

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** held on **TUESDAY 4 FEBRUARY 2014** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at 8.00 p.m.

Present: Parish Councillors: Mr A. Gomme (Chairman)
Mrs M. Hersey (Vice-Chairman)
Mr M. Amor
Mr. W. Blunden
Mrs. J Chatfield,
Mrs. M. Hersey
Mr S. Hodgson
Mr C. Snowling
Mr R. Plass
Mrs. V Upton

Also present: Mr. J. Jesson (Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS),
Approximately 25 members of the public.

In attendance: Mrs C. Irwin (Clerk)

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

407. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

407.1 All members of the Committee were present.

408. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

408.1 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.

408.2 Councillor Snowling declared a personal interest in Agenda item 4.2 (Holly Lodge), as he was a close friend of the next door neighbour and stated that he would neither speak nor vote.

408.3 Councillor Blunden declared a personal interest in item 5 - Fullingmill Farm, Spring Lane as the owner was a personal friend.

409. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 14 JANUARY 2014.

409.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 14 January 2014. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

410. ORDER OF THE AGENDA

410.1 It was **AGREED** that Agenda item 5 should be brought forward for the benefit of members of the public present for this item.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

411. PLANNING APPLICATION 13/03948/FUL FULLINGMILL FARM, SPRING LANE (LINDFIELD RURAL PARISH) – AMENDED APPLICATION.

RE-GRADING OF AGRICULTURAL LAND TO ADDRESS POOR DRAINAGE THROUGH THE REDISTRIBUTION OF EXISTING FILL ON SITE AND THE IMPORTATION OF ADDITIONAL FILL.”

411.1 Councillors Snowling and Blunden, having declared personal interest in this item, remained present but did not take part in the vote. This application site was within the Lindfield Rural Parish, but it was recognised that the deliveries of the additional fill material would have an impact on the residents of Lindfield Parish. Councillor Hersey stated that she understood that WSCC Highways Department had concerns about the effect on the road, particularly at the entrance to Spring Lane.

411.2 The report of a recent site meeting held on 28 January 2014 for the purpose of finding out the facts was read out. This meeting had been attended by Lindfield Parish Councillors Alan Gomme, Ron Plass, Val Upton and Simon Hodgson and the Deputy Clerk, Iain Mclean; Lindfield Rural Parish Councillor John Dumbleton; Ardingly Parish Councillor Mick Brixey; Alison Eggert-Hobbs and Sheila Hobbs (Fullingmill Farm). It was **NOTED** that Councillors Hersey and Chatfield had paid a subsequent visit.

411.3 The main points from the site meeting included:

- *The proposal was to level the field, and install adequate drainage to bring the field back into use for all year round grazing.*
- *Approximately 4,100m³ of additional fill material would be imported, translating to approximately 23 deliveries per day over a 4 week construction period, i.e. a total of 46 in and out movements per day.*
- *Farm activity in a mainly rural area was to some extent inevitable*
- *Assurance was given that this operation would be on nothing like the same scale as the recent project at Hill House Farm*
- *A single lorry contractor would be used for the project, under the personal control of Mrs. Eggert-Hobbs who would take a firm approach regarding any reported problems. Communication would be the key to successful management of the project.*
- *Proposed conditions which might be applied to any consent issued by MSDC were discussed:*
 - *wheel washing (understood and accepted)*
 - *restrictions on timing of lorry movements to avoid conflict with school traffic in Ardingly - understood by the applicants but they pointed out that such restrictions would increase the overall length of the project.*
 - *remedial work to address damage to Spring Lane – some voluntary resurfacing of the Lane may be undertaken at completion. The Lane from the end of the row of cottages was owned by the Farm but ownership of Spring Lane from there to the main road, although still private, was unknown*
 - *it was suggested that arrangements should be agreed with WSCC to make good any damage to the turn-in area off the main road, but it was noted that no such agreement had been in place when the farm was a dairy farm with regular access and egress by heavy milk tankers.*
- *The work would take place during the dry summer months and August was considered to be the ideal time, during the school holidays*
- *Ardingly PC had concerns about routing the lorries from the north to avoid Lindfield High Street.*

411.4 Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) expressed the Preservation Society's general support for activities beneficial to the rural economy, but there were concerns about the effects of the large number of lorry deliveries on local roads, amenities of local residents and the heritage assets either side of Lindfield High Street. The Society would be writing to MSDC with a list of proposed conditions as, if permitted, it was vital for this project to be controlled by means of a good set of conditions.

Mr. N. White (High Street resident) commented in terms of lack of clarity about the calculations the application was based on, the lack of detail about the drainage scheme, the unsustainable amount of traffic and whether monitoring and enforcement of conditions could be guaranteed.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr. G. Turner (High Street resident) expressed concerns about the risk of contaminated imported soil on the adjacent river Ouse.

Mr. M. C. Eggert Hobbs (for the applicant) responded as follows:

- It was understood from the advice from WSCC Highways that the traffic on the trunk road could not be controlled.
- There had been 10 vehicle movements per hour in a normal working week since 1928.
- Importation of contaminated soil would not be allowed as it would damage farm equipment and harm crops.
- Because of the contours of the land and the shallowness of the river, excess water would go back up into the field.
- The intention was to regrade the field to bring it back into agricultural production and promote and preserve that rural area of land, which would otherwise turn to mud and scrubland, without resorting to intensive farming.
- The load numbers had been calculated on the basis of advice from professionals.

411.5 During discussion it was **AGREED** that although generally supportive of the work, in the interests of sustainable farming, the Committee should concentrate its comments on matters of concern for Lindfield residents and recommend to MSDC that if they were minded to grant permission, there should be appropriate conditions to minimise disruption and seek remedies for damage and inconvenience to property owners. It was also pointed out that the lorry route should not include Lewes Road because of the difficult turn and the narrow road.

411.6 **AGREED RESPONSE:** "Lindfield Parish Council acknowledges that this application site is located in Lindfield Rural Parish and, whilst we would state that we are generally sympathetic to the proposed re-grading of the land to bring it back into cultivation and are supportive of measures to promote sustainable farming, we have confined our comments to the issues that would affect the residents of our own parish whose interests we would seek to protect and who have recently suffered the consequences of a similar scheme.

We would therefore request that, if Mid Sussex District Council is minded to approve this application, conditions be applied and rigorously enforced to ensure that the work is carried out with minimum disruption to residents living in properties along the route to be taken by lorries delivering the additional material. Such conditions should clearly define the routes, the total overall period of operation, the timing of deliveries and the provision of wheel washing or preferably full vehicle washing facilities. We would request that the fundamental problem of supervision outside the site is addressed through appropriate conditions.

Lewes Road is very narrow and is therefore considered to be unsuitable as a route for the lorries and we would request that this is taken into account when defining the routes.

We have concerns about the effect on the amenities of residents in the High Street and on properties, many of which are heritage assets and situated close to the road. It is therefore hoped that it will be possible to include a condition requiring the applicants to provide cleaning for properties affected by mud and dust caused by this work.

There are also concerns that the additional large vehicle movements will have an adverse effect on the highway, particularly the turning point at the junction of the B2028 and Spring Lane. It is hoped that WSCC can be indemnified for any resultant damage to the highway.

We would stress that this work should be controlled by an effective set of conditions to minimise and remedy any damage or inconvenience caused and that these conditions be stringently enforced".

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

412. PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS REFERRED TO THE PARISH COUNCIL BY MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION

412.1 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. In addition, the Chairman agreed to change the order for the benefit of members of the public present.

412.2 14/00087/FUL – LAND ADJACENT TO THE WITCH INN, SUNTE AVENUE
THE ERECTION OF 4 NO. SEMI-DETACHED DWELLINGS WITH ADDITIONAL LANDSCAPING AND OFF STREET CAR PARKING.

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) stated that the Society considered there to be a considerable improvement in the appearance compared to the earlier applications but there were still concerns about the flood risk.

Mr. D. Macmillan (Sunte Avenue resident) referred to the dismissal of the appeal in respect of the previous application and stated that the current application had not addressed points made by the Planning Inspector regarding the building line whereby the houses would be closer to the road than the adjacent properties to the west of the development site.

Mr. G. Taylor (resident) expressed concerns regarding the increased overall footprint which would mean that the land's capacity for absorbing water would be reduced and the compensating measures would have to be increased. He therefore considered this application for four houses to be overdevelopment of the site.

Mr. D. Marr (Agent) stated that the an attenuation tank beneath the car parking area would alleviate the flood risk and that the Planning Inspector had found the revised drainage and flood risk measures, submitted the day before the hearing, to be acceptable. Residents had been consulted about the new proposals and the general view was that the semi-detached houses, with reduced height and hipped roofs would be more acceptable. The houses would be set back by 4 m and in design terms the reduced height, bulk and layout respected the surrounding area.

During discussion Members remained unconvinced that the overall problem of flooding had been adequately resolved and objections were raised regarding the proximity of the houses to the pavement and the impact the development would have on the parking in the area, particularly parking associated with The Witch Inn.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has objections to this application on the following grounds:

- We consider the proposed dwellings to be out of keeping with this part of Sunte Avenue because they would not form a continuation of the building line from number 83 and they would be in close proximity to the pavement
- We still have concerns about the overall problem of flooding in the area and we are not confident that the potential adverse effect on the drainage system has been satisfactorily addressed
- The access leading to the dedicated car parking area for the properties and the likelihood of parking outside the new houses would lead to the displacement of parking associated with the adjacent Witch Inn into Hickmans Lane, with a possible adverse effect on road safety, given the nature of this junction.
- The proposed full height windows to the ground floor front elevation are considered to be out of keeping with the style of the other properties in this locality.
- The proposal is considered to be overdevelopment leading to problems with parking and flooding.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- 412.3 14/00081/FUL – 56 BLACKTHORNS
TWO STOREY SIDE AND SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS.

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) stated that the houses either side of this property, as well as others in the locality had been similarly altered.

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

- 412.4 14/00142/FUL AND 14/00143/LBC – 129 HIGH STREET (WICKHAM HOUSE)
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND RELATED INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) Stated that the effect of the proposal on the Conservation Area, as viewed from the front, was minimal, but that the work represented a major change to a listed building, with a substantial amount of historic fabric to be removed. He therefore recommended that this work be carried out under supervision to ensure that anything of interest was recorded.

During discussion it was pointed out that this house was unique in being the only property in Lindfield and the surrounding area with a mansard roof, which Members were pleased would not be affected.

AGREED RESPONSE: “Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application. We are pleased to see that the proposed alterations will not affect the mansard roof, of which this is the only example in the village. However, as a considerable amount of historic fabric is to be removed, we would request a condition that this work must be appropriately supervised to ensure that anything of interest is recorded”.

- 412.5 14/00026/FUL – CLARE COTTAGE, OAK BANK
DETACHED SINGLE GARAGE.

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

- 412.6 14/00031/FUL – HOLLY LODGE, 5 WEST COMMON
THE ERECTION OF A BRONZE STATUE ON A PLINTH IN THE REAR GARDEN. STATUE 2.8M TALL, PLINTH 0.75m WIDE AND 0.8M DEEP.

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) expressed some concern that the proposed statue would be visible from West Common, but the Society had no objections on planning grounds.

A neighbour’s letter on MSDC’s website, regarding the visibility of the statue from their property was noted.

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

- 412.7 14/00082/TREE – 9 SHENSTONE
OAK T2 AND OAK T3 – LIFT CROWN BY 3 METRES AND THIN CROWN BY NO MORE THAN 25%.

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

- 412.8 14/00141/FUL - LANTERN COTTAGE, SPRING LANE
SINGLE STOREY AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSIONS, BLOCK UP EXISTING FRONT DOOR AND UTILISE EXISTING WINDOW OPENING TO FORM NEW FRONT DOOR (REVISED PROPOSAL TO 13/03638/FUL).

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) stated that the Society had no objection and considered the proposal to be an improvement to this row of cottages; the work would not affect the front elevation to a significant extent and although in the Conservation Area, in the absence of an Article 4(2) Direction, these properties were not subject to the same restrictions as other parts of the Conservation Area.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

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

- 412.9 14/00167/FUL – 13 EASTERN ROAD
FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION TO REAR ELEVATION WITH PITCHED ROOF AND MATERIALS TO MATCH EXISTING.

Mr. J. Jesson (LPS) stated that the Society was pleased to see that the existing detail featuring red quoins was to be incorporated, but had noted that obscure glazing for the side window on the first floor had not been specified.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to a condition requiring the window of the proposed new bathroom to be glazed with obscure glass".

- 412.10 14/00209/OUT – LAND NORTH OF BIRCHEN LANE, HAYWARDS HEATH
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 48 DWELLINGS WITH ASSOCIATED GARAGING, CAR PARKING, OPEN SPACE, LANDSCAPING AND THE FORMATION OF ACCESS ROADS.

It had been decided prior to this meeting that a special meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee should be convened to consider this application. Therefore no discussion took place under this item.

- 413. 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.**

- 413.1 13/04136/FUL – 43 Denmans Lane. The Clerk reported that this application for demolition of an existing property and construction of a new dwelling had been approved but the Parish Council's requests for a comprehensive management plan and a sustainability report/appraisal with reference to the construction phase had not been addressed in the conditions.

414. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

- 414.1 No other items of business were raised.

The Meeting concluded at 9.15 p.m.