

Lindfield Parish Council

Minutes of the **PLANNING AND TRAFFIC COMMITTEE** meeting held on
Tuesday **28th June 2022** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

P&TC Members:

Parish Councillors: Mr R Plass (Chair)
Mrs M Hersey (Vice- Chair)
Mr W Blunden*
Mrs L Grace
Mr M Leach
Mrs A Matthews
Mr J Stevens
Mrs V Upton*
Mr C Wood*
Mr I Wilson
* Denotes absent from meeting

In attendance: 31 Members of the public
Mr M Harris, Freeths
Lindfield Society (LS)
Mr D Parsons (Deputy Parish Clerk)

The Meeting commenced at **20:00**.

388. Apologies

388.1 Apologies from Cllrs Upton, Wood and Blunden were received, and the reasons accepted.

389. Declarations of Interest

389.1 None advised.

390. Approval of Minutes

390.1 The Chair noted that the draft Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 7th June 2022 had previously been circulated and sought any members comments. Committee **agreed** that the Chair should sign the Minutes as a true record of that meeting.

391. Questions/comments from members of the public

391.1 None

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

Appendix One shows the application details and agreed responses.

For each application, the observations of the members who had specifically studied the plans were read out and any public comments received, before discussion by the Committee, as summarised below (where applicable). For applications where Lindfield Preservation Society (LPS) had no comments, or their view was 'No objection' this is not recorded.

392.1 In respect of Appendix One, item v, **DM/22/1893 – Site A, Land at the entrance, The Welkin:**

392.2 LS considered that the Application for Site A would eliminate nearly half the greenspace at the entrance to the Welkin, which was integral to the overall design of the estate and its designation as an Area of Townscape Character. Further, that the proposal was contrary to DP 26 which requires that development "*protects open spaces, trees, and gardens that contribute to the character of the area gardens*" and accordingly should be refused. LS also highlighted the impact on residents' amenity due to the net loss of parking spaces caused by the proposals which the Society would oppose.

392.3 Mr Harris, of Freeth's spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the proposal. He noted that both schemes have been formulated following feedback from the respective local councils and are designed to be sympathetic to the Estate. That the scheme(s) were designed to respect the Area of Townscape Character designations and retain open space and clear views across The Welkin, with trees being unaffected by the proposals. Further, that parking for existing and proposed residents is considered sufficient, that sustainable principles were incorporated in the units' designs and that other benefits included footpath improvements, EV charging points and

Lindfield Parish Council

- additional outdoor seating. He noted comments around the Construction Management Plan and that these could be addressed.
- 392.4 Ms V Saunders spoke as resident of The Welkin against the applications, noting the very limited consultation to immediate neighbours by MSDC, when the matter is a much wider issue, in conflict with the designation as an Area of Townscape Character within the Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan. Further, that the open vistas and greenspaces evident throughout the estate will be lost if properties are squeezed in at every corner. She considered that the developers consultation to a handful of homes was totally inadequate for a proposal which would impact all 170 households on the estate and that their assertions of 'underused' parts of the estate is far from the case, with the greenspace at Site A used extensively by residents, noting also that Site B would insert a totally alien relationship between new and existing properties.
- 392.5 The Chair observed that there were limited '*planning issues*' with which to completely oppose the proposal.
- 392.6 For Appendix One, item vi **DM/22/1890, Site B, Land at the entrance, Green Meadows:**
- 392.7 LS observed that the proposer's description of "under-used land," failed to understand that open spaces are part of The Welkin's character and that the Design and Access Statement's assertion of "low biodiversity" would not be improved by building two houses, rather than planting trees and shrubs. Further that the proposal did not fit DP 26 development "creates a sense of place while addressing the character and scale of the surrounding buildings and landscape" and should fail for this reason. LS also noted the overbearing mass of the proposal and its impact on neighbouring properties, as well as the parking issues flagged under the related application.
- 392.8 Mr Harris, of Freeth's spoke on behalf of the applicant in support of the proposal (see also 392.3 above). Additionally, he noted that this was currently an area of untidy tarmac and that the proposed houses were designed to be in proportion to the nearby bungalows, taking care to consider residents' amenity, including the impact on sunlight and daylight.
- 392.9 Ms B Lines spoke as a freeholder living behind Site B and advised that she had attended the developer's presentation. She considered that the area was not 'unloved' but had been neglected by Hamway's over recent years. Further, that the proposal did not fit the estate, where every other bungalow had green space front and rear and that no properties face each other as the new builds would, themselves obliterating the outlook for existing residents. She noted that 15 houses have no parking, and that this proposal would lose 7 current spaces, and was concerned that access for bin lorries would be difficult. Finally, that the existing greenspace assists with drainage, which can be challenging on clay; and that the new builds would reduce the available soakaway area.
- 392.10 Cllr Hersey noted that the applications were being 'called in' to MSDC's Planning Committee and that this was appropriate, to ensure that the application was fully considered by members alongside council officer's reports
- 392.11 The Chair sought members views and it was **agreed** to object to both proposals, with the final wording to be agreed by the Deputy Parish Clerk under the Temporary Delegated Authority.
- 393. 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.**
- 393.1 None.
- 394. Outstanding Action Points**
- 394.1 The Deputy Parish Clerk (DPC) referenced the previously circulated paper, which was **noted** by Committee who also sought that consideration be given to re-advertising the Tree warden role and review whether a paid role or use of professional advisors might be an appropriate solution.
- 394.2 Cllr Mathews updated Committee on the most recent meeting with the school, which seeks to progress an application for yellow lines and seeking Cllr Wall's (WSCC) support
- 394.3 It was agreed that the DPC should investigate to present papers for both items above to a future committee.
- 395. Cycleways Update**
- 395.1 Cllr Grace advised that the next meeting had been cancelled and was to be rearranged. Committee **noted** this update.
- 396. TRO**

Lindfield Parish Council

396.1 The DPC advised that following the recent consultation, two further responses had been received and that the Council's consultant was now updating the original report with a view to addressing the various points raised by WSCC Highways. Committee **noted this update**.

397. Neighbourhood Plan

397.1 The DPC advised that following a recent presentation by MSDC, it is not a legal or policy requirement to update the Neighbourhood Plan, noting that updated District Plan's would gradually supersede individual elements. Committee **agreed** that Full Council should be apprised of the position and that the DPC should contact Lindfield Rural Parish Council, as joint owners of the NP, in considering any future updating.

398. Black Hill Parking

398.1 See 394.2 above.

399. Matters Arising.

399.1 None

The meeting closed at 20:45.

The **next P&TC Meeting is scheduled for Tuesday 19th July 2022**
at 8pm in the King Edward Hall.

Lindfield Parish Council

Appendix One – Responses to Planning Applications received from Mid Sussex District Council

Item	MSDC Application Year	MSDC Reference	PROPERTY NAME/ NUMBER	STREET	PROPOSAL
i	2022	1657	Ladywell	Black Hill	Replace existing conservatory with tiled pitched roof to match existing, replace existing pitched glazed roof to rear and new single storey rear extension.
RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application, subject to comments from MSDC's Conservation Officer					
ii	2022	1870	7	Finches Gardens	T4 - Oak - Reduce over extended branches by 1-1.5m and thin crown by 15%
RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.					
iii	2022	1203	10	Woodpecker Chase	Proposed single storey rear extension with flat roof and roof lantern (Revised Floor Plans and Elevations received 08.06.2022. Revised Block Plan received 15.06.2022)
RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council considers that it's response dated 18/5/22 remains apposite.					
iv	2022	1784	70	Meadow Drive	Demolition of single storey side extension and provision of 2 storey side and single storey rear extension and front entrance porch.
RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council has no objections to this application.					

Lindfield Parish Council

Appendix One – Responses to Planning Applications received from Mid Sussex District Council

Item	MSDC Application Year	MSDC Reference	PROPERTY NAME/ NUMBER	STREET	PROPOSAL
v	2022	1893	Site A, Land at the entrance	The Welkin	Erection of 2 three-bedroom dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and footpath works.
<p>RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to this proposal which seeks to build on the public, open green space on the left-hand side of the entrance to The Welkin, contrary to this estate’s categorisation as an Area of Townscape Character, as set out in Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan 2014-31 (Policy 7), which states that proposals should:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. “retain trees, frontage hedgerows and walls which contribute to the character and appearance of the area; ii. retain areas of open space, (including private gardens) which are open to public view and contribute to the character and appearance of the area; and iii. avoid the demolition of existing buildings which contribute to the character and appearance of the area.” <p>Clearly the proposal is contrary to point ii above as well as Policy DP 26 of MSDC’s District Plan 2014-31 which includes a strategic objective “4) To protect valued characteristics of the built environment for their historical and visual qualities.” Indeed, it is noted that the proposed development does not afford the same level of open green frontage as is provided to existing properties within the estate.</p> <p>Whilst not a planning issue, LPC is also concerned that the removal of existing kerbside parking will significantly exacerbate the parking challenges which are already evident across the estate. Any proposed changes to the estate should not only enhance its appearance but also build in improved parking arrangements for all residents. If MSDC is minded to approve the application notwithstanding the policy breaches detailed above, LPC would ask that MSDC and WSCC Highways carefully review this situation and in particular the statement within the applicant’s Transport Statement that alternative parking is “within a 200m walking distance.” This would seem to denude rather than contribute to residents’ amenity and potentially lead to increased noise and possibly conflict.</p> <p>Finally, the Construction Management Plan needs to be carefully constructed to address issues such as dust control, controlled deliveries, and the use of a Banksman as appropriate.</p>					

Lindfield Parish Council

Appendix One – Responses to Planning Applications received from Mid Sussex District Council

Item	MSDC Application Year	MSDC Reference	PROPERTY NAME/ NUMBER	STREET	PROPOSAL
vi	2022	1890	Site B, Land At the entrance	Green Meadows	Demolition of existing structures and erection of 2 three-bedroom dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated parking, landscaping and footpath works.
<p>RESPONSE: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to this proposal which seeks to build on an area of land which is currently open to all and is well used for solely required parking as well as contributing the to the open nature of the estate. This appears to be in conflict with the estate’s categorisation as an Area of Townscape Character, as set out in Lindfield and Lindfield Rural Neighbourhood Plan 2014-31 (Policy 7), which inter alia states that proposals should “...retain areas of open space, (including private gardens) which are open to public view and contribute to the character and appearance of the area.”</p> <p>Further, it would also seem contrary to Policy DP 26 of MSDC’s District Plan 2014-31 which includes a strategic objective “4) To protect valued characteristics of the built environment for their historical and visual qualities.” Additionally, immediate neighbours to the proposed development are likely to experience a loss of their amenity, particularly in terms of outlook and the overbearing nature of a two-storey property in an area currently comprising well-spaced bungalows. Indeed, it is noted that the proposed development does not afford the same level of open green frontage as is provided to existing properties within the estate.</p> <p>Whilst not a planning issue, LPC is also concerned that the removal of existing kerbside parking will significantly exacerbate the parking challenges which are already evident across the estate. Any proposed changes to the estate should not only enhance its appearance but also build in improved parking arrangements for all residents. If MSDC is minded to approve the application notwithstanding the policy breaches detailed above, LPC would ask that MSDC and WSCC Highways carefully review this situation and in particular the statement within the applicant’s Transport Statement that alternative parking is “within a 200m walking distance.” This would seem to denude rather than contribute to residents’ amenity and potentially lead to increased noise and possibly conflict.</p> <p>Finally, the Construction Management Plan needs to be carefully constructed to address issues such as dust control, controlled deliveries, and the use of a Banksman as appropriate.</p>					
<p>Note: Where application addresses are listed more than once with different reference numbers but the same description, this indicates that more than one type of planning application is required for the work (e.g., both a Householder or Full application and Listed Building Consent)</p>					