

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 30 JUNE 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. M Hersey
Mrs. E Hinze
Mr. S Hodgson (Vice Chairman)
Mr. C Snowling
Mrs. V Upton
Mr. S Shortland

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Councillor C. Hersey (MSDC)
4 members of the public

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

Absent: Mrs. J Durrant; Mr R Plass.

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

020. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

020.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Durrant, and the reason accepted.

021. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

021.1 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, 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.

[Councillor Hersey clarified that she was now on Planning Committee A, not B.]

021.2 There were no other declarations of interest.

022. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 09 JUNE 2015.

022.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 09 June 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

023.1 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.

023.2 DM/15/1709 – TILECROFT, LEWES ROAD

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF TRELLIS PANELS ABOVE EXISTING BOUNDARY WALL TO REPLACE SCREEN OF IVY.

Mr Jesson observed that the height would be in excess of the 2m normally permitted. The LPS did not object to the proposal, but did have concerns about the structural integrity of the wall. A collapse has occurred in the past, and it was unsure as to how this might be prevented in the future. However, it was acknowledged that this is not a planning consideration. The owner of the adjacent property argued that the wall was not designed for such a trellis, and that the overall height had increased over time by some 75%. In his view the state of the wall is not good, and he strongly objects to the proposal. He has reported the matter to MSDC under the Dangerous Structures provisions. Councillor Blunden said that the decision was a difficult one, because the problems with the wall were appreciated, but that there are no objections on strictly planning grounds. Councillor Snowling said that the comments had been very carefully thought through, and that it wasn't within the Council's remit to comment on such technical matters. Councillor Hersey said that if there was a further collapse of the wall, it should be pursued through the courts as a civil action.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Although the appearance of the trellis may be a little overpowering, the Parish Council notes that (i) no neighbour has objected to it on that ground, (ii) no part of it abuts the public highway, and (iii) part is already screened. The Council do not therefore consider there is reason to object to it. We are aware that the owner of South Malling Lodge is seriously concerned about the possibility of the wall collapsing, but that issue falls to be dealt with under the Dangerous Structures legislation."

- 023.3 DM/15/2206 – 20 HIGH STREET
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO INCLUDE STORE, KITCHENETTE AND DISABLED WC. CREATION OF NEW DOORWAY INTO REAR EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO ROOF SCAPE (SPACE?).

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had no objections, but pointed out the likely typing error made by MSDC in the description of the work.

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

- 023.4 DM/15/2122 – ARCHWAY HOUSE, OLD PLACE, HIGH STREET
REVISED DESCRIPTION: RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR INSTALLATION OF SECONDARY GLAZING.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS understood the need to carry out the work, and that whilst it had no objections, there were two concerns. One was the possibility of the secondary glazing being a fire escape issue, and this would need to be looked into from the buildings regulations point of view. The other concern was to try and ensure that with these obviously historic (and likely graded) buildings, owners understand the need to obtain consent prior to any work being carried out.

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

- 023.5 DM/15/2284 – 75A HIGH STREET
RETROSPECTIVE RELOCATION OF BATHROOM THROUGH THE MOVING OF TWO NO. STUD WALLS AND ERECTION OF A NEW STUD WALL.

Mr Jesson said that whilst it is always preferable for owners to obtain advice and planning consent, prior to the carrying out of any proposals, it is likely that the work in this case would have been consented anyway.

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

- 023.6 DM/15/2385 – 75A HIGH STREET

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

RETENTION AND CONTINUED USE OF REPLACEMENT GLASS PANELS AND METAL POSTS SERVING RAISED DECKING

Mr Jesson thought that although this was work that would not normally be expected in a Grade II listed building, it was acceptable. The applicant explained the background to the work, and set out the justifications for using the metal and glass solution. He also said that the neighbours had not objected, and that whilst it was quite a modern feature, it did in fact sit very well with the property.

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

024. 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.

024.1 14/04475/OUT – land north of Birchen Lane, Haywards Heath, for residential development of up to 48 dwellings: the Deputy Clerk reported and confirmed that the planning application, which was refused by MSDC, has been lodged at the Planning Inspectorate for appeal. Councillor Hersey clarified that in addition to the original planning application going to appeal, the applicant had lodged a revised planning application with the Planning Inspectorate, which was intended to address the issue of the effect of the proposed development on the setting of Sunte House.

024.2 14/4279/HOUS – 48 Savill Road, for new pitched roof over existing garage to provide additional annexe accommodation: the Deputy Clerk reported that the application, which had been refused by MSDC on 21st January 2015, has been lodged at the Planning Inspectorate for appeal.

025. MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL: PRE-SUBMISSION DISTRICT PLAN

025.1 It was **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk be granted delegated authority, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, to finalise the response to the consultation being carried out by MSDC on the pre-submission District Plan, for onward recommendation to full Council at its next meeting on 16th July 2015.

026. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

026.1 There was none.

The Meeting concluded at 8.23 p.m.