

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 28 APRIL 2015** 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. J. Chatfield  
Mrs. M. Hersey (Vice Chairman)  
Mr. S. Hodgson  
Mr. C. Snowling  
Mrs. V Upton

**Also present:**

Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)  
Councillor C. Hersey (MSDC)  
1 member of the public

**In attendance:**

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

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

**572. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

572.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Amor, and the reason accepted.

**573. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

573.1 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.

573.2 Councillor Hodgson declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in item 4(xi) on the Agenda (2 Portsmouth Wood Close), as the applicant was a near neighbour, and so said that he would leave the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.

**574. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 07 APRIL 2015.**

574.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 07 April 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

575.1 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.

575.2 DM/15/1020 – BROOMFIELDS, 54 HIGH STREET  
MAINTENANCE AND IMPROVEMENTS TO FRONT GARDEN AND FRONT ELEVATION – TO INCLUDE WOODEN BIN ENCLOSURE IN FRONT GARDEN, REMOVAL OF ROOF LIGHT AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

- 575.3 DM/15/1152 – 14 BY SUNTE  
FRONT SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION WITH PORCH. SIDE SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. NEW PITCHED ROOF OVER REAR FLAT ROOF EXISTING EXTENSION. (ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RECEIVED 30/03/2015).

Mr Jesson said that there were no objections to the application, but as there was no mention of it in the papers, matching materials and finishes should be used. It was therefore agreed to add this in to the Parish Council's response.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided it is a condition of approval that matching materials and finishes are used."

- 575.4 DM/15/1303 – 29 DENMANS LANE  
ASH – FELL.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "The response was dealt with separately under delegated authority, and sent 20<sup>th</sup> April 2015."

- 575.5 DM/15/1371 – 6 WOODPECKER CHASE  
PART RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR EXISTING SUPPLEMENTARY HARD STANDING AND PROPOSED GARDEN WALL.

Mr Jesson said that there were no objections to the application, but noted that a small part of the garden fell within the Conservation Area.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the hard standing, but does object to the brick wall and railings, as they are out of keeping with the street scene in this rural area."

- 575.6 DM/15/1431 – EVERYNDENS, 109 HIGH STREET

HOLLY (T1) – REDUCTION IN HEIGHT BY ONE THIRD.

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

- 575.7 DM/15/1327 – 78 HIGH STREET (THE HOLT)  
TWO DORMER WINDOWS TO FRONT ELEVATION AND A CONSERVATION ROOF LIGHT TO REAR.

Mr Jesson said that the application had not overcome the problems with regard to very much the same application submitted in 2004. He outlined the concerns he had about the nature of the proposal and the effect on surrounding properties. Councillor Snowling said that he agreed with Mr Jesson's comments, and that the application needed to be looked at afresh. As there was a difference between the recommended comments, and the revised response, which expressed these concerns, the Chairman called for a vote. On a show of hands, the proposal to submit the below response was carried by five votes in favour, with one against (Councillor Hersey), and one abstention (Councillor Upton).

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council has concerns that the property, which is already larger than the flanking or adjoining houses, which are listed, will become even more prominent. In the Parish Council's view, the addition of these features will upset the setting of the listing buildings either side of the property. This application cannot therefore be supported."

- 575.8 DM/15/1475 - 18 HIGH STREET  
TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION AND ROOF OVER SIDE PASSAGEWAY AND STORE AREA.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

materials and finishes are used.”

575.9 DM/15/1501 – 22 EASTERN ROAD  
TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “Lindfield Parish Council notes that this application is being re-advertised.”

575.10 DM/15/1506 – 44 HICKMANS LANE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION WITH NEW ENTRANCE. CONVERSION OF EXISTING GARAGE INTO A HABITABLE ROOM. REAR SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION. NEW PITCHED ROOF TO HOUSE WITH RAISED RIDGE LEVEL BY 800 MM. DORMER WINDOW TO FRONT ELEVATION.

Mr Jesson thought that the proposal would add a number of features, which would detract from the look and setting of the property. There was some architectural merit, but overall, the proposal did not respect the character of the area, given that it is within an Area of Townscape Merit, and so it was not in compliance with policy B1 of the 2004 Local Plan. Councillor Snowling agreed, and said that it will rather fill out the entire plot, and so was out of keeping with the setting of the property.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “Lindfield Parish Council is not able to support this application, in that the proposals do not take into account the character of the area, given that the property is situated in an Area of Townscape Character. It would appear to fill the plot completely, and so would not be in keeping with the surrounding properties. Accordingly, the Parish Council does not believe that the requirements of Policy B1 of the 2004 Local Plan, have been met.”

575.11 DM/15/1552 – 54 HIGH STREET (BROOMFIELDS)  
G1 5 YEW: REDUCE BY 2.5M. G2 4 HAZEL: COPPICE. T1 LEYLAND CYPRESS: RAISE CANOPY BY 2.5M. G3 6 APPLE TREES: FELL. T2 WILLOW: FELL. T3 SILVER BIRCH: REMOVE CO-DOMINANT STEM.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided the work is professionally carried out.”

575.12 DM/15/1569 – 2 PORTSMOUTH WOOD CLOSE (THE OAKS)  
T1 (OAK) - REMOVE HIGHEST FORKING BRANCH BACK TO JUNCTION WITH MAIN STEM. T2 (OAK) - REMOVE HIGHEST LIMB CLOSEST TO HOUSE BACK TO JUNCTION WITH MAIN STEM. T3 (OAK) - REMOVE HIGHEST FORK BACK TO JUNCTION WITH MAIN STEM. DEADWOOD ALL THREE TREES.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided the work is professionally carried out.”

*Note: In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Hodgson left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.*

**576. 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.**

576.1 DM/15/0964: Paolino, 96 High Street, **NOTED:** that the application for the variation of condition 2 of the planning permission 12/03777/COND to allow the extension of hours of the outside seating area to 22:00 close Monday to Saturday, had been REFUSED by the Planning Authority on 28<sup>th</sup> April 2015.

**577. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS (TROs)**

577.1 Mr Graham Turner referred to the petition in support of the two TROs, being (i) a 7.5. tonne weight limit along the B2028 through Lindfield, and (ii) the removal of road traffic direction signage, and said that this

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

now had 1,266 signatures. Mr Jesson said that he would be presenting further evidence in support of the applications, from All Saints Church and the Sussex Bus Company, when the application forms had been finalised. It was noted however, that there had been a couple of comments from Lindfield High Street traders, who stated that they were concerned about the proposal to remove the road traffic signage (directing Wakehurst and the South of England Agricultural Showground (SEAS) at the junction of the B2028 with Summerhill Lane) as this could have an adverse effect on the number of visitors passing through Lindfield, who might stop and use the shops and facilities.

- 577.2 Councillor Gomme said that it was important to separate out the two TROs, as the LPS had done, and to deal with them individually. It would also be the case that the applications would have to be supported at County Local Committee level, and that each one will have different merits and considerations. Particularly on the signage issue, it would be appropriate to consult with neighbouring Parishes and the wider community, in order to try and get them on board. Councillor Blunden said that he didn't have as much concern over the signage, since the existing arrangements, particularly during the course of the SEAS annual summer show in June, worked fairly well. Councillor Hersey also referred to the separation issue, and said that it was important that if one application failed, the other one should not. Councillor Snowling was concerned that by consulting on the signage issue, it would simply be indefinitely delayed, given that the process had the potential of taking a very long time.
- 577.3 Councillor Gomme moved towards asking whether members wanted both applications to proceed to full Council with an expression of support. However, Councillor Blunden indicated that he would not be able to support the signage TRO, and Councillor Gomme supported that view.
- 577.4 After further discussion therefore, and in view of the importance of the matter, it was **RESOLVED** to refer the consideration of both TROs to the next ordinary meeting of the full Council on 19<sup>th</sup> May 2015.

### 578. FOOTPATH CREATION ORDERS

- 578.1 **NOTED:** (i) the confirmation and coming into operation (on 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2015) of a public foot path creation Order for land to the east of Brushes Lane, Lindfield (as previously reported to Committee on 25<sup>th</sup> February 2014); and (ii) a public path dedication agreement entered into between WSCC and MSDC on land north of Newton Road, Lindfield; and (iii) a public path dedication Agreement entered into between WSCC and Barratt Homes Southern Counties, also as regards land north of Newton Road, Lindfield (both Agreements effectively extending the network of public footpaths to the rear of the Limes development).
- 578.2 Councillor Gomme said that he had recently walked the footpaths, and these were a good addition to the recreational facilities in the Parish.

### 579. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 579.1 As this was the last meeting of the Committee during the term of this Council, the Chairman expressed his thanks to Councillors Amor and Chatfield, who were standing down at the forthcoming election, for all their help and support in the work of the Committee over the last four years. He also thanked the Clerk and Deputy Clerk for all their help and support.
- 579.2 Councillor Blunden asked whether there had been any change in the planning rules regarding the replacement of windows in the Conservation Area (CA). It had been noticed that the windows being replaced at the former White Horse public House, did not appear to comply, in that they were "upvc", but in other cases, it had been a requirement that windows had to be aluminium or as specified so as to respect the CA. Accordingly, the Deputy Clerk was asked to look into the matter, and will report back in due course.

The Meeting concluded at 8.46 p.m.