

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 29 APRIL 2014** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present: Parish Councillors: Mr A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mrs M. Hersey (Vice-Chairman)
Mr M. Amor
Mr R. Plass
Mr W. Blunden
Mr C. Snowling
Mrs V. Upton

Also present: Councillor Chris Hersey (MSDC), Councillor Andrew Lea (MSDC), Mr John Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society) (LPS), and 25 members of the public.

In attendance: Mr I. McLean (Deputy Clerk).

Absent: Councillors Mrs J. Chatfield and Mr S Hodgson.

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

439. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

439.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chatfield and Hodgson, and the reasons were accepted.

440. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

440.1 The Deputy Clerk read out Councillor Hersey's standard declaration, which states that as a District Councillor, she reserves 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.

440.2 In respect of item 5(iv) on the Agenda, Councillor Hersey also declared a personal interest, as the applicant was her son.

441. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC.

441.1 Mr Jesson referred to the examiner's report into Cuckfield Parish Council's Neighbourhood Plan, which had just recently been published on its website, and asked about progress with regard to Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Parish Councils' Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor Gomme responded that the report had been seen, and was being studied. He also referred to the forthcoming public meeting of the Steering Group on 8th May 2014 in the King Edward Hall, at which progress would be duly reported. The meeting had been advertised in an article, in the May edition of Lindfield Life.

442. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 07 APRIL 2014.

442.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 07 April 2014. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

443. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

443.1 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 in order to cater for those persons present wishing to speak to an application.

443.2 14/01122/FUL – SELBY COTTAGE, LEWES ROAD
PITCHED ROOF TO PORCH AND REPLACING CONSERVATORY WITH LARGER SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition).”

443.3 14/01134/FUL – 1 THE WILDERNESS
CARPORT/GARAGE AND WOOD STORE.

Mr Jesson commented that this was a prominent feature, and whilst acceptable as a principle, the location and height of the building were a concern. He would therefore support the Parish Council's comments. A nearby resident spoke against the application and said that the grounds for an inspector rejecting an appeal against the refusal of planning consent in a similar matter, were relevant. The applicant stated that the proposal was reasonable and in keeping with the street scene and other similar constructions. He pointed out that this was the only possible location, and that the building would eventually be screened by recently planted hedging.

Councillors expressed different opinions, and so the proposed response was put to a vote. This was carried on a show of hands, being three in favour, and one against. Two did not vote, and Councillor Hersey abstained.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council feels that it cannot support this application in such a prominent area. It appears to be overdevelopment of the property, and would change the street scene in a very sensitive area, having a detrimental effect. It is therefore contrary to Planning Policy B1 of the 2004 Local Plan.”

443.4 14/01144/FUL – 18 LUXFORD ROAD
REMOVAL OF OUTBUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that the extension would be very close to the rear boundary fence, but it was felt that this would be a matter for building regulations.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition).”

443.5 14/00937/FUL – CORNER COTTAGE, ROUNDWOOD LANE
AMENDMENTS TO PREVIOUSLY APPROVED PERMISSION FOR NEW BUILD FIVE BEDROOM HOUSE.

Mr Jesson said that he was still concerned about the height of the building, and expressed the view that the removal of the balcony had not improved matters. The applicant spoke in support of the application, and stated that he was responding to concerns from the Urban Architect, and observations previously made by the Parish Council.

AGREED RESPONSE: “In the light of the previous approval, Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.”

[NOTE: Councillor Hersey left the room for the consideration of this item and took no part in the proceedings, in accordance with her declaration of interest recorded above.]

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 443.6 14/01208/FUL – 4 OLD SCHOOL COURT
CHANGES TO FRONT GARDEN LAYOUT, TO IMPROVE ITS APPEARANCE AND TO GIVE BETTER ACCESS TO FRONT DOOR.

Mr Jesson commented that it needed to be certain that the permeability of the materials to be used, was assured.

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

- 443.7 14/01221/LDC – 14 APPLEDORE GARDENS
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION WITH NEW PITCHED ROOF DORMER AND ROOFLIGHT TO REAR AND NEW ROOFLIGHT TO THE FRONT. 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, Lindfield Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as it is aware."

- 443.8 14/01244/FUL – 28 HICKMANS LANE
SINGLE STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. NEW DORMER TO NORTHERN ROOF SLOPE. PLEASE NOTE CORRECTED ADDRESS 4TH APRIL 2014.

Mr Jesson said that as the details in the application were not clear, it needed to be certain that matching materials and finishes should be used.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition)."

- 443.9 14/01249/FUL – 28 CHESTNUTS CLOSE
SINGLE STOREY REAR AND SIDE EXTENSIONS.

Mr Jesson said that as the details in the application were not clear, it needed to be certain that matching materials and finishes should be used. Councillor Amor made the point that he didn't think this was so important for side and/or rear extensions.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition)."

- 443.10 14/01318/FUL – 26 SAVILL ROAD
TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION, FIRST FLOOR FRONT AND REAR EXTENSION TO WEST SIDE OF PROPERTY OVER EXISTING GROUND FLOOR CONSTRUCTION.

Mr Jesson noted that this application had been re-validated by MSDC at a later date, which would affect the timing of the responses. It was uncertain why this was. The Deputy Clerk said that he had taken the matter up with the Planning Officer, and a reply was awaited.

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

- 443.11 14/01344/FUL – ROUNDWAYS, 13 OAK BANK
GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION AND ENLARGEMENT OF EXISTING FRONT DORMER.

Mr Jesson said that as the details in the application were not clear, it needed to be certain that matching materials and finishes should be used.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition)."

443.12 14/01350/TCA – STABLE LODGE, LEWES ROAD
T5 YEW. REDUCE CROWN SPREAD BACK TO 0.5M FROM NORTH WEST LINE OF BUILDING.

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

443.13 14/01355/FUL – 57 SUNTE AVENUE
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY OUTSIDE WC AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO CREATE FURTHER HABITABLE ACCOMMODATION.

Mr Jesson stated that there were no objections in principle, but that matching materials and finishes should be used. The applicant sought to explain the late changes to the plans, which had been sent by MSDC only earlier in the day, following consultations with her neighbours. Councillor Snowling said that it was too late to consider these, and the Committee could only consider what was before it on the night.

AGREED RESPONSE: "The original plans were very faint and therefore difficult to understand. In particular, the details of the ground floor side extension are not clear. Otherwise, Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, based on the original plans presented, provided matching materials and finishes are used (by condition)."

443.14 14/00209/OUT – LAND NORTH OF BIRCHEN LANE, HAYWARDS HEATH
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 48 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING, CAR PARKING, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING, AND THE FORMATION OF ACCESS ROADS. REVISED INFORMATION RECEIVED 10TH APRIL 2014 IN RESPECT OF GREAT CRESTED NEWTS (REVISED MASTERPLAN, PARAMETER PLAN AND CONSTRUCTION ENVIRONMENT MANAGEMENT PLAN).

Mr Jesson said that he supported the Parish Council's comments, and particularly urged that the views of the professional officers amongst other statutory consultees should be listened to by MSDC. There needed to be robust objections to this application for a number of reasons. Representatives from Save Birchen Fields spoke against the application, citing particularly the ecological and environmental concerns. These concerns were all referred to in more detail in a briefing note that the Parish Council had received, and which had been circulated to all members of the Committee. Councillor Andrew Lea said that all the ecological survey information needed to be obtained before a planning decision could be taken.

Mr J Escott (Agent for the applicant) took issue with each of the Parish Council's points, and re-iterated that the appropriate surveys are being done. The application is full and detailed, and there is no intention to hide anything. He pointed out that the fields had no legitimate recreational use.

Councillor Snowling said that the issues had been clearly set out, both for and against, and that there were serious issues that needed to be resolved. There is an overwhelming view that this is not an appropriate development in this area. He moved that with some refinements and revisions, the proposed response (as read out by the Deputy Clerk) should go forward to MSDC. Councillor Blunden seconded the proposal, and this was unanimously agreed.

AGREED RESPONSE: "With appropriate refinement and revisions, the Parish Council's response will be as per the detailed paper, which the Deputy Clerk read out at the commencement of the item. This will record the strong objections of the Parish Council to this application on a number of planning grounds as set out in detail in the paper."

444. **TO CONSIDER A RESPONSE (IF ANY) TO THE NEW PLANNING APPLICATION FOR BUXSHALLS UNDER PLANNING REFERENCE NUMBER: 14/01120/FUL.**

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

444.1 The Deputy Clerk reminded the Committee of the history of this site, and the planning applications that had been made. It was noted that the previous application in 2013, which had been refused by MSDC was going to appeal. Although not a matter for this Parish Council, a number of comments noted that the design of the new build was more acceptable and in keeping, being of a Sussex barn style appearance. The main concerns however, still related to construction traffic management and movements, road safety issues, and road damage. It was important that the lessons with regard to previous experiences should be learnt.

444.2 It was noted that a number of the Parish Council's previous concerns were intended to be addressed by planning condition, and it was agreed that the Parish Council should respond by repeating the previous concerns, and urging that similar conditions from MSDC and West Sussex County Council should be attached to any consent that may be granted in respect of this new application.

445. TO RECEIVE REPORTS ON ANY SIGNIFICANT PLANNING DECISIONS MADE BY MSDC AND THE PLANNING INSPECTORATE AND TO AGREE ANY FURTHER ACTION WHICH MAY NEED TO BE TAKEN BEFORE THE NEXT MEETING.

445.1 The Deputy Clerk reported that the planning application for The Postmasters, 34 High Street (ref: 14/00513/FUL) had been granted by MSDC, subject to conditions. The Deputy Clerk had already circulated a copy of the letter of consent containing the full details.

445.2 The Deputy Clerk also reported that the planning application for Fullingmill Farm, Spring Lane (ref: 13/03948/FUL) had been granted by MSDC, subject to conditions. The Deputy Clerk had already circulated a copy of the letter of consent containing the full details.

446. TO REVIEW THE RISK ASSESSMENT FOR THE PLANNING & TRAFFIC COMMITTEE.

446.1 The risk assessment document regarding the safety of members undertaking planning application property inspections, was received, noted, and discussed.

446.2 It was agreed that the current document was fit for the purpose, and that no changes or revisions were necessary. *Accordingly, it was **resolved** to approve the document in its current form, and to review the matter again in April 2015.*

447. TO RECEIVE AND NOTE THE COMMITTEE'S BUDGET ANALYSIS PAPER FOR 2013/14 AND TO CONFIRM THE ALLOCATION OF UNSPENT FUNDS AS AT 31ST MARCH 2014.

447.1 The paper prepared by the Responsible Financial Officer was received, noted, and discussed.

447.2 *Accordingly, it was **resolved** to recommend to the Finance and General Purposes Committee and to the Council, that the allocation of unspent funds, being miscellaneous costs of £200, be put to the General Reserve for 2014.15, and that £20,000, being professional fees and neighbourhood planning costs, be put to the Designated Reserve for 2014/15.*

448. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

448.1 No other items of business were raised.

The Meeting concluded at 9.15 p.m.