

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 3 FEBRUARY 2015** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

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

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson, Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS). Councillor C. Hersey (Mid Sussex District Council).
2 members of the public (for part of the meeting only)

In attendance: Mrs. C. Irwin (Parish Clerk).

Absent: Councillor Mrs. J. Chatfield. Mr. S. Hodgson

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

544. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

544.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Chatfield and Hodgson and the reasons were accepted

545. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

545.1 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 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.

545.2 Councillor Snowling declared a personal and prejudicial interest in item 4(i) as he knew the applicant well and had received professional advice from him.

546. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (FULL) HELD ON 5 JANUARY 2015.

546.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 5 January 2015. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

547.1 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 interest in a particular application.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 547.2 14/04637/COU – 44A HIGH STREET
CHANGE OF USE OF THE PREMISES FROM A1 (SHOP) TO A DUAL USE OF B1 (BUSINESS) AND D1 (NON RESIDENTIAL INSTITUTION).

Mr. Jesson commented that insufficient time had elapsed since withdrawal of the previous application to demonstrate lack of interest in this property as a retail unit, particularly as this period had spanned the winter months, and further attempts should be made to find a retail use before approval was granted for a change of use.

In support of her application the applicant stated that the premises had been empty since July 2014 and the commercial agent had confirmed that there had been very little interest for retail use, so the time was now right. Her existing physiotherapy clinic in Lindfield had proved successful and she was keen to expand into larger premises to meet demand and where she could set up a Pilates studio.

It was noted that letters of support had been received, including from immediate neighbours who would welcome the property being occupied. Members felt that this would be an appropriate use for this property.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Whilst we regret the loss of a village shop, we find no reason to object and so there are no objections from Lindfield Parish Council to this application”.

- 547.3 14/03411/FUL – 17-19 DENMANS LANE
CONSTRUCTION OF NEW DETACHED HOUSE. ARBORICULTURAL REPORT AND AMENDED PLANS RECEIVED 22/12/14.

Councillor Snowling, having declared a personal and prejudicial interest, as recorded in Minute 545.2, withdrew from the meeting room for the duration of this item.

Mr. Jesson commented that the Arboricultural Impact Assessment, now submitted, had not adequately addressed the risk to trees at the neighbouring property, which were close to the south-east boundary.

The applicant confirmed that there were no trees on the site: the only ones under consideration were those just outside the site, close to the boundary.

It was noted that the assessment of the impact of development on the Root Protection Area was a technical issue, but this was understood to be a standard method applied throughout the country to trees in particular environments.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council very much supports the views of Lindfield Preservation Society with regard to this application. In brief, the proposal does not meet the requirements of the Lindfield Village Design Statement (VDS). Despite minor changes to the drawings to address previous concerns about the application in respect of the trees immediately adjacent to the boundary within the neighbouring property, the design does not meet the requirements of policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Plan 2004, in terms of needing to respect the character of the locality by reference to building form, details and materials. The overlooking issues arising from the proposal remain unaddressed and are contrary to policies B1 and H3 of the Local Plan 2004. The conflict of car parking with garden provision has also not been adequately resolved as required by policy H3. To summarise, therefore, this application cannot be supported as it is contrary to policies B1 and H3 of the Local Plan 2004 and Guidelines 10 -14 and 35 - 37 of the Lindfield Village Design Statement.”

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

547.4 14/04562/LDP – 44 HICKMANS LANE

PROPOSED FLAT ROOF DORMER WINDOW TO REAR ELEVATION, TWO NO. PITCHED ROOF DORMER WINDOWS TO SIDE ELEVATIONS AND TWO NO. VELUX WINDOWS TO FRONT ELEVATION. 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 proposed development, we can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware”.

547.5 14/04586/HOUS – 73 MEADOW LANE

SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. RENOVATIONS TO EXISTING GARAGE TO PROVIDE SINGLE GARAGE AND NEW UTILITY ROOM. FIRST FLOOR WINDOW SILLS LOWERED TO THE FRONT ELEVATIONS. PITCHED ROOF PORCH CANOPY ABOVE THE FRONT DOOR TO FRONT ELEVATION.

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

547.6 14/04689/TCA – ST LAWRENCE, BLACK HILL

T1 OAK - REMOVE. T2 OAK - REDUCE LIMB OVER ROAD BY 25% AND ANY NECESSARY BRANCHES ABOVE TO BRING BACK INTO SHAPE. T3 OAK - REDUCE CANOPY BY 25%. T4 CONIFER - REMOVE. T5 CEDAR - REMOVE. T6 LIME - POLLARD TO 50%. T7 OAK (X2) - REDUCE CANOPY ON ROAD SIDE BY UP TO 25%. T8 SYCAMORE - REMOVE DEADWOOD. T9 LARCH - REMOVE. T10 BAY - REDUCE CANOPY BY 25%.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council did not consider this application at the meeting on 3 February as the approval letter had already been issued”.

547.7 DM/15/0081 – 4 PICKERS GREEN

T1 – OAK – RAISE CROWN BY 2M BY REMOVING SECONDARY BRANCHES TO SUITABLE GROWTH POINTS.

Mr. Jesson stated that he could see no compelling reason for the proposed work on this tree, which was an amenity for people enjoying the adjacent recreation area.

Members considered that work may need doing in time, but not yet.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council cannot see good reasons for the proposed work. We acknowledge that management of the tree may become necessary in the long term, but at the present time we consider that this would be premature, given that this oak tree has amenity value in the setting of the Hickmans Lane recreation area.

547.8 DM/15/0089 – LONE OAK, 21 WEST COMMON

CUT BACK LATERAL BRANCHES BY 2-3 METRES TO CLEAR ELECTRICITY CABLES AND REDUCE ANY INTERFERENCE WITH TRAFFIC. ALSO RESHAPE CROWN BY LOWERING IT BY APPROXIMATELY 5 METRES AND RESTORE ITS OVERALL PROFILE.

Mr. Jesson stated that LPS supported the application on account of the proximity of the tree’s branches to overhead electricity cables.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application providing that the proposed work is supported by appropriate arboricultural advice.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 547.9 DM/15/0092 – LAND OPPOSITE 6 & 7 SUMMERHILL DRIVE
2 x HORSE CHESTNUT AND 2 x LIMES TO BE CROWN LIFTED OVER THE ROAD BY APPROXIMATELY 4 METRES.

Mr. Jesson commented that lifting the crown by 4m to give clearance for road traffic seemed excessive particularly as the canopies were already quite high.

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

- 547.10 DM/15/0106 – 54 BLACKTHORNS
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION, TOGETHER WITH INTERNAL MODIFICATIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO FENESTRATION.

It was noted that most houses in Blackthorns had been altered.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to the use of matching materials and finishes as stated in the application.

548. 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.

- 548.1 13/015669/LDC: 36 High Street, **NOTED:** the application for a Certificate of Lawful Use for the utilities box in the front garden of the property had been refused by MSDC because it had not been demonstrated that the utilities box had been constructed by a statutory undertaker and therefore did not benefit from permitted development rights,

- 548.2 14/04362/TREE: 12 Finches Gardens. **NOTED:** MSDC had refused permission for the felling of a scots pine at this property as it was considered to contribute to the visual amenity of the area and no reason had been put forward for its loss.

549. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 549.1 No other items of business were raised.

The Meeting concluded at 8.30 p.m.