

**230 ~~Dwellings~~, Dwellings**, together with associated areas of Open Space, Play Space and Amenity **~~Space~~:Space**: Land East of Lindfield: Wates Developments Limited. (12/04316/FUL)

Change of Use of Land to Publically Accessible Recreational Open Space. Land South of Snowdrop Lane (12/04318/COU)

Change of Use of Land to Publically Accessible Informal Recreational Open Space Land North of Lyoth Lane (12/04322/COU)

#### Draft Recommendations

**A The Parish Councils' and (District Council's) proper course of action is to take a sequential approach as follows:**

- i. consider the merits, or otherwise, of the proposed alternative sites for Informal Recreation Areas before considering the application for 230 dwellings;**
- ii. ~~make~~ recommendations upon ( determine) the residential application:**
- iii. make recommendations upon ( determine) the applications for Informal Recreation Areas.**

**B The application for residential development should be refused on the grounds that:**

- 1 the proposal will not:**
  - i. respect or enhance the character and distinctiveness of Lindfield Village, surrounding settlements and landscapes around the Village of Lindfield, contrary to CC6 of the South East Plan ;**
  - ii. respect the character of the locality contrary to policy B1 of the Local Plan;**
  - iii. maintain or enhance the quality of the rural character of the district at the fringe of Lindfield contrary to policy B8 of the Draft District Plan;**

- iv. Meet the requirements of paragraph 61 of the NPPF which requires- that planning policies and decisions should address the connections of people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built, and historic environment. **The particular effect of the proposal in this regard not only on Lindfield Village High Street, which contains many listed buildings, but also on the many listed buildings in the immediate vicinity of the development, such as Greyfriars, Criplands, Lyoth Cottage, Gravelye House, should not be underestimated ”**

**2 the proposal will:**

- i. result in the coalescence of Lindfield /Haywards Heath and Walstead and urbanise the area between the **2** separate settlements contrary to District Plan policy DP 9,
- ii. not “respect or enhance the character and distinctiveness of settlements and landscapes” contrary to CC6 of the South East Plan; and
- iii. not satisfactorily integrate new- development into the natural built, and historic environment. contrary to paragraph 61 of the NPPF

**3 The distances from the proposed new development to the Town Centre, Village Centre, Major Supermarkets, Railway Station, and Primary Schools are such that it is **likely certain** that the majority of journeys by future residents for day-to-day services will be by car contrary to CC1 of the South East Plan ,and paragraphs 14,17 (11), 29 and 35 of NPPF.**

**4 The proposed development will **materially** add to traffic congestion at the High Street/Lewes Road junction contrary to Local Plan policy T4 (b) and paragraph 32 and of the NPPF.**

**5 The Informal Recreation Area set aside on the application site by the terms of planning permission reference (08/02532/OUT) is not surplus to requirements and this expected provision- will not be replaced by equivalent or better provision elsewhere, contrary to the requirements of NPPF paragraph 74.**

6 The potential noise and disturbance arising from traffic generated by ~~the proposed dwellings will be detrimental to existing and future occupants of dwellings occupied and permitted in close proximity to~~ the access route through land west of, and adjoining, the application site contrary to policy B3 of the Mid ~~Sussex Local~~ **Sussex Local Plan and NPPF** and NPPF paragraph 17(4) of the NPPF.

C ~~The~~ application for an Informal Recreation Area north of Lyoth Lane should be refused due to - ;

- i. the potential loss of highway safety arising from increased use of Lyoth Lane;
- ii. the additional distances required to access the site by the majority of the local population;
- iii. the proposal to gain access across the Wilderness Nature Reserve,
- iv. the steeply sloping nature of the site;

The proposal is not appropriate and lies within open countryside where there is a presumption against development under policy C1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan

D ~~The~~ application for an Informal Recreation Area at Snowdrop ~~Lane~~ **Lane should** be refused due ~~to~~ **to**;

- i. the potential loss of highway safety arising from increased use of Lyoth Lane;
- ii. the additional distances required to access the site by the majority of the local population;

The proposal is not appropriate and lies within open countryside where there is a presumption against development under policy C1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan

**Additional observations from Lindfield Parish Council were made as follows:-**

1. In terms of the lay-out and design, the development is contrary to Policies B1 and B2 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

2. In overall terms, but particularly in regard to the proposed block of flats, and the effect on the existing new development, the proposal will have an adverse and

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

detrimental effect on the surrounding properties, and is therefore unneighbourly, contrary to Policy B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

3. The development does not demonstrate that the increased traffic consequences, in terms of added usage and congestion, have been fully appreciated, and the measures proposed by the developer, particularly as regards the junction of Lewes Road and Lindfield High Street, are inadequate and unsupported. The proposal is therefore contrary to Policy B23 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

4. The development represents a significant loss of agricultural land, which could be brought back into use for such purposes, and so preserve the rural setting of the location. The proposal does not therefore satisfy Policy C9 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

5. Sustainability is not demonstrated for the larger houses as these fail a quality test for communal space, as there is a disproportion between the number of bedrooms and living spaces.

6. Sustainability on infrastructure requirements has not been demonstrated, particularly as regards land drainage. Surplus water should be re-cycled, if it is not to add to the existing flooding pressures on nearby rivers and streams. The proposals do not therefore meet the requirements of Policies CS13 and 15 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.

**Additional observations from Lindfield Rural Parish Council were made as follows:**

j. That the applications should be considered pre-emptive as they seek approval prior to the publication of the local Neighbourhood Plan. Following the Localism Act, the government requested that parish councils worked with their communities to produce neighbourhood plans to identify appropriate sites for development. LRPC, together with LPC are in the process of producing a neighbourhood plan.

ii. Concerns from residents indicated that the plans for flats on part of the site would be considered unneighbourly to those living at Redwoods and other adjoining properties (RH16 2SL) and would be inappropriate use of planning policy.

iii. Further concerns related to the conversion of viable agricultural land to alternative uses.

iv. The impact of additional large numbers of dwellings and the consequent increase in residents on the infrastructure. Concerns exist regarding the known deficiencies of the current infrastructure in respect of sewage, water, doctors' surgeries and schools. There are also doubts about the data provided in the Traffic Report.

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Not Italic

**Formatted:** Indent: Left: 0 cm

v. Loss of strategic gap as in policy C2 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan. The Croudace development has already encroached into the gap between Haywards Heath and Scaynes Hill. Lindfield is a village with its own entity and identity, Walstead similarly. There are also concerns about the creep into agricultural land.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold

**RMW 6.2.13**

