

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on
WEDNESDAY 4TH APRIL 2018 in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

The meeting commenced at **20.00**

Present:

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

Also present: Two members of the Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)
Nine members of the public (who left after items ii, iii and v)

In attendance: Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

Not present: Mrs. S. Richmond
Mr M. Damsell

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

441 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

441.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Richmond and Damsell and the reasons were accepted.

442 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

442.1 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.

442.2 Councillor Snowling advised that the freeholder of Lindfield Coffee Works (Agenda Item 4.v) was a fellow Trustee of the King Edward Hall. However, the application being considered relates to the Leaseholder of the premises and having taken advice considered that this did not provide a conflict which should preclude him from discussing this matter.

443 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 13TH MARCH 2018

443.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 13th March 2018. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

444.1 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.

i. DM/18/0634 – 6 & 7 BECKWORTH LANE

DEMOLITION OF CONSERVATORY AT 6 BECKWORTH LANE TOGETHER WITH TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION AND FIRST FLOOR REAR EXTENSION TO 7 BECKWORTH LANE TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application subject to the materials and finishes of the external walls and roof of the extension matching in colour and texture those of the existing dwelling house.

ii. DM/18/0895 – 8 THE GLEBE

REMOVAL OF EXISTING GARAGE. PROPOSED TWO STOREY SIDE AND REAR EXTENSION. SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. PITCHED ROOF OPEN PORCH TO FRONT ENTRANCE TO REPLACE EXISTING FLAT ROOF PORCH.

Mrs Young spoke against the application, advising that she is a resident of the Glebe and came to speak on behalf of a resident adjacent to the proposed development. She advised that The Glebe had been cleverly designed so that whilst the road was straight the houses set out in a curve, with No 8 the closest to the road. She considered that the proposed development was unneighbourly and would be 1m from the house at No 9 and that its unbroken slab brick frontage would extend at 90° past the adjoining property, leading to a loss of light to both the ground floor sitting room and a first floor bedroom. Further that the overall development would be unsightly in what is currently an attractive road and is therefore unsuitable.

Mr Hinze spoke against the application, noting that a letter of objection from another resident had not been published under this planning application [The Chairman explained that this was a matter for Mid Sussex District Council as the Planning Authority]. He explained that he was also a neighbour and concerned at the effect the proposal would have of the long standing neighbour adjacent to the property. He felt that the extension would be very prominent and change the aspect of the location. He hoped that the textures used in the existing property would be used in any works undertaken.

Lindfield Preservation Society spoke against the application, advising that they endorsed the preceding comments and that the loss of light to the neighbouring property caused by this proposal would be contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31 Adoption Version. Further, three nearby houses had in the past suffered from subsidence and that this was ascertained to be due to geological weaknesses rather than caused by tree roots. Consequently, the society had concerns that the works required might further destabilise nearby properties and that the application should be refused in its present form.

Councillors reviewed the plans and Councillor Blunden noted that adjacent house had been extended in the past but not so prominently as this proposal. He also commented that the neighbouring resident was likely to benefit from 'Rights to Light' given a greater than 20 year residency. Councillor Upton agreed and the Chairman observed that light was a concern, affecting the property adjoining which would be behind the proposed extension. Councillor Hersey noted the close proximity of the extension to the boundary and Councillor Plass considered the two storey extension to dominate, whereas a one storey extension would be acceptable. Councillors agreed unanimously that they could not support this proposal.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application. It considers that a single storey extension may be acceptable but that the proposed two storey extension is too dominant and overbearing for the site. Further that the likely loss of light to the neighbouring property is unacceptable and contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31 Adoption Version and therefore LPC cannot support this application.

iii. DM/18/0949 – SAXON GATE, 1A LINDEN GROVE

CONIFERS AND LAUREL - TRIM BRANCHES FROM NEIGHBOURS BOUNDARY.

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

iv. DM/18/0884 – 34 DUKES ROAD

PROPOSED TWO-STOREY EXTENSION TO REAR & SIDE AND PROPOSED NEW LEAN-TO CANOPY WITH FIRST FLOOR FRONT EXTENSION.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Dr Hewitt spoke against the application, advising that she owned the next door property and wanted to highlight three concerns; (1) Significant overbearing impact (2) Loss of outlook and (3) Loss of daylight and sunshine. In respect of (1) and (2) that the scale and bulk of the proposed footprint, first floor and roof would impact on five south facing rooms, all of which would be affected, in some cases severely, and similarly impact the rear garden and patio. Dr Hewitt noted that the objections raised against the (withdrawn) 2016 Planning Application have not been addressed in this proposal. Further that the 25° rule would not be complied with and that the proposal contravened DP 26, NPPF paras 17, 56 & 64 and the Lindfield Village Design Statement section 5.1.

Dr Kennedy spoke against the application, firstly advising that, as Chairman of LPS and owner of the neighbouring property he had recused himself from LPS considerations of this application. Noting the planning policies and reasons already cited he highlighted the intrusive and unneighbourly nature of the application and that it was entirely out of keeping with the character of the close. Mentioning that the 2016 application, which was almost identical in external, dimensions, had been withdrawn he viewed the latest application as an assault on neighbours quality of life and, if approved, would create an ominous precedent for similar overdevelopment elsewhere in Lindfield.

LPS considered that the plans were inconsistent and led to confusion. The Society objected to the development as it was contrary to DP 26, causing detrimental impact to the amenities of neighbouring residents with its 2x increased footprint overwhelming the original property. That if was carried out, would be a significant overdevelopment which was unsympathetic to the street scene. Further that it would alter the locality noting also that the site abuts the Conservation Area and such development would not be in accordance with DP 34, with the setting of seven listed buildings detrimentally affected.

Councillor Plass noted recent development to the property undertaken as Permitted Development and considered that further development, more than doubling the size of the property, would lead to a significant loss of light to the neighbouring property and that the angle of the garden would make such development unneighbourly, with a significant loss of amenity. Councillor Hersey noted that the proposed development would be right up to the boundary and although a single storey development would be alright this double storey proposal was very close to the neighbouring property and taking away light, which she considered to be unneighbourly. Councillor Upton agreed. Councillors agreed unanimously that they oppose this application.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application. As proposed, the development and in particular its upper floor extension will dominate the neighbourhood and in particular the neighbouring property at 35 Dukes Road, contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31 Adoption Version. A previous extension has been undertaken under Permitted Development guidelines and that combined with the proposed works, will at least double the foot print of the property. This will result in light being taken away from the neighbouring property and negatively affect the outlook from a number of its rooms and garden area. Accordingly LPC cannot support this application and notes that some of the plans submitted and statements made in support of the proposal are inconsistent or unsupported and therefore potentially misleading.

- v. DM/18/1004 – Lindfield Coffee Works, Unit 2, The Old Corn Store, ALMA ROAD
VARIATION OF CONDITION 3 RELATING TO PLANNING APPLICATION DM/17/0928 TO ALLOW OPENING OF THE PREMISES BETWEEN 08:30AM-23:30 PM.

Ms Cawley spoke against the application, advising that her kitchen wall was 1m away from the subject property and she shared the serious concerns as to noise as MSDC's Environmental Protection Officer [report on MSDC's Planning Portal]. She cited experience of a previous event where the live music could be heard throughout her property despite all windows being closed. She didn't complain at the time, recognising that the existing limited night time opening conditions made this a relatively rare occurrence. However, if approved, this could lead to such events up to 365 days a year until 11.30pm. She noted that her neighbours had a young baby but that planning letters has not been received by affected residents due to notice procedures not being followed. Finally, that when it was built 5 years ago it was expected to be a dental surgery, to which no one really objected, but if it had been proposed as a licensed premises then more resistance would have been likely.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Mr Kerslake spoke against the application, advising that five cottages were immediately affected by the proposal as well as the gardens of listed buildings in the High Street. He considered that whilst an alcohol license to 23.00 was reasonable, hours agreed for planning requirements can be different (as Tamasha). Citing DP 26 and the amenity of nearby residents he felt that the opening restriction should stay as 10.30pm – 11pm maximum although would prefer 10.30pm. Noting the mention of private parties he questioned how often and noisy, concluding that it should remain as 10.30pm.

LPS agreed with MSDC's Environmental Protection Officer and considered that the proposal would contravene DP 26, if moved from 10pm one night per month to the sought 23.30 everyday. LPS were particularly concerned that change of ownership with an uncontrolled open ended ability to trade was inappropriate, further commenting that it was regrettable that the applicants intentions were not clearer.

The Chairman felt that the planning conditions should be left as they were and that an anomaly between licensing and planning conditions was not a reason to change one to the other. He felt that 11pm was too late in that location. Councillor Blunden saw no reason to alter the existing conditions and Councillor Hersey noted that the 23.00 licensing hours (23.30 with drinking up time) contrasted with planning approved closure at 10pm, with the application seeking something in between. She was not convinced and felt existing conditions should remain. Councillor Plass felt that the applicant's objectives were not clear; he wouldn't support the planning hours moving to the licensing hours and felt it was unclear what was really being sought here. Councillors concluded that they could not support the proposed change in planning approved trading hours and urged that existing conditions should remain.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application. It considers that the difference between agreed Planning and Licensing hours is not of itself a reason for the agreed Planning restrictions to be changed and urges the Planning Authority to retain the existing conditions in the interests of protecting the auditory amenities of the nearby properties.

- vi. DM/18/1024 – 23 DUKES ROAD
SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND TWO/SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND ASSOCIATED ALTERATIONS

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application. The proposed two storey extension is likely to deprive the neighbour to the south of the development of light and will be constructed very close to the boundary representing an unneighbourly façade, contrary to Policy DP26 of the Mid Sussex District Plan 2014-31 Adoption Version.

- vii. DM/18/1049 – 8 DUKES ROAD
(T1) LIME - CROWN RAISE TO 5M AND (T2) LIME - CROWN RAISE TO 5M

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

- viii. DM/18/1073 – OLD DAIRY COTTAGE, 1B BACKWOODS LANE
SYCAMORE AND HORSE CHESTNUT GROUP (G1) - CROWN LIFT TO 3M, REDUCE OVERHANG TO GARDEN BY APPROX. 1M

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

- ix. DM/18/1117 – 39 HIGH STREET
REMOVAL OF CONDITION 4 RELATING TO PLANNING PERMISSION DM/17/3135 IN REGARDS TO PROVIDING CYCLE PARKING SPACES

The Chairman observed that the applicants' agent referred to Car Parking spaces and not cycle racks and Councillor Blunden noted largely unused cycle storage in the nearby Car Park and that the owner had previously considered putting cycle racks where the current planters are in Denmans Lane.

LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council objects to this application. Neither the application form nor the plan provide the information required by condition 4 of the original application, therefore we cannot approve this application.

- x. DM/18/1126 – 9 DUKES ROAD
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH PROVISION OF LOG BURNER FLUE

The Chairman felt that the flue would shine brightly in view of the proposed materials and Councillor Plass reconfirmed the comments the reviewing team had made.

AGREED RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to the proposed extension but is concerned about the visual impact of the stainless steel external flue on the neighbouring properties and the street scene, as the flue is mounted externally on the upper floor and projects above the roofline.

445 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.

- 445.1 DM/18/0428 – 21 Summerhill Grange; various tree works. LPC P&TC expressed concern as to the removal of trees with TPOs, relying on MSDC to use their judgement. MSDC gave Permission 23.3.18.
- 445.2 DM/17/4865 – Orchard House Roundwood Lane; garage demolition and two storey extension. LPC P&TC objected to the original and revised application. MSDC's Planning Committee B will be hearing the latest application on 12th April 2018, which is recommended for Permission.
- 445.3 The Committee **NOTED** the decisions.

446 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 446.1 None

The meeting concluded at 20:52