



BURGESS HILL TOWN COUNCIL

*Council Offices
96 Church Walk
Burgess Hill
West Sussex
RH15 9AS*

Tel: (01444) 247726
Fax: (01444) 233707
Website: <http://www.burgesshill.gov.uk>

16 July 2008

To: **MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

A **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** will be held in the Council Chamber on **MONDAY, 21 JULY 2008** at **19.00 hours**, when your attendance is required.

David Carden
Town Clerk

A G E N D A

1. **OPEN FORUM**

Members of the public are invited to put questions or to draw relevant matters to the Council's attention, prior to the commencement of business. This is for a period of up to fifteen minutes and shall be limited to three minutes per person.

2. **PRESENTATION BY LEE DANCE OF SOUTH EAST WATER**

3. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

An apology for absence has been received from Mrs Jacqui Landriani.

Members of the Planning & Transport Committee – Tony Balsdon, Simon Hicks, Sara Alderson-Jenkins, Denis Jones, Jacqui Landriani, Ronnie Paulsen and Ian Simpson.

4. **SUBSTITUTES**

Andrew Barrett-Miles will substitute for Mrs Jacqui Landriani.

5. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In respect of any matter on the agenda.

6. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

7. **MINUTES**

To consider the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 7 July 2008 (copy herewith).

8. **TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

9. **FORMER SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS 08.01644.OUT**

10. **SOUTH EAST WATER'S DRAFT WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2010-2035 AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT CONSULTATION**

11. **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78 APPEAL**

12. **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - SECTION 78 APPEAL DECISION**

13. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

14. **MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL DELEGATED DECISIONS**

8. **TOWN & COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

Applications (as set out in the accompanying schedule) under the Town & Country Planning Act, 1990 received by Mid Sussex District Council and forwarded for observations since Monday, 7 July 2008 to be considered.

NOTE: The Committee are reminded that when considering these applications they should bear in mind the implications of the Town Council's Environmental Charter.

9. **FORMER SEWAGE TREATMENT WORKS 08.01644.OUT**

- 9.1 At their meeting of 23 June 2008 the Committee deferred making a decision on this application pending a report from the Town Council's retained planning consultant, Richard Walker (Page 219 of the Minutes refers). A copy of the draft report will be available to the Committee in advance of the meeting.

08.1644.OUT

SJA

LEYLANDS WARD

Land at and Adjacent to the Former Sewage Treatment Works Fairbridge Way. (Fairbridge Developments Ltd & Glenbeigh Developments Ltd)

Development comprising the redevelopment of the former sewage treatment works to provide up to 325 residential dwellings (Class C3), the relocation of the existing residential gypsy site, a community hall with associated access and landscaping at Fairbridge Way. Such development to include the remediation of the Tip, demolition and excavation of (derelict) existing buildings and infrastructure associated with previous use as a sewage treatment works, and the remodelling and remediation of the remainder of the site to provide for revised ground contours and development platforms; strategic landscape, realigning of existing service infrastructure (to include the laying out of foul and surface drainage infrastructure and water attenuation), and new vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access routes, ancillary engineering and other operations.

- 9.2 On 23 June 2008 the Committee agreed that the following points should be considered in the preparation of Richard Walker's report:

- The Inspector rejected this as a small scale housing site prior to 2016;
- It was allocated for business use at the moment and if it were to be developed for housing an allocation for land for business use would have to be made elsewhere;
- The integration of this site with development to the North, Maple Drive and into the Town Centre needed to be planned as there were no shops or other services on site;

- Access and transport issues needed to be addressed;
- Waste traffic needed to be separated from residential traffic;
- There was a need for cycleways, pathways etc and concern was expressed that the current proposals may not be sufficiently wide;
- Drainage; and
- The Core Strategy needs to address the use of this site.

9.3 **NOTE:** The previous history on this site is as follows:

BH.01.00402.OUTES - an application for the redevelopment of the former sewage treatment works for an employment development (within Classes B1, B2 and B8) together with improvement to existing roundabout, car parking and landscaping was considered by this Council in April 2001 when the following comments were made:

“No Objections – the application is supported, in principle, as it is more manageable, though lacks imagination. Concern is expressed that the application does not adhere to the Mid Sussex Local Plan Deposit Draft BH11, which states:

- a) that no development shall take place until the existing residential gypsy accommodation has been replaced and is available for use and Freeks Lane has been improved;
- b) a substantial belt of landscaping shall be provided along the northern and western boundaries of the site. This shall incorporate a bridleway specifically designed for use by walkers, cyclists and horse riders; and,
- c) the existing access from the A273 should be improved.

The Town Council welcomes the access to the Civic Amenity Site via Fairbridge Way and not Marchants Way. It is suggested that the landscaping of the site should be in keeping and not detrimental to neighbouring properties.

Mid Sussex District Council **APPROVED** this application in May 2003 and Condition 1 states:

- “1) Approval of the details of the siting, design and external appearance of the buildings and landscaping of the site (hereinafter called the “reserved matters”) shall be obtained from the Local Planning Authority, prior to the commencement of development on site.

Application for approval of the reserved matters shall be made to the Local Planning Authority before the expiration of 3 years from the date of this permission.

The development hereby permitted shall be begun either before the expiration of 5 years from the date of this permission, or before the

expiration of 2 years from the date of approval of the last of the reserved matters to be approved, whichever is the later.

Reason: To enable the Local Planning Authority to control the development in detail and to comply with Section 92 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.”

BH.05.01509.COND - an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 for permission to develop land without complying with Condition (1) of planning permission BH.01.402.OUTES. Removal of Condition (1) and replacement with a Condition with an end date of 2011 was considered by this Council in August 2005 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal. There is no obvious reason for removal of this condition.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in August 2006.

BH.07.01863.OUT – An application for a development comprising the redevelopment of the former sewage treatment works to provide up to 400 residential dwellings (Class 3) with associated access and landscaping. was considered by this Council in July 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal - This application is premature. The outcome of the small scale housing inquiry and the Town Wide Master Plan should be awaited before decisions on this site are made. In the current structure plan this site is allocated for commercial/industrial use and no reason could be seen to change the use at this stage, particularly if Burgess Hill were to take more houses and the waste transfer site needed to expand. The site is strategically important for any future development to the north of Burgess Hill in terms of access, drainage, sewerage and the Green Crescent. If this site were to be developed these issues would need to be addressed.

Highways issues were identified with access to the development as types of traffic would be mixed with some going to the houses and others to the waste transfer site. There would need to be a separate access point for the residential area and concern was expressed that one access point was insufficient for 400 houses.

The access road is prone to flooding and this would need to be addressed.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in September 2007.

This site was referred to in the November 2007 Inspector’s Report on the Examination into The Small Scale Housing Allocations Development Plan Document.

9.4 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's views on the draft report are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – Considered within the draft response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – This is a consultation from a partner organisation.

10. SOUTH EAST WATER'S DRAFT WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2010-2035 AND ENVIRONMENTAL REPORT CONSULTATION

10.1 At the Planning meeting on 27 May 2008 it was agreed that the Strategic Planning Key Area Group (KAG) would prepare a response to this document (Minute 308 refers). This Group met on 14 July to consider the document. Their initial views are set out below in the extract from the notes of the meeting, but they were keen to discuss the issue further with Lee Dance of South East Water (see agenda item 2) before finalising the response.

10.2 “Ian Simpson stated that he had attended the consultation exhibition at Clair Hall and informed the KAG that Burgess Hill fell into a region where it was proposed to make use of existing infrastructure, which included Clay Hill in Lewes. It was noted that the balance between supply and demand was met once Clay Hill was included. However, it was felt that until the new reservoir was operational in 2020 Burgess Hill faced a difficult 12 years. Concern was expressed that any housing built between now and 2020 created additional pressure on the locality and there were already water pressure problems in areas to the east of the town. This situation would rapidly become worse with houses on “windfall” sites being built at a rate of 70 per annum and the recently agreed Small Scale Housing sites. It was noted that when Folders Farm had been developed it had put further pressure on the water supply and that the system had had to be upgraded for sewage disposal.

David Carden, the Town Clerk, had requested the background to some of the statements made in the consultation and in the management plans that were available on South East Water's website at:

http://www.southeastwater.co.uk/environment/assets/SEW_WRMP_Summary.pdf

Discussion ensued over current policies and it was noted that South East Water was responsible for pipes up to the meter and the home owner from

the meter to the property. In addition, if a home owner wanted a meter then they currently had to pay for it.

The KAG felt that it would be interesting to see South East Water's proposals to Ofwat to understand their investment programme.

It was agreed that the long term proposals were acceptable but the KAG questioned the short term proposals and felt that these should form the basis of the questioning to Lee Dance at the Planning Committee meeting.

RESOLVED that:

the comments of the KAG be incorporated into the Planning Agenda for the meeting on 21 July 2008 and then the comments from the Planning meeting form the basis of a response to be approved by Andrew Barrett-Miles and Tony Balsdon."

10.3 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's views are sought following the discussion with Lee Dance.

Environmental Charter Implications – These will be considered with the draft response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – This is a consultation from South East Water.

11. TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 – SECTION 78 APPEAL

11.1 Notification has been received that the following appeal has been made to the Planning Inspectorate.

08.01555.TREE

Appeal by: Mr K Traylen

Land at: **82 Meadow Lane**

Proposed Development: Oak (T1) - Reduce and reshape canopy by 30%.

Appeal Ref: APP/TPO/D3830/111

11.2 Mid Sussex District Council's reasons for refusal were:-

"The proposed reduction is considered excessive and unwarranted, as the tree has not grown significantly since 2004. Furthermore, the proposed reduction would have an adverse effect on the visual amenity value of this very prominent and important tree."

11.3 The Town Council's comments were as follows:-

“**Objection** – the growth of the trees since 2004 does not appear sufficient to warrant this work at this time.”

11.4 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee is recommended to:-

- A) support the reasons for refusal and reiterate their previous comments to the Planning Inspectorate; and,
- B) request copies of the appeal decision letter.

Environmental Charter Implications – These were considered with the original application.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – The Town Council was consulted on the original application.

12. **TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990 - SECTION 78 APPEAL DECISION**

12.1 Notification has been received from the Planning Inspectorate that the following appeal has been WITHDRAWN.

07.03828.FUL.

Appeal by: (Piazza Developments Ltd)

Land at: **6-10 Junction Road**

Proposed Development: Conversion of existing office, manufacturing and storage buildings into 2 houses and 4 flats.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A.08/2074858/NWF

12.2 Notification has been received from the Planning Inspectorate that the Appeal in respect of the following application has been ALLOWED.

07.03594.ADV

Appeal by: (H Krogsgaard- Nielsen)

Land at: **96 Junction Road**

Proposed Development: 1 pole type sign non illuminated.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/H/08/1203057

12.3 **RECOMMENDATION**

Members are requested to note the contents of this report.

Environmental Charter Implications – These were considered with the original applications.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – The Town Council was consulted on the original applications.

13. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS**

- 13.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the following Tree Preservation Orders were confirmed on 2 July and 19 June 2008 respectively.

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No 6)
Tree Preservation Order 2008
Tudor House, Gloucester Road

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No 2)
Tree Preservation Order 2008
Land Rear of 36-44 Church Road

- 13.2 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the following Tree Preservation Order was NOT confirmed on 19 June 2008.

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No 5)
Tree Preservation Order 2008
75b Cants Lane

13.3 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee is requested to note the contents of this report.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

14. **MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL DELEGATED DECISIONS**

- 14.1 The following delegated decisions, which have been taken by Mid Sussex District Council Planning Officers in the last month, differ from the recommendations made by this Committee. Members are reminded that the applications and paperwork are in the relevant section in the Planning Trolley.

- a) 08.01031.FUL
Land Adjacent to Charles Avenue
Development of the site to provide a 62 bedroom Premier Inn and ancillary Beefeater restaurant.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.

This application has been WITHDRAWN.

- b) 08.01341.FUL
38 Charlwood Road
Two storey side extension.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.

- c) 08.01452.FUL
4 Woodland Crescent
2 storey side extension.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.

14.2 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is requested to note the contents of this report.

Environmental Charter Implications – These were considered with the original applications.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – The Town Council was consulted on the original applications.

SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 25 July 2008.

08.01700.FUL.AP (LW) FRANKLANDS WARD

77 Folders Lane (Mr Chris Adair)

Demolition of existing 5 bed house and erection of 8 no. new dwellings (four no. 1 bed flats, three no. 2 bed flats and one no. 2 bed bungalow). Amended plans received showing removal of flat and reduction of car port.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.06.01605.FUL - an application for demolition of property and erection of 10 No. flats, garaging and parking was considered by this Council in September 2006 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal - Concern was expressed over the proposed entrance onto Folders Lane and the proximity to the Folders Farm development and railway bridge sites, which would have an impact on traffic flow. It was suggested that a traffic survey be undertaken with a traffic management scheme in mind before any more plans were approved.

It was considered an unneighbourly development and an overdevelopment of the site. Concern was expressed regarding pedestrian safety as there was no pavement on this side of the road and pedestrians would have to cross to the south side (only pavement).

The proposed development was not in keeping with the street scene and it was feared that this would cause a ‘domino effect’ which would change the character of the area.

If Mid Sussex District Council is minded to approve this application some traffic management scheme needs to be introduced.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in November 2006.

BH.06.02768.FUL - an application for demolition of existing property and the erection of two detached dwellings and 4 no. flats, garaging and parking was considered by this Council in January 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – although there had been some improvements in design to overcome the problem of overlooking this was still an overdevelopment of the site. If the District Council was minded to approve this application no work should commence on site until the

30 mph traffic management scheme for Folders Lane had been fully implemented.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in June 2007.

BH.06.02768.FUL.AP - an application for demolition of existing property and the erection of two detached dwellings and 4 no. flats, garaging and parking. Amended plans received showing reduction in height of the two proposed detached dwellings were considered by this Council in April 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – the plans were incorrect and there was very little difference from previous plans that had been submitted. The plans were unneighbourly and the site overdeveloped. It was felt inappropriate to build flats in a semi-rural location. If Mid Sussex District Council were minded to approve this application no work should commence on site until the 30mph traffic scheme for Folders Lane had been fully implemented.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in June 2007.

BH.06.02768.FUL.AP1 - an application for demolition of existing property and the erection of two detached dwellings and 4 no. flats, garaging and parking. Amended plans received 09.03.2007 showing a reduction in height of the two proposed detached dwellings and amended plans received 02.04.07 showing reduction in height on plots 1 and 2, and repositioning of plot 1 further forward were considered by this Council in April 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – there was no material difference between this and previous applications. Flats on Folders Lane had been refused for the Folders Farm development and should be refused for this application. The development was unneighbourly (particularly to 11 Saddlers Close), out of keeping with the street scene and an overdevelopment of the site. Small gardens were out of character with the detached properties on Folders Lane. The flow of traffic on Folders Lane would increase.

The previous comments were reiterated:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – the plans were incorrect and there was very little difference from previous plans that had been submitted. The plans were unneighbourly and the site overdeveloped. It was felt inappropriate to build flats in a semi-rural location. If Mid Sussex District Council were minded to approve this application no work should commence on site until the 30mph traffic scheme for Folders Lane had been fully implemented.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in June 2007.

An appeal was LODGED in July 2007 and was DISMISSED in March 2008.

08.01700.FUL - an application for demolition of existing 5 bed house and erection of 8 no. new dwellings (four no. 1 bed flats, three no. 2 bed flats and one no. 2 bed bungalow) was considered by this Council in June 2008 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal. The Committee accepted that the new application had overcome some of the unneighbourliness of the previous ones but if the District Council were minded to approve this application it was requested that conditions be added limiting the height of the hedge to 2.2 metres and preventing any dormer windows being added to the proposed bungalow.

This was an overdevelopment of the site due to the loss of garden space which would be replaced by parking spaces and aggravated by insufficient parking for visitors in a location predominantly accessed by car. There was no on-street parking provision and this made it dangerous. It was felt that it was inappropriate to build flats in a semi rural location.

In addition to the access required to no 77, 77b Folders Lane would also require a new vehicular access at a potentially dangerous point on Folders Lane for traffic coming from the east, leading to a loss of vegetation and therefore a significant change to the street scene.

Mid Sussex District Council should liaise with West Sussex County Council over the cumulative effect on traffic east of the railway.”

Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine this application.

08.01733.FUL

(HM)

MEEDS WARD

197 Lower Church Road

(Mr Richard Williams)

Conversion of existing shop and bedsits to form two self-contained one bedroom flats and two self-contained studio flats. Two storey extension to rear, removal of shopfront and alterations to front elevation.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.00.00797.FUL – a retrospective application to reinstate first upper floors to residential creating 2 x studio and 1 x 2 bed self contained flats; separate rear of ground floor to create self contained studio flat was considered by this Council in May 2000 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval - the Council regrets the retrospective nature of this application.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in May 2000.

08.01838.FUL (CB) VICTORIA WARD

Fortes Bakery, 55 Victoria Road (Mr Joseph King)

The erection of a three storey block of offices as an extension to an industrial unit.

08.01972.FUL (RB) LEYLANDS WARD

**Units 1-10 Ashwyn Business Centre,
Marchants Way** (Mr P Calland, S D Holdings Ltd)

To erect 2m triple point palisade fencing, with two leaf matching access gates across both accesses to Ashwyn Business Centre.

08.02004.FUL (RB) DUNSTALL WARD

24 Coulstock Road (Mrs Woodall)

Erect a PVCU conservatory to property.

08.02029.FUL (RB) DUNSTALL WARD

20 The Maltings (Mr L Partridge)

Conversion of existing garage to provide enhanced living space and extension over garage to provide enlarged bed 1 and guest bedroom. New porch to front elevation.

08.02068.FUL (LW) FRANKLANDS WARD

1 Greenlands Close (Clive Barton)

First floor bathroom extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.01.02559.FUL - an application for a first floor extension to provide third bedroom and bathroom was considered by this Council in January 2002 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in January 2002.

08.00645.FUL - an application for a first floor extension was considered by this Council in April 2008 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in May 2008.

08.02154.FUL (AW) FRANKLANDS WARD

7 Rosebarn Close (Mr & Mrs W Rhys-Williams)

Proposed alteration and garage conversion (including mono-pitch roof to replace existing flat roof).

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.01.00632.FUL - an application for a proposed single storey extension to rear of property was considered by this Council in April 2001 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in May 2001.

08.02207.COU (LW) MEEDS WARD

Bar Pulse, 31 The Martlets (Mr Simon Hancock)

1m high portable screens to enclose eating area. Change of use from pedestrian public highway to A4 use.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.03868.COU - an application for portable screens to enclose eating area was considered by this Council in January 2008 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval providing a thoroughfare is maintained that will allow people and double buggies to get through as space is at a premium in this area, especially on market days.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in July 2008.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 1 August 2008.

08.01640.TREE.AMENDED (DS) FRANKLANDS WARD

Land to the rear of 1-3 Franklands Close (Miss M McMonagle - Maule & Co)

Two Oaks within Group G19 - Reduce by 15% and thin by 20%. Amended Description.

NOTE: This application was originally considered by this Council in May 2008 when the following comments were made:

“Deferred – pending comments from The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council who is awaiting clarification on this application.”

The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has now received clarification and his comments are as follows:

“This has now been sorted out and I have no objection to the amended scheme to reduce and balance.”

08.02071.FUL (CB) VICTORIA WARD

Capers Portland Road (Mr Martin)

Proposed loft conversion to existing property, with rear gable extension.

08.02073.FUL (MR) MEEDS WARD

11 Park Road (Mr Peter Fry)

Single storey rear conservatory.

NOTE: This site was the subject of a new garage and front entrance porch in 1989 (BH.018.89 refers).

4 Woodland Crescent

(Mr James Bruce)

New porch. This is an application to establish whether the proposed development is lawful: this will be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed development cannot be taken into account.

PRE-APPLICATION ADVICE RECEIVED REPRODUCED FROM THE APPLICATION FORM:

A previous application for a lawful development certificate, 07.03220.LDC, was refused because the porch was slightly higher than 3m. This has been corrected. The previous application was also for a two storey side extension and it was deemed that part of the extension (the porch) would be nearer the highway than the dwelling house. The two storey extension has now been certified under a separate application, 08.00571.LDC.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.06.00950.FUL – An application for a proposed new end of terrace house and associated work to existing property was considered by this Council in May 2006 when the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Refusal** – the property would increase from three to six bedrooms and this would be an overdevelopment of the site. There could be an increase in on-street parking in the main thoroughfare of Cants Lane.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in June 2006.

An APPEAL was lodged and subsequently DISMISSED on 20 June 2007.

BH.07.00144.FUL - an application for a proposed new 2 bed end of terrace house was considered by this Council in February 2007 when the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Refusal** – this was an overdevelopment of the site and would change the street scene in this small crescent. It would be unacceptable in terms of road safety. The highways advice in the email correspondence from the Planning Liaison Engineer was confusing and out of date. There was a need for off street parking as Cants Lane was narrow and car parking took place on the north side of the road restricting two way flows. Since the report was written in 2005 St Andrew’s Community Centre had been developed and on-street parking had increased during the day and night.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in March 2007.

An Appeal was lodged in October 2007 and subsequently DISMISSED in January 2008.

BH.07.03220.LDC - an application for a two storey side extension and front entrance porch was considered by this Council in November 2008. This was an application to establish whether the proposed development was lawful: this was a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed development could not be taken into account. The following comments were made:

“The situation regarding a legal decision was noted.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in December 2007.

08.00571.LDC - an application for two storey side extension. This is an application to establish whether the proposed development is lawful: this will be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed development cannot be taken into account was considered by this Council in March 2008 when the following comments were made:

“The situation regarding a legal decision was noted.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2008.

08.01452.FUL - an application for a 2 storey side extension was considered by this Council in May 2008 when the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Approval.** Mid Sussex District Council is requested to ensure that this dwelling is not converted into two separate dwellings in the future.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in June 2008.

08.02214.FUL

(SK)

VICTORIA WARD

116 Royal George Road

(Simon Hull)

Proposed new single storey extension to the rear and roof conversion including rear dormer window.

08.02249.TCA

(DS)

VICTORIA WARD

Capers, Portland Road

(Miss T Bush-Nelson)

Fell 1 Yew and 1 Hazel. Trim back canopy of Ash on eastern side by approximately 2m.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has no objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as follows:

“Visited by prior appointment with Miss Bush-Nelson who has recently bought the property. The garden was very overgrown and, following my previous visit on 7 May 2008 (and my advice), much of the overgrown vegetation has now been cleared so that the trees can be assessed.

At this stage I suggested that a small Yew and a Hazel be felled to allow more light into the garden. In addition, I suggested that a small Ash be trimmed back on its eastern side by about 2m. This will have no significant effect on visual amenity.

Further, I suggested that the ivy be cut at the bottom of other trees so that, when it has died, a further assessment of those other trees can be made.”

08.02254.TREE

(DS)

FRANKLANDS WARD

7 Thornhurst

(Mr & Mrs R Charsley)

Oak (T18) - Reduce overall canopy by 1.0 - 1.5m and thin by 15% - 20%.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has no objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as follows:

“Visited by prior appointment with Mrs Charsley,

The Oak (T18) was reduced in 2004 (BH/04/01768/TREE) and has since grown.

This is a potentially very large tree in a relatively small garden and so needs to be kept under control. It is also very close to the neighbouring property, No 8.

I suggested that the canopy be reduced overall by up to 1.5m and thinned by up to 20%. This will not have a significant impact on the tree’s appearance.”

08.02255.TREE

(DS)

VICTORIA WARD

6 Hammonds Gardens

(Mr M Shipp)

Ash (T5) - Thin canopy by 15% - 20% and reduce by approximately 1.5m - 2.0m.

Oak (T6) - Trim back canopy on southern side to clear adjacent property.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has no objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as follows:

“Visited by prior appointment with Mr Shipp. Also present was a neighbour from Warelands.

The Ash (T5) has a dense canopy overhanging Warelands and several branches have recently broken off.

I suggested that the canopy be thinned by 15%-20% and the canopy reduced overall by 1.5m-2m so that the weight of the branches is lessened. This will not have a significant impact on the overall appearance of the tree in the longer term.

The Oak (T6) overhangs the roof of 3 Owen Close, almost touching the roof and facilitating access by squirrels. As the canopy is slightly more weighty on its southern side I suggested that it be trimmed back to clear 3 Owen Close. This would not have a significant impact on the tree’s appearance.”

08.02297.TCA

(DS)

FRANKLANDS WARD

Highmead, Birchwood Grove Road

(Mr Robert Eggleston)

Sycamore - trim back to boundary.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council’s comments will be available at the meeting:
