

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on **TUESDAY 13 MARCH 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. S. Richmond  
Mrs V. Upton

**Also present:** Councillor Andrew Lea (West Sussex County Council and Mid Sussex District Council)  
One member of the Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS)  
31 members of the public (30 who left after items i and iv)

**In attendance:** Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

**Not present:** Mr W. Blunden  
Mr M. Damsell  
Mrs M. Hersey

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

**435 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

435.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Blunden, Damsell and Hersey and the reasons were accepted.

**436 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

436.1 None declared

**437 MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE HELD ON 20TH FEBRUARY 2018**

437.1 The Chairman called for approval of the Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 20 February 2018. It was **AGREED** to **APPROVE** the Minutes, and the Chairman **SIGNED** the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

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

438.1 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/17/4865 – ORCHARD HOUSE, ROUNDWOOD LANE  
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DETACHED GARAGE AND LINKING PASSAGEWAY, RE MODELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO-STOREY SIDE EXTENSION TOGETHER WITH ASSOCIATED INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS. AMENDED DRAWINGS RECEIVED 14.2.18

Mr G. & Mrs M. McLeish, owners of the property immediately to the east of the application, spoke against the submission, providing photographs to illustrate their points. Mr McLeish stated that their lounge and kitchen enjoyed a west facing, light outlook and good levels of privacy. Their amenity would be significantly affected by the revised proposal which they considered would breach the 25° light test and that the proposed extension, being twice as high as the current hedge, would cause the kitchen to lose sunlight far earlier and lead to a significant area of shadow across their property. Mrs McLeish advised that the current outlook to a garden scene would be become that of an overbearing, large wall and would

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

greatly affect their outlook to the west, with their patio becoming hemmed in. Further, that the window from their lounge would look directly at the end wall of the proposed extension rather than the current tree, which is proposed to be removed as part of the works. She considered that the works would result in the loss of what she viewed as the existing wonderful amenity that their property enjoys. She stated that she was happy with change and that there is plenty of room to extend Orchard House in other directions. She noted that under MSDC District Plan developments shouldn't cause harm and considered that this proposal should be opposed accordingly.

Kate Andrews, Agent for the Applicant, stated that the revised proposal was designed to be more accommodating than the original and was 1m further away from the eastern boundary, 4.5m high to the eaves and 7m to the apex. She noted that T9 Cypress Lawson was 12m and therefore higher than the proposed extension. She considered that the proposed removal of this tree would improve the light reaching Mr & Mrs McLeish's property and that this had been discussed with them, the applicants having understood that its removal would be welcomed. She advised that Mr & Mrs McLeish had in 2012 removed a large established conifer hedge on their western boundary, which had been there for many years, and was far more substantial than the current hedge. In respect of the 25° test, following the revised plans and the involvement of a land surveyor, she considered that the lounge window would be 18.2°, therefore not breaching the 25° test. The kitchen was assessed at 27.4°, which she considered to be only a marginal increase over the 25° test, and that following removal of the tree the level of light received would not be significantly harmed.

Councillor Plass reiterated that he considered that the unfavourable comments LPC's Planning & Traffic Committee had previously made applied equally to this revised proposal. Both Councillors Richmond and Upton supported this view. Councillors voted unanimously against the revised proposal.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council objects to this (revised) application, which it considers to remain overbearing and creating a significant loss of light to the neighbour east of the subject property. The design also radically changes the frontage of the property which would impact on the established street scene in an Area of Townscape Character.

- ii. DM/18/204 – 26A PELHAM ROAD  
PROPOSED CLADDING AND DOOR REPLACEMENT IN WHITE UPVC TO THE SOUTH EAST ELEVATION

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

- iii. DM/18/0586 – LINDFIELD COFFEE WORKS, UNIT 2, THE CORN STORE, ALMA ROAD  
CHANGE OF USE OF PART OF FORMER WAITING ROOM, INTO A DISABLED ACCESSIBLE TOILET CUBICLE, IN ASSOCIATION WITH CAFÉ

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, providing all work is undertaken with a sympathetic view towards the Conservation Area and provision is made to minimise inconvenience to the neighbours whilst work is in progress.

- iv. DM/18/0733 – TAVISTOCK AND SUMMERHILL SCHOOL, SUMMERHILL LANE  
PROPOSED ERECTION OF 48 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS COMPRISING OF 6 HOUSES AND 42 FLATS WITH ASSOCIATED INTERNAL ACCESS, BASEMENT AND SURFACE-LEVEL CAR PARKING, LANDSCAPING WITH OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE.

Two local residents spoke against the proposal:-

Deborah Rendell highlighted the location in Summerhill Lane and that MSDC had been scrupulous in seeking to maintain townscape character, with their case officers always protective of the street scene and noted that proposed 15/17 Birchin Lane developments had been refused recognising density issues. She considered that 8-10 houses/hectare would be more in keeping in an area incorporating Turner and similar style properties, with its verdant green nature, in contrast to the overbearing development being proposed.

## LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL

David Quickfall advised that he represented a number of neighbours likely to be affected by the proposed development. He stated that he was not opposed to development of the site but that it should be carried out bearing in mind local guidance, including the Lindfield Village Statement, Mid Sussex Local Plan and Mid Sussex District Plan and recognising the setting alongside an Area of Townscape Character. He advised that when Summerhill Grange was developed it was designed to have a low profile and be barely visible from the surrounding Area of Townscape Character. As proposed, he considered that the application was completely out of character with the local area and contrary to Guidelines 11/15 of the Village Design Statement and B1/16 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan. The proposed 3 storey blocks were overbearing at ~15m and their built height, located at the highest points of the site conflicted with Guidelines 11/15 and policies B1/16.

Mr Quickfall observed that the development as proposed would lead to some neighbouring properties being likely to lose light all day in the winter. Further, that to date, no balconies had been approved in the area and that the proposed privacy screening on site would benefit only the occupiers of the new property, as opposed to existing residents overlooked by the proposed balconies. He also highlighted that the proposals as they stood were causing significant levels of concern and stress to local residents. He hoped that MSDC would be consistent as they had been in the past in declining proposals which did not fit in with the townscape.

Mrs Tyler, for Lindfield Preservation Society, stated that they were concerned at the loss of 14 trees under the proposals and that their detailed response would follow.

Councillor Richmond stated that she was even more firmly against the proposed development having heard the comments made. Councillor Upton agreed and Councillor Plass noted that with the Mid Sussex District Plan nearing adoption this strengthens the weight of the Local Plan, and that this proposal falls foul in a number of areas.

In response to a question from the attendees, Councillor Andrew Lea (West Sussex County Council and Mid Sussex District Council) advised that the Mid Sussex District Plan had now been found sound by the Inspector and would be adopted by the Council shortly. This would then provide a stronger argument to object to inappropriate planning applications.

Councillor Snowling proposed that LPC should object to the application, recognising the reviewing councillors' comments and the views put forward at the meeting. Councillor Plass seconded this proposal and it was carried unanimously.

**AGREED RESPONSE:** Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to the development as proposed.

LPC has no objection to the redevelopment of the former school site with appropriate residential accommodation. It does however consider that the current proposal would be out of keeping with the local environment, surrounded as it is by Areas of Townscape Character. Further, LPC is concerned about the impact that the proposed blocks would have on the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties (including significant overbearing, loss of outlook and, in some cases, restricted sunlight), particularly in Oak Bank and in the lower part of Summerhill Grange. Whilst screening is proposed in the application, this would appear to be inadequate to protect the existing neighbours' privacy from users of the proposed balconies, which themselves would be quite out of keeping with the Lindfield Village setting. LPC notes the proposed allocation of parking spaces but seriously questions whether the number proposed would be adequate for the residents of the development, notwithstanding the statements put forward in the application. LPC also questions whether the provision of recreational facilities would be in any way adequate.

As proposed, LPC considers that the development flies against the ethos of the Lindfield Village Design Statement (in particular Guidelines 11, 15 and 35), the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan, and the Mid Sussex Local Plan (Policies B1, B3, B16).

**LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL**

- v. DM/18/0758 – 20 FINCHES GARDENS  
PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION AND LOFT CONVERSION, DORMER WINDOW TO THE REAR AND TWO ROOF LIGHTS TO THE FRONT INCLUDING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS. 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, Lindfield Parish Council can only comment that there are no reasons for legal, valid objections as far as we are aware.

**439 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.**

- 439.1 DM/18/0031 – 20 Backwoods Lane, Two bay garage; had been granted permission
- 439.2 DM/17/5140 – Marlow House, 107 High Street, Conversion of consented garage building to form a one bedroom dwelling; had been refused permission
- 439.3 DM/17/4893 – Clough's Deli, 27 Sunte Avenue, extensions to create an additional flat; had been refused permission
- 439.4 The Committee **NOTED** the decisions.

**439 TO CONSIDER DEVELOPMENTS (IF ANY) IN RESPECT OF LINDFIELD PARISH COUNCIL'S TRAFFIC STUDY CONSULTATION WHICH CLOSED 10TH FEBRUARY 2018**

- 439.1 The Deputy Parish Clerk advised that collation work remained ongoing.

**440 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

- 440.1 None

The meeting concluded at 20:35