

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **Tuesday 30th October 2018** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at **20.00**

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr R Plass (Vice-Chairman of the Planning and Traffic Committee and acting Chairman for this meeting)
Mrs M Hersey
Mr I Wilson
Mrs S Richmond
Mrs V Upton
Mr W Blunden (joined the meeting at item 529)

Also present: Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) representative, Mrs M Tyler
17 members of the public

In attendance: Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)
Councillor Andrew Lea, District and County Councillor
(joined the meeting at item 529)

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

522. Apologies

522.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Snowling and Damsell, and the reasons were accepted.

523. Declarations of Interest

523.1 Cllr Hersey stated that she reserved the right to express a different opinion, when present at any meeting at Mid Sussex District Council which considered any matter discussed at LPC's P&TC, in the light of officers' reports and representations from members of the public and fellow Members.

524. Approval of Minutes

524.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 9th October 2018. It was **agreed to approve** the Minutes, and the Chairman **signed** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

525. Questions/comments from members of the public (Limited to a maximum of 15 minutes).

525.1 The Chairman confirmed that Mr Turner would be able to present his paper at item 10 (531 below).

525.2 Mr Kerlake expressed his view that the Traffic Study was of poor quality and had not collected enough evidence for West Sussex County Council (WSCC) to be able to take forward any of the seven schemes (Item 8 / 529 below). Indeed, he understood that WSCC had already decided not to support the proposed schemes.

525.3 The Chairman advised Mr Kerlake that he was quite wrong in his assertions and that the details would be discussed more fully under the agenda item.

526. Planning Applications and other matters referred to the Parish Council by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) for consideration

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.

i. DM/18/4002 – 7 Hickmans Close

Proposed ground floor side and rear extensions, incorporating extended hipped roof linking existing house and garage/annex.

Mr Bryant, a neighbour of the site, advised that he had no objections to the extensions as proposed despite the two storey elements. However, he considered that the height and design of

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

the proposed rendered wall above the ridge of the existing garage roof leading up to the roof of the main building would materially affect the outlook from his property. That the render finish proposed was out of keeping with the 50's style architecture of neighbouring properties, nor would it match the finish of the property being extended and it would be clearly visible from the road as well as neighbouring properties in Shenstone.

LPS considered that it was an "inspirational design" and had no objections.

Lindfield Parish Council objects to the proposed structure linking the roofs of the existing house and garage/annex. Whilst the Council has no objections to the proposed side and rear extensions, it considers that the proposed curved roof wall atop these extensions is overbearing to the neighbouring properties, affecting their outlook. Further that it impacts negatively on the established street scene, being visible from the street. This is particularly inappropriate in an Area of Townscape Character and contrary to Policy 7 of the Lindfield & Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan 2014-31 and Policy DP 26 (Character and Design) of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31.

- ii. DM/18/4011 – 44 Barncroft Drive
Proposed garage conversion/extension and installation of bifold doors.

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

- iii. DM/18/2945 – The Holt, 78 High Street
Proposed loft conversion to include one dormer window on the front and two rooflights on the rear with the removal of one side light on roof. (Amended plans and description 09/10/2018)

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

- iv. DM/18/3990 – Allens Wall, Black Hill
Proposed two storey side extension and removal of conservatory. 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 considered.

As this is a request for a Lawful Development Certificate Lindfield Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware.

- v. DM/18/4035 – 68 Meadow Drive
Proposed two storey extension to side, single storey extension to rear and internal alterations

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

- vi. DM/18/4135 – 9 Beckworth Lane
Proposed 2 storey side extension, covered porch incorporating bay window, and rear single storey pitched roof extension.

LPS had no objection and noted the pleasing symmetry of the proposal.

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application, subject to materials matching existing.

- vii. DM/18/4211 – Fivestones, 2 Little Black Hill
8 Lime Trees - Pollard.

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

- viii. DM/18/4213 – Rosemary Cottage, 80 High Street
Alder tree - Overall crown reduce by 1.22 -1.83 metres

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.

- 527. 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.**

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

527.1 The Deputy Parish Clerk Planning advised that no significant issues had been identified.

528. Finance update

528.1 The **Committee noted** the paper submitted and considered that there were no additional items to be considered at the time. Cllr Richmond asked that in respect of the Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) managed by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC) it would be useful to understand the support available / required to add projects (see Traffic Study Agenda Item 8 / 529 below). The Chairman noted the ever-present threat of Planning Applications and whether consideration should be given to a budget item, in anticipation it being necessary to employ consultants.

528.2 The **Committee noted these aspects** and agreed that the discussion of such should be taken forward outside of this meeting, reporting back at the next appropriate juncture.

529. Update on Traffic Study and Next Steps

529.1 The Chairman read from the Traffic Study Working Group Conclusions paper provided as part of the Agenda Papers (*shown in italics below*):-

- *In the light of resident's concerns relating to traffic volumes, speed and safety, a Traffic Study was commissioned in 2015 to identify issues and assess potential improvements.*

The Chairman noted that this was a result of many residents expressing concerns in respect of traffic issues to the Parish Office.

- *The completed study provides the basis for discussions with, and ultimately applications to, the Highways Authority and potential future developers as to desired improvement schemes.*

The Chairman considered that this was a valuable, factual document, undertaken by a professional commissioned by the Parish Council following the recommendation of suitable parties from the County Council as the Highways Authority, and should provide a sound basis for decisions in the future.

- *It was clear from residents' feedback that support for improvements exists, however views were mixed over the appropriateness and likely effectiveness of the schemes proposed.*
- *There remain seven sites where there is a desire for improvements and the Working Group recommends that a Community Highways Scheme (CHS) Application is submitted West Sussex Highways Authority with the support of Andrew Lea, District Councillor.*

The Chairman noted that this is the current position and that Cllr Lea had joined the meeting. Cllr Lea agreed that he would be available at the end of the meeting to discuss issues as required by the attendees.

- *The Working Group also recommends that Mid Sussex District Council be asked to add the schemes to its Infrastructure Development Plan (IDP) for consideration as part of the Planning Application deliberations for sites in Lindfield Village and nearby which are likely to impact upon the highway infrastructure.*

Consequently, at the present time, it is not envisaged that any further expenditure should be incurred on Traffic Study activity. This position may of course need to be reconsidered in the light of future housebuilding or other construction, or if necessary to support a scheme which is received positively under the CHS or IDP.

The Chairman noted that the Study represents the completion of what the Council had originally set out to do and that the next steps require West Sussex County Council (WSSC) to formally consider the proposed schemes. As the highways owning authority, WSSC had set scoring mechanisms as hurdles for such projects and consequently determination of further progress would now move to their hands.

The Working Group considers that the study and public consultation has proved to be a useful and productive exercise, coming some 20 years after the last detailed study. It has captured the current views of residents and their concerns, updated traffic data and provided detailed proposals for highway enhancements. The Working Group considers that the proposals should remain under review by the Council's P&TC recognising the dynamic changing planning environment.

529.2 The Chairman highlighted ongoing activities including:-

- Speed Indicator Devices (SIDS) - two units had been received in the past few days and these would be employed around the village to encourage appropriate behaviour by drivers and collect data regarding vehicle size, speed and the time of day

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

- Cycleway – that, in conjunction with other local Parish Councils, the Council was engaging with Cllr Andrew Lea to consider schemes to improve cycle access to the Village
 - Investigating the possibility of a recommended lorry route around the village (sometimes Known as the 'Petworth model')
 - Noting also the tentative proposals for the development of Haywards Heath Golf Club, that these would have a significant impact on the village and initial plans show that High Beech Lane may be diverted.
- 529.3 Cllr Richmond observed that the issues identified by the Traffic Study had been debated long and hard by the Working Group, recognising the money expended and the raised expectations of residents. She considered that the Council will need to push WSCC hard to ensure the appropriate level of debate and that it is essential to keep this moving forward. However, this was rather a chicken and egg situation as no fatalities have been identified and consequently there is the danger that WSCC have been inclined do nothing; and that levels of frustration will only increase if this approach continues.
- 529.4 The Chairman shared this view, noting that the study identified issues to be addressed but that the Parish Council is not responsible for the Highway, consequently that the Parish Council must keep the pressure up on WSCC and if there are particular issues, work towards resolutions.
- 529.5 Cllr Blunden agreed that matters would now be in the hands of WSCC and that the governance process needed to be followed.
- 529.6 Cllr Hersey emphasised the need to keep up the pressure, as many other councils have similar problems and the Parish needs to keep Lindfield at the top of the list with help from Cllr Lea. Further, that in the event of WSCC not supporting the proposals, LPC should seek a full explanation and understanding of the reasons why and what can be done to address such, so that with the support of Cllr Lea the proposals can be put to WSCC's moderation panel.
- 529.7 The **Committee agreed** that Richard Speller at WSCC now be asked to review and score the proposals as the first step.
- 530. Roll-out of Speed Indicator Devices (SIDS)**
- 530.1 The Chairman noted his previous comments and that training of Parish Council operatives needed to be progressed with WSCC, following which the SIDS would be rolled out.
- 531. Proposal for a Traffic Regulation Order on the Lewes Road (between Gravelly Lane and High Street)**
- 531.1 Following an invitation from the Chairman, Mr Graham Turner, a resident of the village presented his paper (previously circulated). Mr Turner quoted Pevsner "...Lindfield as having the 'finest village street in East Sussex' (the county boundaries were later redrawn)" and observed that there are 96 listed buildings in the High Street. He noted that WSCC restricts heavy vehicles from using routes other than those recommended in its advisory lorry routes map and that all villages south of Lindfield have heavy vehicle restrictions however Lindfield does not. Further that under S72 of the Road Traffic Act it is illegal to drive on the footpath, yet by allowing such actions the Council is effectively condoning such behaviour.
- 531.2 His proposal is to seek appropriate signage to encourage heavy vehicles to use the A272 and not turn up into the Lewes Road when passing between Haywards Heath and Uckfield. His research indicates that this would cost a maximum of £1k in physical infrastructure (road signs). He noted that whilst the road had been surfaced in the High Street in the distant past, and that bollards and York stones were installed outside the Butchers some years ago, he was concerned that nothing gets done and advised that the road resurfacing was again being delayed, from November 2018 to March 2019.
- 531.3 He drew attention to the proposal to restrict heavy vehicles in Queens Road and adjoining roads in Haywards Heath. Noting that this road was 7.7m wide compared with 4.65m at the Lewes Road/High Street junction, he questioned why Lindfield should not get similar support for protection against the vibration, noise and air pollution caused by such vehicles when Lewes, Chichester and Burgess Hill all benefit from such restrictions. He considered that lorries based in Crawley and Cophorne, for example, will change their behaviours of using Lindfield as a route if the HGV restrictions were effected, noting WSCC policy to push such movement to A roads.
- 531.4 The Chairman stated his support and that the Council should look to facilitate Mr Turner in making this application to WSCC with Cllr Lea's support. Cllr Hersey felt very strongly that the council should support this application but was concerned over the potential impact on other roads (e.g. High Beech Lane) if the lorry movements were altered. She suggested that Mr

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Turner liaise with local councils to the North (e.g. Ardingly and Turners Hill) to seek their support. Cllr Blunden stated that the PC should support this scheme as he had been concerned for many years about lorries and 4x4s at the High Street/ Lewes Road junction in particular. He noted that there were current proposals to close the Balcombe Road whilst a roundabout was built and the impact that this would likely have on the village. He considered that Lindfield had not been well served by WSCC whilst Cuckfield had benefited from resurfacing and additional crossings in recent years.

- 531.5 Cllr Wilson advised that he had recently seen a lorry and trailer cause 10 minutes of delays in the High Street whilst negotiating the junction and that traffic was everywhere. He fully supported the proposal. Cllr Hersey added that it was important to keep pressure on the CC including Cllr Ackerman to take this matter forward. The Chairman agreed that dialogue with other villages was needed to strengthen the case but that whilst this might be a benefit to Ardingly and Turners Hill, it might also delay any progress.
- 531.6 Mr Turner noted that the previous proposal that he and John Jesson had worked on for area wide lorry ban had been lost in the long grass at WSCC and that following complaints, WSCC had apologised for the delays in providing any response. He felt that his current proposal could be quickly implemented and was cheap and effective.
- 531.7 In conclusion, The Chairman confirmed his support and that the Council should facilitate Mr Turner in making this application. Cllr Blunden stated that he could not see that this would have any effect on High Beech Lane and that Mr Turner should submit his application facilitated by the council.
- 531.8 The **Committee agreed** that the Chairman should act as Working group to support Mr Turner with this application.

532. Outstanding action points from previous meetings

- 532.1 The Chairman asked that the Deputy Parish Clerk pressed for a meeting with Lindfield Rural Parish Council to address the issue that had emerged following the adoption of MSDC's District Plan earlier this year and its conflict with Lindfield's Neighbourhood Plan.

533. Matters Arising

- 533.1 **Blackthorns Community Association** – the Chairman noted the resident's concerns and suggested that LPC act as a facilitator to arrange a meeting with all interested parties (e.g. BCA, School, Residents, Parents, Head Teacher, Governor(s), police and WSCC), with a view to addressing the traffic issues around pick up and drop off times at the school.
- 533.2 **Haywards Heath Golf Club** – the Chairman recommended that the Council help and support Lindfield Rural Parish Council in looking at any Planning Application which emerges and other related activity.
- 533.3 **Gravelly Lane / Taylor Wimpey** – the Chairman suggested that recognising the outline planning permission in place, LPC attends the meeting being sought by TW with LRPC. Cllr Blunden was concerned about attending such and a previous instance whereby a member of the public complained that this was in contravention of the Code of Conduct. Consequently, he felt that advice should be sought from MSDC's Solicitor before doing so. Cllr Hersey advised that attendance would be acceptable but that no comments should be made.
- 533.4 The **Committee agreed** that the Chairman should take these aspects forward, with the Deputy Parish Clerk contacting MSDC's Solicitor accordingly.

The meeting concluded at 21.19