

Lindfield Parish Council

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** Tuesday 9th March 2021

The Meeting commenced at **19:00** and was undertaken using video conferencing.

Present:

Parish Councillors: Mr R Plass (Chair)
Mrs M Hersey (Vice-Chair)
Mrs A Matthews
Mr I Wilson
Mrs V Upton
Mr C Wood
Mr J Stevens
Mr M Leach
Mr W Blunden

Also present: Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) and two members of the public.

In attendance: Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

261. Apologies

261.1 Received from Mrs L Grace and the reason accepted.

262. Declarations of Interest

262.1 Cllr Blunden and Plass advised that they would leave the meeting when Item 269 was discussed. This was due to their roles at the King Edward Hall and that the Local Planning Authority had recently advised that should the planning appeal in respect of the Tavistock and Summerhill School site be successful, S106 monies of £18,000 are likely to be allocated for improvements to the hall. Cllr Hersey advised that she also leave the meeting for this item in view of a relation's involvement in the proposal.

263. Agenda Order

263.1 In the light of the Declarations of Interest and with three attendees present for Item 266.xi, the Chair suggested that this item be heard first under planning applications and that the Planning Appeal (Item 271) be moved to the end of the meeting, after Matter Arising, to allow those members who had made Declarations of Interest to leave the meeting before it was discussed. All **agreed** to these changes of order.

264. Approval of Minutes

264.1 The Chair noted that the draft Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 16th February 2021 had previously been circulated and sought any members comments. Committee **agreed** that the Chair should sign the Minutes, subject to this amendment, as a true record of that meeting as soon as Coronavirus restrictions allow.

265. Questions/comments from members of the public

265.1 None.

266. 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. For applications where Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) had no comments to make or their view was 'No objection' this is not individually noted against the applications considered.

i. DM/20/4671 – 5 Beckwith Close

Proposed Lawful Development application for a proposed single storey rear extension.

Lindfield Parish Council

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

ii. DM/21/0308 – 32 Dukes Road

First floor extension over existing garage

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to matching materials being used.

iii. DM/21/0358 & 0366 – The Old Forge, Denmans Lane

Installation of two new conservation roof lights to front roof elevation, removal of internal stud partition wall and renovation to enhance energy efficiency and improve character of building

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to the works being carried out in line with the Local Planning Authority Planning Officer's pre-application advice that the roof lights should be located on the rear roof slope, so as to have less impact on the appearance of the building.

iv. DM/21/0373 – East Wing, Old Place, High Street

Removal of part of masonry wall separating kitchen from breakfast space on ground floor

The Chair and Vice Chair noted that this application had been referred to Historic England who had declined to make any comment.

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to the Local Planning Authority Conservation Officer's comments.

v. DM/21/0413 – The Goods Building, 93 Sunte Avenue

Silver Birch reduce by 5 metres to previous cut points

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application

vi. DM/21/0501 – Stable Lodge, Lewes Road

Group of Yew Trees (G1) reduced back away from the house by 3 metres

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application

vii. DM/21/453 – Summerhill, 1 Summerhill Drive

Proposed extension and internal alterations.

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to matching materials being used.

viii. DM/21/571 – The Oak Trees, 1A Pelham Road

T1 Oak - raise crown up to 10 metres around tree, specifically the overhanging lowest limb - lateral towards road (Appledore Gardens), remove split limbs and deadwood from entire crown.

Lindfield Parish Council notes that there is no report from a suitably qualified tree surgeon as to the condition of the tree and works, if any, required. In the absence of such a report the council objects to the works proposed to this protected tree.

ix. DM/21/573 – 3 Barrington Close

Oak T1 Remove all hanging branches over 25mm in diameter and crown reduce by approximately 3m. Oak T2 Remove all hanging branches over 25mm in diameter. Oak T3 Remove all hanging branches over 25mm in diameter and crown reduce by approximately 2-3m. Oak T4 Remove all hanging branches over 25mm in diameter and crown reduce by approximately 3m. Sycamore T5 Remove and replace

Lindfield Parish Council notes that there is no application form posted on the Local Planning Authority's site for this application. Based on the information contained in the Arboricultural Consultant's report LPC has no objections to the works proposed.

x. DM/21/0346 – Lindfield Dry Cleaners, 4 Denmans Lane

Lindfield Parish Council

Rear extension to 4 Denmans Lane

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to matching materials being used.

The following item was considered first under Planning Applications at the meeting, as mentioned under item 263 above, but is reported here in line with the published agenda numbering. After hearing the committee's conclusion, Mr Kennedy and Mr Tollit left the meeting.

xi. DM/21/0485 – Milton House, Black Hill

Proposed two storey replacement rear extension

Mr Kennedy (LPS) highlighted the letter of objection submitted by the society and summarised that that there were two levels of objection: the loss of amenity (overlooking and light) to neighbours and Heritage, also being within the conservation area and the setting of a listed building. He considered that policies DP 26, 35 & 34 would be contravened and noted that the application made no mention of the lie of the land North towards Primavera and that this was misleading. In terms of Milton House, whilst not listed he would consider it be a heritage asset and to be preserved accordingly. In summation, he was concerned that should this application be permitted, it would set a very poor precedent, potentially encouraging others to play fast and loose with the Local Planning Authority's policy.

Mr Croft, an immediate neighbour spoke against the proposal highlighting its negative impact in terms of sunlight and daylight, with an increased 2m width and 3m apex being particularly overbearing, negatively affecting the enjoyment of the property and consequently that the proposed substantial additions to Milton House were unacceptable to occupants of Primavera.

Mr Tollit, another immediate neighbour also spoke against the proposal, noting that his property, Ladywell, is attached to Milton House and that the proposed plans with a 3m pitched roof would be overbearing and block light from its kitchen, bedroom and garden, exacerbated by the eastern aspect. He was also concerned at maintenance and drainage issues with the extension being built right up to the boundary, concluding that the loss of light, outlook and overbearing nature of the plans was unneighbourly.

Cllr Hersey was keen to strengthen the council's response and specifically that the proposal was contrary to policies DP 26 Character & Design, DP 35 Conservation Areas and DP 34 Listed Buildings and other Heritage Assets. Cllrs Leach and Woods adding that the proposal was inappropriate. Committee **agreed** to object to this proposal.

Lindfield Parish Council strongly objects to this application which as proposed would be overbearing and result in a loss of outlook for neighbouring property. Further, the changes to the property are considered to be unsuited to the Conservation Area and indeed to the property itself, which is considered to be a Heritage Asset.

The proposal does not meet a number of Mid Sussex District Plan policies including:-

DP 26 Character and Design which requires development that "*... does not cause significant harm to the amenities of existing nearby residents and future occupants of new dwellings, including taking account of the impact on privacy, outlook, daylight and sunlight ...*" It is notable that the topography of the site leads to a significant impact on surrounding property, which is not evident from the plans alone.

DP 35 – Conservation Areas which requires "*...extensions are sensitively designed to reflect the special characteristics of the area in terms of their scale, density, design...*"

DP 34 – Listed Buildings and Other Heritage Assets which requires the council "*...to conserve heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance, so that they can be enjoyed for their contribution to the character and quality of life of the District. Significance can be defined as the special interest of a heritage asset, which may be archaeological, architectural, artistic or historic...*"

Lindfield Parish Council

The significant impact on the neighbouring properties Primerva and Ladywell, within the Conservation Area, when considered in the light of both DP 26 and DP 35, should be sufficient to refuse an application of this scale, especially recognising its proximity to the neighbouring properties. The further loss of two gothic windows within Milton House and wider impact on the setting of nearby Listed Buildings further underlies the unsuitable nature of the works as currently proposed.

xii. DM/21/0643 - 48 Sunte Avenue

Proposed single storey outbuilding at bottom of rear garden

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application

xiii. DM/21/0704 – Dormy, 8 Brook Lane

Retrospective application to vary condition 3 of 13/01243/FUL for Velux windows as built

Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application

xiv. DM/21/0727 – West Wing, Old Place, High Street

T1- Yew - reduce crown by 1m

Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to works being carried out on trees under TPO protection where it is necessary. However, this application suggests a precautionary approach although there is no indication within the documents submitted that a qualified Tree Surgeon has been consulted or that there is a concern with the condition of the trees (Section 4, Q1). Accordingly, LPC requests that the Planning Authority's Tree Officer is satisfied in both these regards and that any works are carried out in accordance with BS 3998:1989 Recommendation for tree work.

267. 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.

267.1 The Deputy Parish Clerk advised that MSDC had refused DM/20/4729 & 4732 Boarsland, 72 High Street rear extensions, which P&TC had not objected to. Committee **noted** this.

268. Lewes Road TRO Update

268.1 Committee **noted** the outline timetable detailed in the paper submitted.

269. Action Points

269.1 Committee **noted** the outstanding items, with Cllr Blunden mentioning that he had spoken with three CLC members who had indicated that they were supportive of the proposed TRO.

270. Matters Arising

270.1 None

Cllrs Plass, Hersey and Blunden left the meeting at this point, with Cllr Upton taking the Chair
--

271. Planning Appeal AP/21/0012 – Tavistock & Summerhill School, Summerhill Lane

Committee **agreed** that the wording proposed in the paper be submitted to the Planning Inspector.

The meeting closed at 19.35.

The **next P&TC Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 30th March** and is expected to be held online using video conferencing. Full details to follow.