

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 27 JUNE 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr. S Hodgson (Chairman)
Mr. C Snowling (Vice-Chairman)
Mrs. M Hersey
Mr. R Plass
Mrs. V Upton

Also present:

Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Councillor C Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council)
Roger Harper (Creative Roads Limited) (for item 7)
7 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting)

In attendance:

Mr. I McLean (Planning Administrator)

Not present:

Mr. W Blunden

The Chairman opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall. He also said that he would be altering the order of the Agenda to take items 6 and 7 first in view of the interest from members of the public in those matters.

303. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

303.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Blunden, and the reason accepted.

304. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

304.1 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.

304.2 Item 6 DM/17/2271 – land to the east of High Beech Lane. Councillor Hodgson declared a personal interest as he lives in Portsmouth Wood Close, which is proximate to the application site. He therefore said that he would leave the room for the duration of the item, and hand over the Chair to the Vice Chairman, Councillor Snowling.

304.2 Item 4(i) DM/17/2174 - 34 Luxford Road. Councillor Upton declared a personal interest as she lives in the same road, and so is a near neighbour to the subject property.

304.3 Item 4(vi) DM/17/2264 – 66 Eastern Road. Councillor Upton declared a personal interest as she is related to the person who drew up the plans for this application.

305. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 06 JUNE 2017.

305.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 06 June 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

306.1 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.

306.2 DM/17/2174 – 34 LUXFORD ROAD
SINGLE STOREY TIMBER BUILDING FOR USE AS A GARDEN ROOM.

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

306.3 DM/17/2189 – STABLE LODGE AND ROSEMARY COTTAGE, LEWES ROAD
WESTERN RED CEDAR (T1) SHORTEN BRANCHES OVER CAR PARKING AREA BY UP TO 1.5 METRES TO A HEIGHT OF 8 METRES ABOVE GROUND LEVEL. YEW (T2), (T3), (T4) SHORTEN BRANCHES ON SIDE FACING STABLE LODGE, BY UP TO 2 METRES TO SUITABLE GROWTH POINTS TO 3 METRES ABOVE ROOF RIDGE.

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

306.4 DM/17/2132 – 43 HIGH STREET (FIELD AND FORREST)
PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE EXTERNAL COLOUR OF CAFÉ / DELI TO MARITIME TEAL.

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

306.5 DM/17/2157 – LINDFIELD CRICKET CLUB, LINDFIELD COMMON, CRICKET PAVILION, BACKWOODS LANE
PROPOSED 8X SOUNDTEX ACOUSTIC QUILTS TO BE ATTACHED TO THE REAR AND SIDE OF THE CRICKET NETS. QUILTS ARE TO BE HUNG ON THE METAL CAGE SURROUNDING THE NETS AND ARE TO BE IN-SITU APRIL-AUGUST EACH YEAR.

A member of the public raised an objection on the basis that the current netting does not have any adverse visual impact, but that this proposal will have, particularly in terms of its effects on the Conservation Area. Clarity is also needed on the meaning of "period of use". Councillor Snowling felt that the proposal should be supported, and that it would be appropriate to see how it actually works out in practice. In the main however, members agreed with the proposed response, but as there was a difference of view, the Chairman formally moved that the response be agreed, and called for a show of hands. There were 4 votes in favour and 1 against.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application in principle. However, the application implies that the quilts will be permanently in place from April to August each year. If this is the case, the Parish Council is concerned that the visual impact of the proposal will be very prominent within the Conservation Area of Lindfield Common for that five month period. Accordingly, the Parish Council would want to see a condition that requires the quilts to be removed after each period of use (as for the sight screens), and stored appropriately.

306.6 DM/17/2239 – 36 HIGH STREET
REPLACEMENT WINDOWS TO FRONT ELEVATION TO MATCH EXISTING. REPLACEMENT PORCH CANOPY. REPLACEMENT GROUND FLOOR DOOR AND WINDOWS TO MODERN EXTENSION (LOUNGE). REPLACEMENT ELECTRIC METER CABINET AND TIMBER STORE WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING. REPAIR AND REPLACE EXISTING CHIMNEYS.

Mr Jesson said that there was some concern at the loss of some historic glazing, but that the building itself, is quite modern and of no great historic value. A member of the public said that because the property is within the Conservation Area, the level of detail had to be very clear. He felt that there were issues with the electric cabinet (although the reduction in size is to be welcomed) and the nature of the bin store. The applicant said that he appreciated these concerns, and that the cabinet will indeed be smaller and more discreet. The bin store is being done by reference to other similar ones nearby. However, these issues were being looked into, in terms of being able to satisfy the Conservation Officer, who was awaiting further information. Councillor Snowling therefore proposed that as more information

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

is awaited the proposed response be agreed, but that a final response be delegated to the Clerk in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman in accordance with Standing Orders. This was agreed by the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, except in regard to the proposal for the electric meter cabinet. The Parish Council understands that the Conservation Officer has raised some issues, and is currently awaiting further information. The Parish Council therefore reserves its position on this aspect, until the additional information is to hand.

306.7 DM/17/2264 – 66 EASTERN ROAD
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson had concerns with the boundary issue. The proposal followed the fence line, and this would therefore detract from the residential amenity of the neighbouring property at no. 68, as it would be very close. Councillor Snowling said that he thought Mr Jesson's response a fair one, and so proposed that the response be altered in order to take account of the concern. Councillor Plass agreed, and so the response was duly revised and agreed by the Committee.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application because of its unneighbourly affect, which is contrary to Local Plan policy. The fact that the building line of the extension goes right up to the boundary of the neighbouring property, will be detrimental to the residential amenity of no. 68 Eastern Road.

306.8 DM/17/2299 – 5 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE
(T1) YEW - REDUCE CANOPY BY UP TO 2 METRES.

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

306.9 DM/17/1119 – TACHBROOK, LEWES ROAD
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUNGALOW AND KENNEL BUILDINGS. CONSTRUCTION OF A DETACHED DWELLING WITH A FURTHER TWO (SEMI-DETACHED) DWELLINGS TO THE REAR. (AMENDED AND ACCURATE SITE PLAN RECEIVED 02/06/17).

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had now reconsidered the application in the light of the additional information provided. Whilst not strictly a planning matter, there was a concern about building over the main sewer across the land. This would need to be re-routed. However, there were now new concerns about the nature of the new two storey buildings to the rear, overlooking the adjoining properties in Meadow Drive. It was considered that this would detract from their residential amenity. A member of the public reiterated the point and said that the buildings will dominate the adjoining properties, and so are not suitable for the street scene. He thought that the proposal represented over development of the site. Councillor Plass said that he agreed with the points made, and that the proximity of the two storey new build was a concern. Councillor Snowling said that the response to the previous application had been that there were no objections in principle, but in view of the concerns now expressed by residents and others, these were points worth making in a revised response, notwithstanding the previous comments.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council notes that the only change to the previous application is the addition of the garages at the rear of the site, which are now shown on the plan. The Parish Council therefore repeats its previous comments regarding the proposal. It does note and regret the loss of another bungalow in Lindfield. The Parish Council also considers that the issues and remedies set out in the Flood Risk Assessment (such as the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage systems) should as necessary, be dealt with by condition. However, having reconsidered the matter, the Parish Council is also concerned by the two storey nature of the two semi-detached dwellings to the rear, and the imposing effect this will have on the neighbouring properties in Meadow Drive. These will be very much overlooked by the development, and visually intrusive. This aspect of the proposal must therefore be regarded as unneighbourly under policy B1 of the 2004 Local Plan.

306.10 DM/17/2353 – 40 DUKES ROAD

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

PROPOSED TWO STOREY FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSION WITH A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that he agreed with the proposed response, and that the LPS had similar concerns about the proximity of the extension to the neighbouring property.

AGREED RESPONSE: The proposed re-development of the existing property seems to fully utilise all of the available space, creating an imposing building, which is detrimental to the street scene, and imposing for the neighbouring properties. The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site, and therefore fails to meet the objectives of policy B1 of the 2004 Local Plan. The Parish Council must therefore object to the proposal.

- 306.11 DM/17/2366 – 133 THE WELKIN
T1 SILVER BIRCH - REMOVAL OF 5 LOWEST BRANCHES.

Mr Jesson could not locate the reason for the proposed work in the application, given that the tree does have a Tree Preservation Order on it. However, it was noted that the tree is not being felled.

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

- 306.12 DM/17/2377 – 48 HICKMANS LANE
PROPOSED DORMER AND PORCH.

Mr Jesson noted that the property is in an Area of Townscape Character, and this is an important aspect to consider in deciding a response. The location of the dormer seemed inappropriate, and whilst the porch was acceptable, it did appear to be unbalanced. The Committee agreed to take in the concern about the dormer, in terms of finalising the response.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections in principle to this application. However, the provision of the dormer needs to be considered against the background of the property being within an Area of Townscape Character. Such a feature therefore needs to be appropriate for an ATC, and so must meet the Planning Authority's design standards. It must also be ensured that all the materials match, and are in sympathy with the existing building.

- 306.13 DM/17/2388 – 2 BARRINGTON WOOD
SINGLE STOREY SIDE KITCHEN EXTENSION.

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

307. **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.**

- 307.1 There were no reports on this occasion.

308. **PLANNING APPLICATION DM/17/2271 - LAND TO THE EAST OF HIGH BEECH LANE/LAND NORTH OF BARRINGTON CLOSE, LINDFIELD – OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF 46 (ONE, TWO, THREE, FOUR, AND FIVE BEDROOM) DWELLINGS (USE CLASS C3) WITH ASSOCIATED INFRASTRUCTURE, LANDSCAPING AND ACCESS. ALL MATTERS TO BE RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS.**

Note: In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Hodgson vacated the Chair, and left the room for the duration of the discussion and decision regarding this application. In his absence, Councillor Snowling took the Chair for the item.

- 308.1 Councillor Snowling introduced the item, and said that whilst the application was very similar to the previously withdrawn application back in 2015, it had to be treated as a new and fresh application.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

However, he noted that despite the minor changes made to the proposal, it was very much the principle of development on this land that the Parish Council had objected to.

- 308.2 Councillor Snowling then invited comments from members of the public present. Mr Jesson said that the access issue was the focus of the LPS's attention, as this was the only matter, which was not reserved. The LPS also has concerns about the loss of trees in order to put in the highway visibility splays. There is no mapping of the trees, and so it is very difficult to assess exactly where the impact will be. The alterations to the road will undermine the rural nature of High Beech Lane. He noted that it may be that the positioning of the main access could change in the future, given that the applicant had purchased a property in Portsmouth Wood Close, and it would be important therefore, if that was to occur, for there to be a fresh application so that the access arrangements could be fully appraised. A resident referred to the flooding concerns, and the fact that the land is not stable. There can be no confidence in the measures being taken by the applicant. The geological fault issue has not been properly addressed, and there remains a real concern about water run off. She noted that balancing ponds can overflow, and will eventually discharge into the ground. In terms of the underground spring issue, there has been no proper testing other than on the site itself, and there remain concerns that the already present risk of subsidence occurring to nearby properties, will simply be exacerbated. Another resident observed that some properties had already had to be built on six metre piles, in order to maintain the structural integrity of the buildings.
- 308.3 Councillor Hersey mentioned a similar application, where an application had been refused on appeal, where the lack of any footpaths/pavements had in itself failed the sustainability test. In general, members felt that the comments they had heard, had only served to strengthen the objections made to the previous application. Councillor Snowling therefore proposed that with any appropriated changes in order to update the response, the comments of the Parish Council should be submitted in very much the same form as previously. This was seconded by Councillor Upton, and unanimously **AGREED**.

309. TRAFFIC SURVEY.

- 309.1 Roger Harper introduced the item, and circulated a short update report to members. He referred to the fact that his work had been guided by the vision in the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan concerning transport, in terms of improving cycling and walking. He referred to the nine sites set out in the brief for the investigation of traffic improvements, in terms of traffic calming options, and road safety measures. He mentioned that residents had been involved, and that all the representations that had come in from members of the public had been considered. This was particularly in the context of the possibility of re-opening Denmans Lane, but that this option had to be ruled out on cost and practicality grounds. The main change from the interim report, relates to the Lewes Road/High Street junction, where the option of a traffic signals solution, had now been picked up. The modelling on the options for the phasing of the lights had been done, and this had demonstrated a preferred solution. From the work, he has put forward a summary of suggested measures with an outline of the estimated costs.
- 309.2 It was noted that the full interim report is available on the Parish Council's website, or in the offices, but the intention was now to move towards producing the final report. This would be presented in the next few weeks, and would need to be the subject of further consultation and input. It would be important to achieve consensus from the community on any measures that go forward for actual implementation.
- 309.3 Members felt that they needed to see the full and final report before inputting the project in any great detail, and that the matter should therefore come back to the next full meeting of this Committee, once the report had been sent.
- 209.4 A member of the public commented that there was a degree of urgency now, and that the Parish Council needed to move as quickly as possible. There is a need to avoid further, unnecessary delays, as it has been quite a long time already, in getting the project to this point.

- 309.4 The Chairman thanked Roger Harper for attending the meeting and making his presentation.

310. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

310.1 No other items of business were raised on this occasion.

The meeting concluded at 9.20 p.m.