

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 31 JANUARY 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

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

Also present:

Mr. J Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS).
Mr A Lea (Lindfield Ward Councillor; Mid Sussex District Council).
Mr. C Hersey (Councillor; Mid Sussex District Council).
4 members of the public for parts or all of the meeting.)

In attendance:

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

Not present:

Mr. A Gomme, and Mr. S Shortland

In the absence of the Chairman (Councillor Gomme), the Vice Chairman, Councillor Hodgson took the Chair for this meeting. He duly opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

238. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

238.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Gomme, and Councillor Shortland, and the reasons accepted.

239. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

239.1 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.

239.2 Councillors Hersey and Upton declared a personal, non-pecuniary, interest in item 4(vi) on the Agenda (All Saints Church) as they are members of the Church.

239.3 Councillor Blunden declared a personal, non-pecuniary interest in item 4(iii) on the Agenda (Swan Cottage, 3 Pondcroft Road) as he is a near neighbour to the property in question.

240. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

240.1 There were none that would not be coming up under later Agenda items, and so the Chairman confirmed that he would be happy to permit public speaking at the relevant point.

241. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 10 JANUARY 2017.

241.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 10 January 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, subject to a correction to minute 232 requested by Councillor Hersey in order to record the fact that she had declared her usual interest at the

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

meeting as appears in minute 239.1 above. This request was duly accepted, and so the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting subject to that amendment.

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

242.1 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.

242.2 DM/16/5646 – 36 LUXFORD ROAD
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had no objections to the application, but that it was important that the brickwork should match the existing.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to a condition that the brickwork should match the existing.

242.3 DM/16/5673 – CURTLE, BLACK HILL
PROPOSED GLASS ROOF OVER EXTERNAL COURTYARD FORMING NEW UTILITY ROOM. REPLACE EXISTING WINDOWS WITH POWDER COATED ALUMINIUM, REPLACE TIMBER PANELS BELOW WINDOWS WITH NEW INSULATED RENDERED PANELS AND REPLACE EXISTING DARK STAINED SOFTWOOD FASCIA WITH NEW WHITE TIMBER FASCIA.

Mr Jesson noted that this property is a fairly contemporary, modern building, and the LPS has no issue with the proposed colour change. Whilst the replacement windows may not strictly be in accordance with MSDC planning Policy for the Conservation Area (CA), they are consistent with the style and age of the property. Councillor Plass agreed that the work would improve the building, but the property was nonetheless in the CA, and it had been a difficult decision to query their suitability in this case. Mr Kerlake reminded the Committee that MSDC's policy within the CA is to resist and reject UPVC windows, and that this should be equally applied to powder coated aluminium frames. That style may be better than UPVC, but they are not as good as wood. There is also a concern that if approved, a precedent will be set. Councillor Blunden noted that two properties in Pondcroft Road (within the CA), had already had similar style windows approved by MSDC. Councillor Snowling proposed in the circumstances, that the Parish Council raise no objection. This was seconded by Councillor Blunden, and on a show of hands, the motion was carried.

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

242.4 DM/17/0023 – SWAN COTTAGE, 3 PONDCROFT ROAD
(T1) FLOWERING CHERRY - REDUCE CROWN BY 1.5M.

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

242.5 DM/16/5636 – FLAT 16, HIGH STREET
NEW FLAT ROOF TO EXISTING CONSERVATORY WITH LANTERN LIGHT AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had no objections to the application, but mentioned that he was not happy with the state of the drawings, a point he had taken up with the Planning Department at MSDC.

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

242.6 DM/17/0064 – NETTLEBED, 18 SUMMERHILL GRANGE
(T1 AND T2) BIRCH TREES - FELL.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Councillor Hersey said that in view of the fact that it had been mentioned by the Tree Warden, the Parish Council should include a comment about the applicant agreeing to plant replacement trees. However, Councillor Snowling said that he would be reluctant to agree to any such request.

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

- 242.7 DM/17/0117 – ALL SAINTS CHURCH, HIGH STREET
(T1) SWEET CHESTNUT - CROWN LIFT TO REMOVE ONE LIMB AND REDUCE CROWN BY 2M.
(T2) SWEET CHESTNUT - CROWN LIFT TO REMOVE TWO LOWEST LIMBS THAT EXTEND OVER THE LANE AND REDUCE CANOPY BY 4M.

The Tree Warden' preference for a reduction in the size of the crown lift was noted, but Councillor Snowling said that it should not be for the Parish Council to make alternative proposals, but to respond to the application as it was presented.

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

- 242.8 DM/17/0144 – CROWHURST, 23 HIGH STREET
PROPOSED TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND PART FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION OVER EXISTING DINING ROOM.

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

- 242.9 DM/16/4957 – ESMERALDA COTTAGE, 43 WEST COMMON
PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION, 2 X SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS AND DETACHED GARAGE TO THE FRONT.

Mr Jesson said that it is a shame to in effect lose what is a Turner House, but that what is being proposed has been done skilfully, and therefore is just about acceptable. The applicant said that he had indeed tried to take these points on board in putting the proposal together.

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

- 242.10 DM/17/0136 – WOODFIELD, 32 WEST COMMON
SIDE EXTENSION TO AN EXISTING DETACHED DWELLING AND ALTERATIONS TO WINDOWS TO THE REAR FACADE OF THE DWELLING. 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.

- 242.11 DM/17/0170 – 29 DENMANS LANE
FLOWERING CHERRY TREE (T1) TO REDUCE THE FIVE THICKER LOWER BRANCHES BY 1.5M EACH.

AGREED RESPONSE: Once again, Lindfield Parish Council notes that there is a lack of a professional or expert opinion with the application, but as the tree seems to be in a poor condition, the Parish Council raises no objections to this application.

- 242.12 DM/17/0190 – 53 SUNTE AVENUE
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

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

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

243. 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.

- 243.1 DM/16/1787 – 1 Grahams Cottage, Spring Lane: Demolition of residential garage/ancillary accommodation and the erection of one 1-bed dwelling house with associated landscaping. The Deputy Clerk reported that the application, which had been refused by MSDC on 8th July 2016, had been dismissed on appeal by a decision letter issued by the Planning Inspectorate on 17th January 2017.
- 243.2 DM/16/4872 – 7 Denmans Lane: Application for the demolition of a garden wall, addition of a paved area to front garden, and dropping of the kerb. (Amended from email received 19/11/16, Saturday): Application for the demolition of a section of garden wall, addition of a paved area to front garden, and dropping of the kerb. Several previously refused applications having been made, the Deputy Clerk reported that MSDC had finally granted planning consent for the application by a decision issued on 19th January 2017.
- 243.3 DM/16/4857 – White Horse Inn, 22 High Street: Retrospective application for a side extension and roof modifications, and DM/16/4850 – White Horse Inn, 22 High Street: Change to the fenestration on the front elevation, to timber painted either black or white. Amendment to planning application number 13/03545/FUL. The Deputy Clerk reported that both these applications had been withdrawn by the applicant on 26th January 2017.
- 243.4 DM/15/4715 – Buxshalls House, Ardingly Road, Lindfield: Application to remove condition 22 of the Planning approval, which is that the apartments hereby approved (other than the one staff flat) shall be occupied only by persons of 55 years of age or over. It was previously reported that the application had been refused by MSDC and had gone to appeal under reference APP/D3830/W/16/3158215. The Parish Council had made a written representation to the appeal reiterating its objection to the removal of the condition. However, in a decision letter dated 27th January 2017, just handed to the Deputy Clerk, it was now reported that the appeal had been upheld. The condition is therefore removed.
- 243.5 Councillor Snowling took the opportunity of making a general point about the effectiveness of MSDC's enforcement actions, where planning conditions had been imposed, but were then breached.

244. TO DECIDE A RESPONSE ON THE PLANNING APPLICATION WITHIN THE RURAL PARISH DM/16/5648 - LAND PARCELS AT 535047, 124666 GRAVELYE LANE, LINDFIELD: OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR A RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 130 NO. DWELLINGS, TOGETHER WITH VEHICULAR AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS, PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, CAR PARKING AND LANDSCAPING. ALL MATTERS TO BE RESERVED EXCEPT FOR ACCESS. THIS IS A RESUBMISSION OF DM/16/1012.

- 244.1 Mr Jesson confirmed that the LPS had just submitted a response to the application, which very much repeated the Society's previous objections. However, he referred to some further detailed work on the biodiversity and ecology aspect of the application, and this indicated a number of cogent facts that were not known at the time of the original planning application, under DM/16/1012. There were also still major concerns about the potential for views of the housing from the Common, and from the nearby Lindfield Conservation Area. Mr Kerlake said that he didn't think it would be sensible to take issue with MSDC's grounds for withdrawing its previous objections, as the decision had been taken with expert planning and legal advice. He felt that the Parish Council's reasons should now be focussed and concentrated on a number of specific planning points. There was general agreement from Councillors that the Traffic Survey should not be referred to, as this was still in its early stages, and had not been through the West Sussex County Council endorsement process. Mr Jesson also mentioned that the application had not been handled well by MSDC, and that the District Council seemed to be confused as to whether this was the same application as previously, or an entirely new one. It was a matter of some concern for example, that the letter sent to the Planning Inspectorate by MSDC on the 16th January 2017 seemed to indicate that the application had already been pre-determined by MSDC.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 244.2 The Deputy Clerk indicated that the Parish Council's response would not differ greatly from the one previously submitted last year, given the fact that the application had not materially changed. However, there were some additional factors to build in, and that he had begun to work on a revised response. It was therefore **AGREED** that the Deputy Clerk would finalise the response and clear it with the Chairman and Vice Chairman of this Committee, prior to it being sent to MSDC by the deadline date of 3rd February 2017.
- 245. TO DECIDE A RESPONSE TO THE SUGGESTION FROM LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH COUNCIL THAT IN THE LIGHT OF THE LACK OF ANY WEIGHT BEING GIVEN TO THE LINDFIELD AND LINDFIELD RURAL NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN IN PLANNING MATTERS, THE PARISH COUNCILS SHOULD SEEK TO RECOVER ALL THE COSTS OF PREPARING THE PLAN FROM MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL, AND/OR THE DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT.**
- 245.1 Councillor Blunden asked for clarification as to whether the request had come from Lindfield Rural Parish Council (LRPC), or just one Member. The Chairman for this meeting confirmed that it had been the latter, but that the Chairman of the Committee had asked for the matter to be put on the Agenda. A member of the public, Mr MacMillan, said that he strongly supported the idea, and that the Parish Council should ensure that it publicises any such action, e.g. by way of an article in Lindfield Life.
- 245.2 The Chairman said that it had been suggested that the Committee should wait to see what LRPC decides to do officially, before agreeing what action this Parish Council should take. This view was generally supported by Members, and so it was **AGREED** that the matter would be deferred for the time being on that basis.
- 246. BUDGETARY MATTERS.**
- 246.1 The Deputy Clerk introduced the paper, which set out the Committee's budget progress report for 2016/17. All payments up to 31.12.16 were recorded, and the available balances of the budget heads set out. The budget progress report was duly **NOTED**.
- 247. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**
- 247.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.48 p.m.