

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 29 MARCH 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

**Present:**

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

**Also present:** Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)  
9 members of the public (for parts or all of the meeting)

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

**Absent:** Mrs. J Durrant, Mrs. V Upton, Mr. W Blunden, Mrs. M Hersey

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

**118. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

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

**119. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

119.1 Councillor Gomme declared a personal interest in Agenda item 5(iii), 19 By Sunte, as he was a near neighbour to this property. It was therefore agreed that Councillor Hodgson as Vice Chairman, would take the item.

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

120.1 Mr Jesson updated the Committee on the progress of the Traffic Regulation Order (seeking to restrict lorry movements on rural roads) lodged by the LPS at West Sussex County Council, to Tony Kershaw, the Head of Law. Mr Jesson also explained that the new process for submitting TROs had been outlined at the last County Local Committee meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2016. Under this system, the LPS's TRO is considered to be in the complex category, and to be an ambitious scheme. It would be costly to implement, and so funding could be a problem. He also referred to the fact that a further endorsement of the scheme had been received from the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England, and this has been sent to WSCC. The application is therefore on track, and the outcome is awaited.

120.2 Mr Oliver advised the Committee that the Desktop Biodiversity report from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre, used to inform the neighbourhood planning process, through the Landscape Focus Group, was now out of date, and there is an opportunity to obtain a free update. He suggested that in the context of planning applications and the Neighbourhood Plan, Lindfield Parish Council, and Lindfield Rural Parish Council, should update the document, so as it is a current and up to date report. Mr Oliver kindly agreed to forward further details to the Deputy Clerk.

**121. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 08 MARCH 2016.**

121.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 08 March 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

122.1 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.

122.2 DM/16/0829 – 6 WOODPECKER CHASE  
ASH (T1) - REDUCE STEM LEANING TOWARDS HOUSE BY APPROXIMATELY 2M. ASH (T2) - REMOVE LOWEST BRANCH OVER LAWN.

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

122.3 DM/16/0867 – 23, 24, 25, AND 26 FIELDWAY  
PROPOSED FRONT PORCHES TO NUMBERS 23, 24, 25 AND 26.

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

122.4 DM/16/0870 – 19 BY SUNTE  
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER GARAGE TO THE FRONT ELEVATION AND ALSO AN OPEN PORCH TO THE FRONT ELEVATION.

In accordance with his declaration of interest above, Councillor Gomme left the room for the duration of the discussion of this item.

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

122.5 DM/16/0872 – SAXON GATE, 1A LINDEN GROVE  
(T1) YEW - REDUCE SIDE BY 1-2M. (T2) YEW - DEADWOOD AND THIN. (T3) YEW - SHAPE AND REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2-3M AND WIDTH BY 1-2M. (T4) SYCAMORE - REDUCE HEIGHT BY 2-3M AND WIDTH BY 1-2M. HOLLY, BY ROAD - SHAPE.

Mr Jesson said that it was difficult to match up the description in the planning notice with what is actually described in the application. This seems to be becoming a fairly common occurrence. Councillors agreed that these applications needed to be precise, and that the point needs to be made in the response. It was agreed that the response also needs to be copied to the Head of Planning at MSDC.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council is not able to comment on this application, as it seems that the work described in the planning notice does not match the work set out in the application form itself. The work to (T3) Yew particularly refers.

122.6 DM/16/0281 – 3 SUMMERHILL DRIVE  
DEMOLISH EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND UTILITY ROOM AND REPLACE WITH 2 STOREY EXTENSION TO SIDE OF PROPERTY.

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

122.7 DM/16/0857 – THE OLD FORGE, DENMANS COURT, DENMANS LANE  
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE ON GROUND FLOOR FROM B1 TO C3.

Mr Jesson noted that the extent of this listed building is not clear from the listing description, but in overall terms, he was in agreement with the Conservation Officer's points, and the Parish Council's response.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council fully endorses the response of the Conservation Officer to this application, as set out in her note of 8th March 2016 to the Planning Officer, and so it cannot support this application in its present form. It also points out that it is difficult to be sure, from the listing description, exactly which parts of the building are listed, and which are not. However, this does not have any effect on the overall adverse implications of the proposal as have been referred to.

- 122.8 DM/16/0857 (LBC APPLICATION) – THE OLD FORGE, DENMANS COURT, DENMANS LANE  
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION AND CHANGE OF USE ON GROUND FLOOR FROM B1 TO C3.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** As for application reference number DM/16/0857 - "Lindfield Parish Council fully endorses the response of the Conservation Officer to this application, as set out in her note of 8th March 2016 to the Planning Officer, and so it cannot support this application in its present form. It also points out that it is difficult to be sure, from the listing description, exactly which parts of the building are listed, and which are not. However, this does not have any effect on the overall adverse implications of the proposal as have been referred to

- 122.9 DM/16/0192 – 30 SAVILL ROAD  
SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSIONS AND TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 11.03.16 SHOWING REDUCTION IN DEPTH AND WIDTH OF SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

The neighbour at no. 32 said that their objection was still the proposed height and the proximity of the extension. The building would encroach over their patio and cast a shadow when the sun sets. It needs a hip roof to slant away. The applicant said that he had put in revised plans after discussion with MSDC, and had tried to take on board the neighbours' concerns. An effort has been made to blend the roof line and merge the buildings. Councillors agreed that this was not an easy application to decide, but felt that the proposed response took a fair and balanced view.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council notes the efforts that have been made by the applicant to make the proposal more acceptable. However, we consider that the revised proposal is still on the borderline of being in conflict with Policies B1 and B3 of the Local Plan 2004 in that it still doesn't go quite far enough to respect the amenities of the neighbouring property, because the height of the proposed extension is so close to the boundary with No 32 that it would be likely to be un-neighbourly.

- 122.10 DM/16/1018 – 1 OLD ORCHARD CLOSE  
TO ERECT 2 NO. WOODEN CLIMBING FRAMES 3M HIGH.

Mr Jesson said that he had a slight concern that the frames would be quite close to the boundary with the neighbouring property. There may therefore be potential for overlooking. The applicant said that they will be sited a reasonable distance away, and that she was not aware of any objections from the neighbours. Councillor Snowling said that he understood Mr Jesson's concerns, but that this was not an unreasonable use of a garden.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to either option set out in this application.

- 122.11 DM/16/1038 – 70 HIGH STREET (REAR OF)  
PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO INSTALL 6 NO. BIFOLD DOORS TO EXISTING SHOP FAÇADE (AMENDMENT TO COU/00273/COU). IN ADDITION TO REPLACEMENT OF EXISTING FLAT ROOF WITH NEW PITCHED ROOF.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, although it would have been helpful if the papers by MSDC had included the planning advice referred to. The application form is therefore incomplete in this respect.

- 122.12 DM/16/1100 – 51 COMPTON ROAD

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

T1 LIME TREE - CROWN LIFT CANOPY OVER GARDEN BY 5 METRES, REDUCE REMAINING CANOPY 2-3 METRES. T2 WILLOW TREE - CROWN LIFT CANOPY OVER GARDEN BY 5 METRES, REDUCE REMAINING CANOPY 2-3 METRES.

Councillor Snowling pointed out that this application is inaccurate, and that these matters should be put right, before the Parish Council can be expected to respond.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Neither of the trees is in the applicant's ownership, despite what the form indicates. Whilst this may not be a planning matter, the Parish Council believes that statements made on the form should be accurate. This application cannot therefore be supported in its present state.

- 122.13 DM/16/1118 – 15 BECKWORTH LANE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND NEW WINDOW TO FIRST FLOOR ON SIDE ELEVATION.

Mr Jesson commented that he thought the additional side window should be of obscured glass.

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

- 122.14 DM/16/1012 – LAND TO THE EAST OF GRAVELYE LANE, GRAVELYE LANE (LAND IS WITHIN LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH)  
OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT WITH SOME MATTERS RESERVED, COMPRISING THE ERECTION OF UP TO 130 NO. DWELLINGS, TOGETHER WITH SOME VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING.

Mr Jesson noted that many of the boxes that had been placed around the site for ecological measurements were located near to the public footpath, which could skew any meaningful results. He felt that many of the planning reasons for objecting to the application at Scamps Hill (see below) were similar to this case. However, in addition it was clear that this development would intrude on the Lindfield Conservation Area in terms of its prominence and visibility. This would adversely affect the backdrop of the Common and the Village. These had been major considerations in terms of refusals of planning applications in this area in the past. The terms of the Village Design Statement were also of particular significance.

In view of the Easter break, it was acknowledged that there had been insufficient time for the application to be studied in any great detail. It was therefore agreed to delegate the response to the Clerk/Deputy Clerk in accordance with Standing Orders.

- 123. 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.**

- 123.1 DM/15/4715 - Buxshalls, Ardingly Road. Removal of condition number 22 relating to planning permission 14/01120/FUL to remove restriction for dwelling to be occupied by persons 55 years of age or over: This application was refused by MSDC on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

- 123.2 DM/15/4457 - Land to the south of Scamps Hill, Scaynes Hill Road. 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: This application is to be decided at District Wide Planning Committee meeting on Thursday 7<sup>th</sup> April 2016 at 2.00 p.m., but it was noted with concern that the planning officer's recommendation is to approve the application. The Deputy Clerk indicated that there would be an opportunity for someone from the Parish Council to register to speak at the meeting, and it was agreed that the Chairman would be the most appropriate person to do so.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

### 124. HAYWARDS HEATH TOWN COUNCIL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (NP) – REGULATION 16 CONSULTATION.

- 124.1 It was noted that the version of the NP has not changed significantly from previous versions, which the Parish Council has inputted previously, but the Plan was very much welcomed as an important planning document for Haywards Heath Town, and it should continue to be supported. Other than to express these sentiments, it was therefore **RESOLVED** to make no further comments on it, and so the Deputy Clerk was asked to write to Haywards Heath Town Council accordingly.

### 125. PETITION REGARDING APPEAL RIGHTS AGAINST PLANNING DECISIONS.

- 125.1 The request for support from Minster Parish Council (in Kent) to have this matter debated in Parliament, had been circulated previously, and although it was up to each member to decide on a response, the question of whether the petition should command corporate support had been raised. Councillor Snowling felt that it should be supported, but Councillor Hodgson said that he thought that there was a political element, which perhaps made it inappropriate to do so. Councillor Snowling said that leaving aside any political over tones, it was something that the Parish residents would almost certainly expect the Parish Council to support.
- 125.2 It was **RESOLVED** that the petition should be supported from the Parish Council point of view, and that the Deputy Clerk be asked to write accordingly. Councillor Hodgson abstained from the decision.

### 126. BUDGETARY MATTERS.

- 126.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, which set out the year end budget progress report for 2015/16. All payments up to 31.03.16 were recorded.
- 126.2 **NOTED:** that the balances at year end, were £200 for the miscellaneous budget head, £14,549.02 for the professional fees/neighbourhood planning budget, and £20,000 for the traffic study budget, no payments having been incurred in the latter in 2015/16.
- 126.3 **RESOLVED:** That as regards the Committee's budget for 2016/17, the Financial and General Purposes Committee and the Council, be asked to agree a carry forward of £200 for the miscellaneous budget head, the balance referred to in 126.2 above for the professional fees budget head (there should be no further expenses incurred under neighbourhood planning), and the full budget of £20,000 for the traffic study budget head (it was likely that this expenditure will be incurred in the current financial year).

### 127. ANNUAL REVIEW OF RISK ASSESSMENT FOR PLANNING & TRAFFIC COMMITTEE.

- 127.1 In the context of planning inspection visits, Councillor Snowling queried what was meant by the need to produce "suitable ID". Members commented on what they might use if asked for ID, although it was acknowledged that this is rarely if ever, requested.
- 127.2 However, after discussion it was agreed that no revisions were necessary at the present time, and to leave the document in its current form. **RESOLVED:** to approve the document for the current year (it was noted that the next review is due April 2017).

### 128. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 128.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 9.11 p.m.