didn't think the proposal met the standards required by being situated in the Conservation Area (CA). Further, it did not meet the objectives of the Village Design Statement. There were no objections in principle, but the new dwelling needed to comply with the planning requirements. Councillor Plass said that this was a difficult application to judge, and noted that although the footprint of the building will be slightly larger than at present, it will embrace the previous consent for the garages. His concern was that this is a dramatic change of use in the CA, and wondered how it will affect the street scene. Councillor Snowling said that the property was erected as garage, and that it was never intended to be a house (see the previous planning conditions). He felt that this proposal would be out of place. Councillor Shortland raised a parking issue, but it was noted that there should still be adequate parking provision within the proposal.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council is concerned about the effects of this proposal within the Conservation Area. It believes that the street scene and the landscape setting will be adversely affected. It is a significant step from permitting the erection of garages, to the conversion/rebuilding of the property as a separate dwelling. There are concerns about the character and appearance of the proposed dwelling within the Conservation Area, and the fact that the proposal will not enhance the views into and out of the Conservation Area. The Council believes that the proposal is not therefore in accordance with Policy B1, B12, and B15 of the 2004 Mid Sussex Local Plan, and so must object to this application".

**102. 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.**

102.1 The Deputy Clerk confirmed receipt of the revised Scamps Hill planning application (within the Rural Parish), details of which had been circulated to all members. The description is now "*Outline application for the development of land to the south of Scamps Hill to accommodate up to 200 dwellings, a 9.54ha country park and land for a primary education facility, together with associated access road, car parking, landscaping and open space. Please note amended description in relation to education provision.*" It was noted that this changed the provision of the proposed school within the application, from a half form entry school, to a full form entry school. This could have significant effects on the traffic generation data, and the overall education provision within the area. The deadline for responses to MSDC is given as 12<sup>th</sup> February 2016, but a short extension of time will be requested, so that the response can be agreed by the Committee, at its next meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> February 2016. It was noted that the application is likely to be decided by MSDC's Planning Committee in March 2016.

**103. PLANNING APPLICATION FOR LAND TO THE SOUTH OF SCAMPS HILL, SCAYNES HILL ROAD (DM/15/4457).**

103.1 The Committee duly noted the decision of full Council taken at the meeting on 14<sup>th</sup> January 2016, to contribute 50% of the planning consultant's fee to Lindfield Rural Parish Council in regard to the planning advice received on the application.

103.2 The Committee considered whether it is prepared to contribute towards the costs of an independent traffic study to review the traffic data supplied by the applicant in connection with the application, should Lindfield Rural Parish Council agree to commission such a study. However, members took the view that this was a specific piece of work that needed to be carried out by LRPC in connection with the Scamps Hill planning application, and that the details of the study/brief are not yet sufficiently clear, in terms of how the issue needs to be approached. It was also thought that the proximity (starting next month) of the Parish Council's own Parish wide traffic survey/study meant that there could be some overlap or duplication.

103.3 It was therefore **AGREED** not to contribute towards the proposed traffic survey, at the present time

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 104. LINDFIELD AND LINDFIELD RURAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN.

104.1 Councillor Gomme reported that the two pop-in sessions held on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2016 had been successful, and that a good turnout was hoped for at the referendum on 28<sup>th</sup> January 2016. Councillor Blunden said that it was very pleasing that the sessions had been so well attended.

### 105. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

105.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.40 p.m.