

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 6 JUNE 2017** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

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

Present:

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

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

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

Not present: None.

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

288. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

288.1 All members were present.

289. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

289.1 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.

289.2 Item 5 (v) DM/17/2036 - 4 Luxford Road. Councillor Plass declared a personal interest in this item as a relative lived at the next door property.

289.3 Item 5 (iv) DM/17/2001 - 103 The Welkin. Councillor Upton declared a personal interest in this item as she was acquainted with the applicant.

290. MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PLANS ONLY) HELD ON 16 MAY 2017.

290.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 16 May 2017. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

291.1 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.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

291.2 DM/17/1873 – LAND OPPOSITE 1 GRAHAMS COTTAGES, SPRING LANE
DEMOLITION OF RESIDENTIAL GARAGE / ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION AND THE ERECTION OF A 1 ONE BED DWELLING WITH ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING.

Mr. J. Jesson commented that the appeal decision on the previous application had been divided into two parts: the critique on the design, which had now been changed and those particular comments were not therefore relevant to the present application, and the Planning Inspector's reasons for concluding that it was inappropriate to allow any dwelling on the site opposite Grahams Cottages. Mr. Jesson added that in terms of Policies B1, B12 and B15 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan, design had to be particularly good to meet standards required in a Conservation Area; the design of the proposed dwelling in this application, which, in his view, lacked character, was not adequate in this sense.

The applicant referred to the Design and Access Statement in which there were photographs of other buildings of similar design to the proposed dwelling, with a timber feathered edge above brick walls. He stated that the Planning Inspector had made points about the site being a sustainable location. This would be a one-bedroom house which was much needed in Lindfield and the wider area and commercial developers were not building houses of this size. The dwelling would not be tied to agricultural use, but would provide much needed housing for a young person working on the nearby farm. The occupants of seven properties in Spring Lane were in support of the proposal. The proposed dwelling would have economic value and was of an immaculate design, similar to others in the Conservation Area and the location had been considered by the Planning Inspector to be semi-rural, rather than rural in character. Approval was already in place for the ancillary use of the existing building, which could easily be converted into a dwelling.

Speaking in support of the application, a neighbouring resident commented that it was useful to her as owner of the farm to have an employee living in close proximity.

During discussion Members expressed sympathy with the applicant and the desire for this building, but felt that for the sake of the future of the area, it could not be supported because of its location and the adverse effect it would have on the rural appearance of Spring Lane. An ancillary garage was considered acceptable, but a dwelling, which (as the Planning Inspector had pointed out) would result in additional domestic paraphernalia, was not.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council still has concerns about the effects of this proposal within the Conservation Area. Any development of the site in such a form, will adversely affect the street scene and the landscape setting. As stated before, it is a significant step from permitting the erection of garages, to the conversion/rebuilding of the property as a separate dwelling. As above, 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. We believe that the proposal is not therefore in accordance with Policies B1, B12 and B15 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan and so we must continue to register our objections to this application".

291.3 DM/17/0826 – 4 COMPTON ROAD
REMOVAL OF REDUNDANT CHIMNEY STACK.

Mr. Jesson stated that he could see no reason for removal of the chimney stack and considered that it was in the interest of the Conservation Area to retain it and suggested that repairing the chimney would probably cost a comparable amount to removing it. There was a further example of a chimney in the same position on the roof of the house by the Tollgate car park.

During discussion it was noted that chimneys were a particular feature Compton Road. It was however also pointed out that there was a perfectly adequate chimney in the centre of the roof, that the other half of the semidetached houses did not have a corresponding chimney on the side and that this particular chimney was ugly and out of character, not adding anything to the Conservation Area.

The Chairman **MOVED** the proposed response, **SECONDED** by Councillor Snowling and Members voted 5 in favour and 1 against.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council agrees with the comments of the Conservation Officer. In the circumstances, the proposal is not considered to adversely affect (cause harm to) the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. It meets current and future Plan policies. In passing, we note that the other half of the pair of houses does not have a similar stack to the one in question, although it might have had when the properties were built".

291.4 DM/17/1855 – 132 THE WELKIN

PROPOSED LOFT CONVERSION. 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 proposal, Lindfield Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware".

291.5 DM/17/2001 – 103 THE WELKIN

T1: SCOTS PINE - REMOVE LOWEST BRANCH OVERHANGING OWNERS GARDEN, REMOVE 4 LOWEST BRANCHES GROWING TOWARDS NEIGHBOUR'S COPPER BEECH TREE, REMOVE 4 BRANCHES OVERHANGING GARDEN TO THE REAR, REMOVE THE 1 LOWEST BRANCH OVERHANGING GARDEN OF 104 BACK TO FORK.

It was **NOTED** that the Tree Wardens had commented that the only branches they considered needed to be removed were the two dead ones overlooking the Copper Beech at 104 The Welkin.

Mr. Jesson stated that there was a degree of interference between the subject tree and a Copper Beech at the neighbouring property but that there was no arboricultural report indicating that the tree was in danger or casting shade. As the Scots Pine was very tall, there seemed no justification for removing limbs other than those leaning into the Copper Beech.

On balance, Members felt that there should be no objection to the proposal and to leave the decision on which limbs should be removed in the hands of MSDC's Tree Officer.

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

291.6 DM/17/2036 – 4 LUXFORD ROAD

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH INCLUDING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

Councillor Plass having declared a personal interest, remained present but did not take part in the discussion. It was acknowledged that a number of other Members were acquainted with the neighbouring resident, but this was not considered to be a prejudicial interest.

Mr. Jesson stated that he considered the proposal to be a nice scheme.

Members discussed whether the proposal might prove to be unneighbourly and it was pointed out that the email from the Planning Officer to the applicant, giving pre-application advice, which had been referred to in the application, had not been included with the plans, and without it the application was considered incomplete. It was **AGREED** to respond with no objection but to make reference to this omission.

AGREED RESPONSE: "Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to the plans as submitted, but it would have been helpful if the email sent by the Planning Officer to the applicant giving pre-application advice had been included".

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

298. 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.

298.1 DM/15/2908 – Postmasters, 34 High Street: Side and rear two storey extension. It was **NOTED** that permission, with conditions, had been granted for this application by MSDC.

299. PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE BUDGET.

299.1 The Planning and Traffic Committee's budget progress report to 30.04.17 was tabled and it was **NOTED** that there had been no expenditure to date.

300. TRAFFIC SURVEY.

300.1 It was **NOTED** that the Traffic Consultant was working on revising the study report and the scheme design drawn up for all sites within the study area. The target was to get the package back to the Parish Council by 20 June so that a further report could be made to the next meeting of the Planning and Traffic Committee on 27 June.

301. PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR SCHOOLS.

301.1 Members **NOTED** the consultation on proposed traffic regulation orders for Blackthorns School and Oathall Community College:

- To introduce or formalise enforceable School Keep Clear Markings, prohibiting stopping from 8am - 5pm Monday to Friday (Blackthorns Close and Appledore Gardens) and
- To prohibit waiting at any time (double yellow lines) on a length of Blackthorns Close

It was **AGREED** to support the proposals.

302. ANY OTHER BUSINESS.

302.1 No other items of business were raised.

The meeting concluded at 8.55 p.m.