

Lindfield Parish Council

Minutes of the **PLANNING, TRANSPORT, and TRAFFIC COMMITTEE (PTTC)** meeting held on Tuesday **20th May 2025** in the King Edward Hall, Lindfield.

PTTC Members:

Parish Councillors:

Mrs V Upton (Chair)	Mrs I Burns*
Mr T Webster* (Vice-Chair)	Mr S Nisbett
Mrs A Matthews	Mr I Wilson
Mrs A Beecroft	Mr D Woolley
Mr W Blunden	

* Denotes absence from the meeting

In attendance: Mr A Funnell (Parish Clerk)
Two members of Fairer World Lindfield

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

379. Apologies

379.1 Apologies were received from Cllrs Burns and Webster, and the reasons accepted.

380. Declarations of Interest

380.1 None

381. Approval of Minutes

381.1 The Chair noted that the draft Minutes of the Planning and Traffic Committee meeting held on 29th April 2025 had previously been circulated and sought any members comments. The committee **agreed** that the Chair should sign the Minutes as a true record of the meeting.

382. Questions/comments from members of the public

382.1 A member of Fairer World Lindfield provided an update on their petition for 20 mph speed limits in the village. FWL were seeking local groups to join them in signing a letter requesting 20 mph limits. A question was raised over when the Parish Council would be ready to consider a report on proposals for 20 mph speed limits. Members advised that the Committee was in the process of confirming the membership of a Working Group that will research 20 mph before any proposals are brought forward to the Committee.

383. Planning Applications and other matters referred to the Parish Council by Mid Sussex District Council (MSDC), West Sussex County Council (WSCC) for consideration.

Appendix One shows the application details and agreed responses. For each application, the observations of the members who had studied the plans were read out and any public comments received, before discussion by the Committee, as summarised below (where applicable).

383.1 **DM/25/1184** - New front porch and front dormer, new two storey rear extension, side elevations reconfigurations. Discussion took place on whether the proposals were in keeping with the existing street scene. Members raised no objections to the proposed rear extension element of the application. Members **agreed** that Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to the proposed new front porch and front dormer in front of the established building line, negatively impacting on the street scene, recognising the established design across the wider Appledore development, contrary to DP26 Character and Design. LPC has no objection to the rear extension.

384. To receive reports on any significant planning decisions or issues made by MSDC, WSCC or other authority for consideration and to agree any further action which may need to be taken before the next scheduled meeting.

384.1 **AP/24/0044 Scamps Hill** – Members **noted** the Planning Inspectorate had allowed the appeal relating to the erection of up to 90 houses with all matters reserved except for means of access.

384.2 **DM/24/2997 The Slatch, Hickman's Lane** – Members **noted** MSDC refused the application to upgrade and improve the windows and kitchen doors, to which LPC had not objected, reasoning that the proposed uPVC windows will cause harm to the character and appearance of the property and its positive contribution to the Lindfield Conservation Area.

Lindfield Parish Council

384.3 **DM/24/2966 – 35 Blackthorns** – Members **noted** MSDC had refused the application for rear flat roof extension and cladding to first floor elevation, to which LPC had not objected, due to it being in the equivalent of Flood Zone 3b.

385. Report on any issues addressed under the Council's Scheme of Delegation and to consider further action required, if any.

385.1 None

386. Budget Report

386.1 Committee **noted** that there had been no expenditure in the financial year 2025/26.

387. Outstanding Action Points

387.1 Committee **noted** the Outstanding Action Points in the report circulated and their status.

388. Working Group 2025

388.1 Members agreed that the Working Group membership would be

- a) Cllr Beecroft: School Street/ Safer routes to School.
- b) Cllr Burns: Traffic Calming - 20mph limit.
- c) Cllr Matthews: Community Engagement.
- d) Cllr Upton: School Street/ Safer Routes to School.
- e) Cllr Webster: Community Engagement.
- f) Cllr Woolley: Traffic Calming - 20mph limit.

389. Matters Arising (for noting or deferral to a future meeting only)

389.1 The Clerk made members aware that he had attended a briefing from a planning consultant. The update had been informative. The Clerk recommended that committee members take the opportunity to attend planning updates.

The meeting closed at 20:19.

The Committee next meets on Tuesday 10th June 2025.

Lindfield Parish Council

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

Item	Year	Ref	Property	Street	Proposal
1	2025	1052	44	Brookway	Oak - Crown thinning of 30%
Response: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application					
2	2025	1104	Marlow House / 107	High Street	Retrospective planning permission for a variation to the scheme approved under DM/22/3694, incorporating some reinstatement works
Response: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application.					
3	2025	1103	Marlow House / 107	High Street	Retrospective planning permission for a variation to the scheme approved under DM/22/3694, incorporating some reinstatement works
Response: Lindfield Parish Council has no objection to this application					
4	2025	1184	15	Appledore Gardens	New front porch and front dormer, new two storey rear extension, side elevations reconfigurations
Response: Lindfield Parish Council (LPC) objects to the proposed new front porch and front dormer in front of the established building line, negatively impacting on the street scene, recognising the established design across the wider Appledore development, contrary to DP26 Character and Design. LPC has no objection to the rear extension.					
Notes: 1. Lawful Development Certificate (LDC) applications (“...an application to establish whether the development is lawful...”) - no response will normally be provided. 2. 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)					