



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>

26 September 2007

To: **MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE**

A **MEETING** of the **PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE** will be held in the Council Chamber on **MONDAY, 1 OCTOBER 2007** 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. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

3. **SUBSTITUTES**

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In respect of any matter on the agenda.

Members of the Planning & Transport Committee – Tony Balsdon, Simon Hicks, Denis Jones, Sue Knight, Jacqui Landriani, Ronnie Paulsen and Ian Simpson.

5. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

6. **MINUTES**

To consider the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning & Transport Committee held on Monday, 17 September 2007 (copy previously circulated).

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

8. **DRAFT ADUR CATCHMENT FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN**

9. **PROPOSED NEW PUFFIN CROSSINGS**

10. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

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

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

7. **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 17 September 2007 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.

8. **DRAFT ADUR CATCHMENT FLOOD MANAGEMENT PLAN**

8.1 The consultation draft of the River Adur Catchment Flood Management Plan has been received from the Environment Agency. A copy is available in the Council Chamber and the report can also be viewed on the Environment Agency's website at:

8.2 http://www.environmentagency.gov.uk/regions/southern/290158/954666/995532/1840127/?version=1&lang=_e

Comments are requested by 9 November 2007.

8.2 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – These will be considered in the response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

9. **PROPOSED NEW PUFFIN CROSSINGS**

9.1 Notification has been received from West Sussex County Council that they propose to install a signal-controlled pedestrian crossing at Queen Elizabeth Avenue (near School Close). This is in addition to the installation of a signal controlled crossing in Queen Elizabeth Avenue (near The Brow) which was considered as a Chairman's Announcement at the meeting on 17 September 2007 when the proposal was welcomed (Minute 103 refers). As there are now two proposals on the same road it is felt they need to be considered together before responding. Drawings are available in the Planning Trolley.

9.2 It is proposed to put a crossing just east of the junction with The Brow because a count has shown that most pedestrians cross at this point. This crossing will be funded from the 2007/08 capital works budget and was

approved as part of the forward programme for this financial year in March 2007. This crossing is planned for installation in December 2007.

- 9.3 The proposed crossing just west of the junction with School Close is where children cross to go to and from St Wilfrid's School. It is to be funded as part of a Safer Routes to School scheme from the 2008/09 budget and installation will be timed to coincide with other improvements at this location associated with the school route. This crossing will not be built until early next financial year.

9.4 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – To be considered in the response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

10. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

- 10.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the following Tree Preservation Order has been served on the owners and occupiers of the land.

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No. 2)
Tree Preservation Order 2007
Land East of Crescent Way

10.2 **RECOMMENDATION**

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

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Notification by a partner organisation.

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

- 11.1 Notification has been received from the Planning Inspectorate that the Appeals in respect of the following applications have been ALLOWED.

- 11.2 BH.06.01613.FUL
Appeal by: (Mrs M Wilding)
Land at: **1 Franklands Close**
Proposed Development: Double garage to rear garden.
Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/07/2041599
- 11.3 BH.06.02633.FUL
Appeal by: (Mr Malcolm Pedder)
Land at: **36/38 Folders Lane**
Proposed Development: Demolition of 36 and 38 Folders Lane and the erection of one chalet bungalow, two semi detached houses and seven detached houses (total ten) with an access road.
Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/07/2043961/NWF
- 11.4 Notification has been received from the Planning Inspectorate that the Appeal in respect of the following application has been DISMISSED. (Members are asked to note that Amended Plans for BH.06.02805.OUT are being considered on the Schedule of Applications.)
- 11.5 BH.06.02805.OUT
Appeal by: (CJP Developments Ltd)
Land at: **241 Junction Road**
Proposed Development: Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 7 no. new apartments (5 no. 2 bed and 2 no. 1 bed) and car parking.
Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/07/2043980/NWF
- 11.6 Notification has been received from the Government Office for the South East that the Appeal in respect of the following application has been DISMISSED.
- 11.7 BH.07.00257.TREE
Appeal by: (Kevin Allen)
Land at: **1 Poveys Close**
Proposed Development: Two Oaks (T4 and T5) - Reduce by 30%.
Appeal Ref: GOSE/107/001/MIDS50606

11.8 **RECOMMENDATION**

Members are requested to note the contents of this report.

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. MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL DELEGATED DECISIONS

12.1 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) BH.07.01251.FUL
31A Park Road
Erection of detached two storey house. Demolition of existing garage.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.
- b) BH.07.01590.FUL
The Code Night Club, 31 The Martlets
Proposed smoking area and pump room at first floor roof level.
BHTC – Recommend Refusal.
MSDC – Approved.
- c) BH.07.01951.FUL
23 Orchard Way
Roof conversion.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.
- d) BH.07.01970.FUL
Braemar, 22 Western Road
Proposed loft conversion to provide 1 no. additional bedroom and 1 no. bathroom.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC – Refused.
- e) BH.07.02111.COU
90 Church Walk
Erection of single storey rear extension to shop. Change of use from retail to Class A2 (financial and professional services).
BHTC – Recommend Refusal.
MSDC – Approved.
- f) BH.07.02347.TREE
9 South Lodge Close
Ash (T1) - Remove 3 lowest branches on northern side.
BHTC – Objection.
MSDC – Approved.

- g) BH.07.02493.TCA
34 Park Road
Bay - Reduce/reshape canopy by 25%. Ash - Remove two leaning stems on western and northern sides.
BHTC – No Objections - Bay. Objections – Ash.
MSDC – No Objections.

12.2 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 5 October 2007.

BH.07.01556.OUT.AP (SK) ST ANDREWS WARD

241 Junction Road (CJP Developments Ltd)

Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 8 no. 1 bed apartments and car parking. Amended plans received showing revised elevations and layout.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.04.02319.FUL - an application for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the formation of 12 no. 1 bedroom flats was considered by this Council in November 2004 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal This was an overdevelopment of the site and would have an adverse effect on adjacent properties. The development was too dense and too high even though one adjacent property had dormer windows. The impact additional surface water would have on the already over capacity drainage system in Worlds End was unacceptable. Clarification was also sought as to whether the sewage system had adequate capacity for the extra dwellings. The size of the proposed amenity area was derisory and did not provide a meaningful facility. It was also located next to the dustbins. In addition, the bins would be located farthest from the flats, which is poor design.

The proposed parking was inadequate and would exacerbate existing congestion with on-street parking which was unacceptable. At times refuse freighters had been unable to get through to collect waste which was an unacceptable health concern. The impact of this development on Junction Road was also unacceptable. Concern was also expressed over the effect the proposed development would have on the roots of adjacent mature trees. Clarification was sought as to whether access to the site for construction could be gained via a private road.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in November 2004.

An Appeal was lodged in May 2005 and was subsequently DISMISSED in September 2005.

BH.05.02676.FUL – An application for the demolition of an existing bungalow and the formation of 10 no.1 bedroom flats was considered by this Council in December 2005 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – This was an overdevelopment of the site and it would have an adverse effect on adjacent properties. It would also compromise highway safety as the junction with Junction Road was not adequate to take the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. It would also cause traffic congestion as only one car parking space had been allocated to each flat so there was no capacity for additional car ownership or visitors. It should be noted that Junction Close was a private road and Junction Road was also heavily congested. The local infrastructure was already struggling to cope. For example, any additional development would significantly increase surface water run off, which would compound the existing flooding problems in Worlds End and neighbouring properties. In addition, there was already a problem with sewage disposal in this area. The District Council’s attention was also drawn to the impact on a cherry tree in a neighbour’s garden.”

The application was WITHDRAWN in February 2006.

BH.05.02735.OUT – An application for 8 x 2 bedroom flats was considered by this Council in January 2006 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – This is not a site for which outline Planning Permission is appropriate. The Council’s previous objections were reiterated, namely:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – This was an overdevelopment of the site and it would have an adverse effect on adjacent properties. It would also compromise highway safety as the junction with Junction Road was not adequate to take the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. It would also cause traffic congestion as only one car parking space had been allocated to each flat so there was no capacity for additional car ownership or visitors. It should be noted that Junction Close was a private road and Junction Road was also heavily congested. The local infrastructure was already struggling to cope. For example, any additional development would significantly increase surface water run off, which would compound the existing flooding problems in Worlds End and neighbouring properties. In addition, there was already a problem with sewage disposal in this area. The District Council’s attention was also drawn to the impact on a cherry tree in a neighbour’s garden.”

The application was WITHDRAWN in February 2006.

BH.06.02805.OUT - an application for the demolition of an existing dwelling and erection of 7 no. new apartments and car parking; 5 no. 2 bed and 2 no. 1 bed was considered by this Council in February 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – although the application had been

reduced to 7 apartments the number of bedrooms was the same as BH.04.02319.FUL which had been dismissed at Appeal. The Council's previous comments were reiterated as follows:

“This was an overdevelopment of the site. It would have an adverse effect on adjacent properties. It would also compromise highway safety as the junction with Junction Road was not adequate to take the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. It would also cause traffic congestion as only one car parking space had been allocated to each flat so there was no capacity for additional car ownership or visitors. It should be noted that Junction Close was a private road and Junction Road was also heavily congested. The local infrastructure was already struggling to cope. For example, any additional development would significantly increase surface water run off, which would compound the existing flooding problems in Worlds End and neighbouring properties. In addition, there was already a problem with sewage disposal in this area.”

Mid Sussex District Council may wish to check the accuracy of the plans and look at the parking on this already busy road, which would be compounded by recent successful applications such as InTech.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in March 2006.

An Appeal was LODGED in May 2007 AND dismissed in September 2007.

NOTE: Application BH.06.02805.OUT is in the Planning Trolley at Agenda Item 11.

BH.07.01556.OUT - an application for the demolition of existing dwelling and erection of 8 no. 1 bed apartments and car parking was considered by this Council in July 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – the Council's previous comments were reiterated as follows:

“This was an overdevelopment of the site. It would have an adverse effect on adjacent properties. It would also compromise highway safety as the junction with Junction Road was not adequate to take the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed development. It would also cause traffic congestion as only one car parking space had been allocated to each flat so there was no capacity for additional car ownership or visitors. It should be noted that Junction Close was a private road and Junction Road was also heavily congested. The local infrastructure was already struggling to cope. For example, any additional development would significantly increase surface water run off, which would compound the existing flooding problems in Worlds End and neighbouring properties. In addition, there was already a

problem with sewage disposal in this area.”

Mid Sussex District Council may wish to check the accuracy of the plans and look at the parking on this already busy road, which would be compounded by recent successful applications such as InTech.”

Any increase in traffic or parking on this busy road would be detrimental to the safety of children walking to school and residents. The plans included another person’s property.”

Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine this application.

BH.07.02375.FUL (TM) DUNSTALL WARD

61 St Marys Road (Mr Matthew Plummer)

To extend the property boundary to 2 metres from the kerb-side and erect a 2 foot brick wall with a 6 foot fence on top.

BH.07.02715.FUL (TM) VICTORIA WARD

17 Erin Way (Mr Nick Draper)

Planning application to build a second storey extension above an existing ground floor extension and garage.

BH.07.02751.OUT (SM) ST ANDREWS WARD

49 Manor Road (Hazel MacQueen & Brian Blaber)

Proposed 3 no. 4 bed houses with ancillary garaging and car parking. Demolition of existing dwelling.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.154.93 – an outline application for one detached house and garage was considered by this Council in August 1993 when the following comments were made:

“Objection. The proposed development will actually lie within the “Development of Countryside” area (Strategic Gap), and therefore contravenes the policy and aims of the Local Plan – Env. 2.5 (c) and (d) in particular.

If Mid Sussex District Council were to approve the application consideration should be given to the proposal in relation to the neighbouring properties in the area, which are all bungalows. In addition the Committee question whether the site is large enough for such a development and the need of an access directly opposite Northway?"

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in September 1993.

An Appeal was lodged in April 1994 and DISMISSED in June 1994.

BH.155.93 - an Outline application for four pairs of semi-detached houses and garages was considered by this Council in August 1993 when the following comments were made:

“Strong Objections. The proposed development is deeper within the Strategic Gap than BH.154.93, and is, once again, in contravention of the Local Plan aims and policies. The Council feel very strongly that no development should take place in this area. The Committee draw the attention of Mid Sussex District Council to the comments made by the Inspector - concerning this area on the conclusion of the Local Inquiry – which inter alia referred to the area as “very much the countryside very much the break”.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED the application in September 1993.

An Appeal was lodged in April 1994 and DISMISSED in June 1994.

BH.04.01225.OUT - an application for the erection of a chalet-style dwelling was considered by this Council in June 2004 when the following comments were made:

Recommend Approval. The applicant has stated that she does not intend to have a new vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway constructed. It is recommended that a condition is placed on this application that the access is not constructed as the property is opposite Northway and an additional access point at this location is likely to create traffic problems.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in September 2004.

BH.04.01225.OUT.AP - an application for erection of a chalet-style dwelling; Amended Plans received showing a turning area on site enabling cars to leave in forward gear was considered by this Council in September 2004 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval. The applicant has stated that she does not intend to have a new vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway constructed. It is recommended that a condition is placed on this application that the access is not constructed as the property is opposite Northway and an additional access point at this location is likely to create traffic problems.”

It was agreed that the Committee would **Recommend Refusal** for the amended plans application. At a previous meeting held in June 2004, the Committee had recommended approval for the original application provided that the applicant did not intend to have a new vehicular or pedestrian access to the highway constructed. The proposed turning area in the Amended Plans was felt to be inappropriate as the property was opposite Northway and an additional access point at this location was likely to create traffic problems. It was also noted that neighbouring properties did not have a similar access point. (Minute 355 refers)

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in September 2004

BH.06.00039.FUL - an application for erection of a chalet-style dwelling was considered by this Council in February 2006 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – the previous objections were reiterated which were:

“The proposed development will actually lie within the “Development of Countryside” area (Strategic Gap), and therefore contravenes the policy and aims of the Local Plan – Env. 2.5 (c) and (d) in particular.

If Mid Sussex District Council deem to Approve the application consideration should be given to the proposal in relation to the neighbouring properties in the area, which are all bungalows. In addition the Committee question whether the site is large enough for such a development and the need of an access directly opposite Northway?””

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in February 2006.

BH.07.02752.OUT (SM) ST ANDREWS WARD

49 Manor Road (Hazel MacQueen & Brian Blaber)

Proposed 2 no. 2 bed houses and 2 no. 3 bed houses with ancillary garaging and car parking.

NOTE: See application BH.07.02751.OUT above for the previous history.

BH.07.02755.FUL (TM) ST ANDREWS WARD

46 Manor Road (Mr I Young)

Single storey rear extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.02018.FUL - an application for single storey rear extension was considered by this Council in August 2007 when APPROVAL was recommended.

This Application was WITHDRAWN in August 2007.

BH.07.02766.FUL (CB) MEEDS WARD

20 Holmesdale Road (Mrs Whent)

Erection of a white UPVC double glazed conservatory to the rear of the property.

BH.07.02784.FUL (TM) VICTORIA WARD

141 Orchard Road (Julian Dean)

Addition of a bedroom above an existing flat roof extension.

NOTE: This site was the subject of an application for a single storey rear and side extension in 1987 (BH.190.87 refers).

BH.07.02824.FUL

(HM)

ST ANDREWS WARD

7 Gladstone Road

(Mr R Andrews)

Demolition of existing garage and construction of two storey extension, construction of first floor extension over existing flat roofed addition; conversion of whole to two self contained flats.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

This site was the subject of an application for a ground floor extension to form new dining room and first floor extension to bedroom in 1980 (BH.200.80 refers). It was also the subject of an application for a ground floor extension to form new dining room and first floor extension to bedroom in 1981 (BH.48.81 refers).

BH.06.02105.FUL - an application for the demolition of an existing garage and construction of two storey flank extension; the conversion of the existing house and incorporation of the extension to create two self contained flats was considered by this Council in November 2006 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – this is an over intensification of development. It was noted that car parking provision had been reduced to one space which appeared too small to park a car on. There is no room on this road to absorb displacement parking. The loss of a family home and a garage was regretted.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in January 2007.

An Appeal was lodged in March 2007 and ALLOWED in June 2007.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 12 October 2007.

BH.07.01727.FUL

(GG)

DUNSTALL WARD

4 Saxby Road

(Mr Thomas Boyle)

Convert rear of garage to dining area 8ft x 8ft x 4in, with door to lounge.

BH.07.02067.FUL (GG) DUNSTALL WARD

17 The Hornbeams (Miss R Olarimi)

Proposed garage conversion.

BH.07.02448.FUL (TM) VICTORIA WARD

Tesco Stores Ltd, Jane Murray Way (Tesco Stores Limited)

Re-site existing recycling area including replacement of existing recycling units with a single Tomra recycling unit together with associated enabling works.

NOTE: This site has an extensive history which can be made available on request.

BH.07.02605.FUL (CB) MEEDS WARD

2 Cyprus Road (Mr & Mrs J Kent)

Conservatory.

BH.07.02620.COU (HM) MEEDS WARD

Unit 3, 5 - 7 Mill Road (A C Gibbs)

Change of use from A1/A3 to A1/D1 - Complementary Therapy Unit.

BH.07.02621.FUL (CB) DUNSTALL WARD

26 Malthouse Lane (Mrs K Garton)

Rear single storey garage/utility extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

This site was the subject of an application for an extension to rear to enlarge lounge in 1979 (BH.124.79 refers).

BH.05.01207.LDC - an application for Lawful Development Certificate for a loft conversion (proposed use) was considered by this Council in July 2005 when the application was noted.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in July 2005.

BH.07.02642.FUL (CB) ST ANDREWS WARD

35 St Andrews Road (My Choice Children's Homes)

Retrospective planning application for a rear conservatory.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.00.02544.FUL - an application for a proposed two storey rear extension incorporating a change from a hipped roof to a gable ended roof and detached garage to rear was considered by this Council in January 2001 when APPROVAL was recommended.

This application was WITHDRAWN in January 2001.

BH.01.01306.FUL - an application for a garage was considered by this Council in July 2001 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in August 2001.

BH.02.00395.FUL - an application for a two storey rear extension was considered by this Council in March 2002 when REFUSAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in April 2002.

BH.06.01984.LDC - an application for a children's home with two permanent residents and rotation of carers was considered by this Council in October 2006. This was an application to establish whether the proposed development was lawful: this would be a legal decision where the planning merits of the proposed development could not be taken into account. The following comments were made by the Town Council:

“The situation regarding a legal decision was noted. However, it was felt that the proposal was a change of use that should require planning permission.”

This Application was WITHDRAWN in January 2007.

BH.07.00281.LDC - an application for Children's Home with two permanent residents and rotation of carers; 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

2007 when the following comments were made:

Recommend Refusal – the situation regarding a legal decision was noted. However, it was felt that the proposal involved a change of use that should require planning permission.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in May 2007.

BH.07.02666.TCA (DS) MEEDS WARD

47 Crescent Road (Oliver Day)

Fell Beech tree.

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:

“The young Copper Beech in the front garden is looking very stressed. The ends of some of the branches are dying and leafless. The foliage is sparse and there is evidence of decay around the base. In the circumstances the owner wishes to fell and replace it. He intends to plant two replacements – one in the middle of the lawn and one close to the western boundary. Because of the tree’s condition this is the most obvious solution.”

BH.07.02700.FUL (SM) LEYLANDS WARD

41 St Johns Avenue (Stirling & Johnson Construction Ltd)

Demolition of bungalow and construction of 4 no. apartments with access and parking.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.00864.FUL - an application for the demolition of a bungalow and construction of 6 no. apartments with access and parking was considered by this Council in July 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – the proposal would overdevelop the site, be overbearing to No 43a and too high at two and a half storeys. It was unneighbourly because the garden would become a car park and the position of the bins was poor. It would set a precedent and have an adverse effect on the street scene. Additional on street parking would be created in an area which already had excessive displacement

parking. Concern was expressed about the capacity of the existing water and sewage infrastructure and it was asked that this be checked should Mid Sussex District Council be minded to recommend approval. Mid Sussex District Council may also wish to examine the trees on this site as some may require a Tree Preservation Order. It was regretted that there was no planning notice on this site.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in June 2007.

BH.07.02727.TCA (DS) FRANKLANDS WARD

46 Ferndale Road (Diana Garnier)

Two Hornbeams - Lift canopy by approximately 1m. Five Cypress – Fell.

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:

“There is a line of five over mature Cypresses on the north-east boundary of the front garden. They are very close to the house and the northern most specimen is suppressing a rather lovely mature Hornbeam. All of them are suppressing deciduous vegetation beneath. The removal of these Cypresses would greatly benefit the other vegetation. They are certainly not TPO material – the only way to prevent their removal.

Also on the north-east boundary of the front garden are two Hornbeams, one of which needs to be lifted slightly (I suggested 1m) to provide a little more headroom and more light into the house. The same applies to a similar Hornbeam on the same boundary but in the rear garden. This lifting would not affect the trees’ overall appearance or visual amenity value.”

BH.07.02803.FUL (LW) VICTORIA WARD

Flow Serve, Consort Way (Flowservice Flow Control (UK) Ltd)

Full enclosure of existing work/storage area which is at present an open ended building with exposed area bounded by three metre high fence.

BH.07.02808.FUL (LW) VICTORIA WARD
23 Henry Burt Way (Mr. & Mrs. A. Bee)

Two storey side extension.

BH.07.02814.FUL (LW) VICTORIA WARD
37 West Street (Mr & Mrs Tomsett)

Proposed replacement single storey extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.182.98 - an application for a first floor bedroom extension was considered by this Council in September 1998 when No Objections were raised.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in September 1998.

BH.07.02853.FUL (TM) LEYLANDS WARD
11 St Peters Road (Mr & Mrs Medhurst)

Single storey rear extension.

NOTE: This site was the subject of an application for a 2 bedroom dormer extension in 1986 (BH.281.86 refers).

BH.07.02882.TREE (DS) ST ANDREWS WARD
24 Rolfe Drive (Mrs C Daly)

Fell Sycamore (T79).

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:

“There are two mature trees in the rear garden – Oak (T77) and Sycamore (T79). They are about 1m apart and, from the road, the Sycamore is not apparent. Large branches have been falling from the Sycamore and the owners are understandably concerned about safety.

Clearly the two trees are now competing for space and the Oak is just winning! The Oak would benefit from the removal of the Sycamore whose removal would hardly be noticed. No visual amenity implications.”

BH.07.02910.TREE

(DS)

FRANKLANDS WARD

Land Parcel known as Sunset Lane, Oakhall Park

(Riley Larkin)

Fell 3 Oaks and reduce/reshape by 20% 2 Oaks (within Group G18).

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:

“The trees are very prominent both in views from Sunset Lane and Pinehurst. No evidence of damage to 33 Pinehurst has been submitted with the application and I have asked for a copy of the structural engineer’s report to be sent to me. If this is satisfactory I cannot see any alternative but to grant consent as a refusal could land the Council with a substantial claim for compensation.”
