

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 31 MAY 2016** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

**Present:**

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

**Also present:**

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

**In attendance:**

Mr. I. McLean (Deputy Parish Clerk).

**Not present:**

None

The Chairman of Council, Councillor Will Blunden, opened the meeting, welcomed those present, and announced the emergency procedure for the King Edward Hall.

**143. ELECTION OF CHAIRMAN.**

143.1 This being the first meeting of the new Committee for the new Council year, Councillor Blunden as Chairman of Council, called for nominations for the office of Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2016/17. Councillor Gomme was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Snowling and **SECONDED** by Councillor Plass. There being no other nominations, Councillor Alan Gomme was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2016/17.

**144. ELECTION OF VICE CHAIRMAN.**

144.1 Councillor Gomme, having duly taken the Chair, called for nominations for the office of Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2016/17. Councillor Hodgson was **PROPOSED** by Councillor Snowling and **SECONDED** by Councillor Blunden. There being no other nominations, Councillor Simon Hodgson was duly **ELECTED** to serve as Vice Chairman of the Planning & Traffic Committee for the Council year 2016/17.

**145. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.**

145.1 There were none.

**146. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.**

146.1 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.

146.2 Councillor Upton declared a personal interest in Agenda item 7(iv) (53 Luxford Road) as she lived in the road in question.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

146.3 Councillor Plass declared a personal interest in Agenda item 7(i) (13 Savill Road) as he was acquainted with the applicant.

### 147. QUESTIONS/COMMENTS FROM THE PUBLIC.

147.1 Mr Jesson asked if there would be any update on the made Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor Gomme said that he would be making a statement later in the meeting.

### 148. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 10 MAY 2016.

148.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 10 May 2016. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

149.1 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.

149.2 DM/16/1860 – 13 SAVILL ROAD  
CONSTRUCTION OF FIRST FLOOR OVER GARAGE, GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR ADDITION AT REAR OF HOUSE, INTERNAL ALTERATIONS AND REPLACEMENT FRONT PORCH.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS had no objections in principle, but that matching materials should be used. The applicant stated that as regards the proposed tiles to be used, he was trying to blend these in with other properties in the road.

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

149.3 DM/16/1893 – 41 COMPTON ROAD  
SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that he was pleased to see the diligent references made in the application to the Lindfield Village Design Statement.

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

149.4 DM/16/1909 – TINKERS, 133 HIGH STREET  
RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION RELATING TO EXTERNAL REDECORATION OF THE EXISTING DWELLING HOUSE.

Mr Jesson noted that the application had received support from neighbours, but that the comments of the Conservation Officer at MSDC should be supported. There is a concern about a precedent being set, and that within the Conservation Area (CA), the tradition of black or brown colours on exterior wooden beams, needs to be respected. It was also important to reinforce the message that planning consent should be obtained before such work is done. Councillors Gomme and Hersey expressed agreement with these points. Councillor Snowling observed that there is a need to ensure that what is applied is appropriate for the CA regardless of the history of the property.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council supports the comments of the Conservation Officer, and for the reasons set out in that response (dated 16<sup>th</sup> May), must therefore object to this application.

149.5 DM/16/1968 – 53 LUXFORD ROAD

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

PROPOSED WHITE PVC-U CONSERVATORY TO THE REAR OF THE PROPERTY.

Mr Jesson noted that the drawings were incomplete in that some of the doors and windows were missing. Also, the statement in the form was inaccurate, as the site could be seen from Newton Road. He commented that imprecise applications do not help an applicant's case, and this was agreed by the Committee. The applicant stated that the points were noted, and observed that there had been no neighbour objections.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application. However, the drawings are incomplete, as they do not show some of the doors and windows, and it is also difficult to understand how the applicant considers that the site will not be visible from the public road (in this case, Newton Road).

- 149.6 DM/16/0638 – ORCHARDS, SUMMERHILL LANE  
PROPOSED 2 STOREY EXTENSION TO NORTH SIDE OF PROPERTY AND ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS INCLUDING CHANGES TO FENESTRATION ON THE EAST AND WEST SIDES.

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

- 149.7 DM/16/0670 – WHITE HOUSE, 73 HIGH STREET  
REPLACE 3 SECTION BOX SASH BAY WINDOW WITH DOUBLE GLAZED REPLACEMENT TO FIRST FLOOR OF HOUSE.

Mr Jesson was concerned that the colour for the windows had not been defined. It was agreed to add his comments to the response, which appears below.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application on the basis that it is a like-for-like replacement. However, it is noted that there is no specified colour for the windows. If these are to be white, this would be acceptable, but there would be a concern about any other colour within the Conservation Area.

- 149.8 DM/16/1767 – RED LION PH, 60 HIGH STREET  
INSTALLATION OF 1 NO. NEW WORKING SOLID FUEL STOVE TO THE REAR TRADE AREA. INSTALLATION INCLUDES PROVISION OF NEW FLUE AND FAN TO BE INSTALLED TO THE EXISTING CHIMNEY STACK.

Mr Jesson said that there was concern about the application, in that the detail e.g. of the fan, could not be detected from the plans and specifications. He felt that the application should not be determined until these details are known. Councillor Shortland said that he agreed with these points, and it was decided to build those concerns into the response.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council is not able to support this application in its present form, as it is incomplete in some of the important details. The size of the proposed fan and its colour are not specified. A couple of options are given, but none selected. The proposal will have an effect on the Conservation Area, but the Council is not able (from the application) to fully determine what this might be.

- 149.9 DM/16/1768 – RED LION PH, 60 HIGH STREET (LBC APPLICATION)  
INSTALLATION OF 1 NO. NEW WORKING SOLID FUEL STOVE TO THE REAR TRADE AREA. INSTALLATION INCLUDES PROVISION OF NEW FLUE AND FAN TO BE INSTALLED TO THE EXISTING CHIMNEY STACK.

Ditto above.

- 149.10 DM/16/1787 – SITE OPPOSITE 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE  
DEMOLITION OF RESIDENTIAL GARAGE/ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION AND THE ERECTION OF ONE 1-BED DWELLING HOUSE WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Jesson said that he fully agreed with the Parish Council's proposed response.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** The agreed response from application DM/16/0023 remains the same as for this application. *"Lindfield Parish Council is concerned about the effects of this proposal within the Conservation Area. It believes that the street scene and the landscape setting will be adversely affected. It is a significant step from permitting the erection of garages, to the conversion/rebuilding of the property as a separate dwelling. There are concerns about the character and appearance of the proposed dwelling within the Conservation Area, and the fact that the proposal will not enhance the views into and out of the Conservation Area. The Council believes that the proposal is not therefore in accordance with Policy B1, B12, and B15 of the 2004 Mid Sussex Local Plan, and so must object to this application."*

149.11 DM/16/1995 – 10 BECKWORTH LANE  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson noted that there was an issue about the severance of a drain, which served the adjoining property, and wondered if this should be raised. Councillor Snowling stated that it was not really a planning matter, and therefore not something the Parish Council should be commenting on.

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

149.12 DM/16/1996 – 5 DUKES ROAD  
ERECTION OF NEW PART SINGLE, PART 2 STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO EXISTING DWELLING.

Mr Jesson wondered if the side window should be of obscured glazing, as it could overlook the neighbouring property. Having looked at the plans however, the feeling of the Committee was that they were not overly concerned about this.

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

149.13 DM/16/2019 – WEST VIEW HOUSE, WEST VIEW  
(T1) LEYLANDII - CROWN REDUCE BY 1.5M. (T2) DOGWOOD - CROWN REDUCE BY 1.5M.

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

149.14 DM/16/2050 – 61 DENMANS LANE  
OAK (T1) REDUCE CANOPY BY 2M AND REMOVE ALL MAJOR DEADWOOD.

Mr Jesson said that he was concerned about the application, in that there was no evidence of structural weakness in the tree. The removal of the deadwood was acceptable, but there seemed to be no reason for the crown reduction. Councillor Snowling said that he thought the applicant had made out a good case.

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

149.15 DM/16/2061 – 10 OAK LEE, COMPTON ROAD  
T1 BEECH IN FRONT GARDEN - FELL AND GRIND STUMP. MAJOR DEADWOOD (25MM+ IN DIAMETER) DETACHED IN PLACES. POSSIBILITY OF MERIPILUS GIGANTEUS. T2 - OAK TO REAR SW BUILDING. ONLY CUT BACK FROM BUILDING (GIVE 2M CLEARANCE), CUT BACK FROM MAIN STEM THAT GROWS TOWARD THE SW OF OAK LEE.

Councillor Snowling wondered why the address had been given as no. 10 Oak Lee, as it could just as well have been any of the others. The applicant was in fact Affinity Sutton, not the addressee.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to either proposal, provided the applicant is required to replace the Beech with a similar tree in order to maintain the row of trees in front of Oak Lee which is an important feature.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 149.16 DM/16/2071 – 47 SUNTE AVENUE  
DEMOLITION OF SINGLE STOREY DILAPIDATED REAR EXTENSION WITH REPLACEMENT SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

Mr Jesson said that the LPS thought this a good application, which would enhance the amenity and aesthetic value of the area.

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

**150. 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.**

- 150.1 DM/16/1461 – The Palms, Lewes Road. Extensions and alterations to a single storey, 3 bedroom, dwelling with attached garage to create a two storey, 4 bedroom, dwelling with detached garage: This application was refused by MSDC on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2016 as the proposal, by virtue of design and scale fail to relate sympathetically to the character of the existing dwelling house, and would be harmful to the appearance and character of the area.
- 150.2 DM/16/1088 – 1 Portsmouth Wood. To erect a 1.8m high fence to west boundary of property behind existing yew hedge (fence to be removed once hedge is established): This application is the subject of an amended description and plans received 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016, which the Parish Council had not been consulted on. Despite a number of objections, the application was approved by MSDC on 27<sup>th</sup> May 2016, although the reasons given indicated that this was very much an exception, and that a precedent should not be regarded as having been set.
- 150.3 DM/16/1030 – Whitesands, Lewes Road. Vehicle crossover to front of house and 2m fence to side boundary next to pavement. This application is also the subject of an amended plan, which the Parish Council has been further consulted on. However, it was received just too late to include it as an Agenda item. Having looked at the amended plan however, which in brief, now proposes to enclose the proposed fencing around the property (as set out in the original application) with beech hedging, it was **RESOLVED** that the revision was not significant, and that there should therefore be no change to the response agreed at the Committee's meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

**151. UPDATES ON CURRENT MATTERS.**

- 151.1 On the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, Councillor Gomme stated that as reported to Council on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016, very regrettably, the made Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan has been the subject of a recent legal challenge for judicial review, which aims to quash the decision of Mid Sussex District Council to formally make the Plan on 23<sup>rd</sup> March this year. Mid Sussex District Council is the Defendant, and so any queries are best addressed to them. However, they are in the process of robustly defending the claim, and as an interested party, the Parish Council will await further updates with interest. It was noted that the applicants to the legal proceedings are Mr David Hill, Wates Developments Limited, and Crest Nicolson Operations Limited.
- 151.2 On the Traffic Survey, a meeting with the consultant had been held in the Parish office recently, when a range of statistical data and information had been discussed (analysis of the speed and accident data obtained), and the phase 1 report should be received shortly.

**152. BUDGETARY MATTERS.**

- 152.1 The Deputy Clerk apologised for the fact that the budget paper, showing progress so far, had not been circulated due to an oversight, but he reported that there had been no expenditure as yet, from this year's in hand budget. It was noted that the budget, as recommended by Committee at its meeting on 29<sup>th</sup> March 2016, had been agreed at Council on 12<sup>th</sup> May 2016. It was further noted that there is likely to be significant expenditure on the Traffic Survey this financial year.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

**153. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.**

153.1 There was none reported.

The Meeting concluded at 8.41 p.m.