



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>

27 February 2008

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

A **MEETING** of the **PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE** will be held in the Council Chamber on **3 MARCH 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. **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, 18 February 2008 (copy previously circulated).

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

8. **SOUTH CENTRAL RAIL FRANCHISE**

9. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER**

10. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER CONFIRMATION**

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 Monday, 18 February 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.

8. **SOUTH CENTRAL RAIL FRANCHISE**

8.1 The following Email has been received from Shelley Atlas, Chairlady of the Brighton Line Commuters (BLC) which is replicated in full for your information. Although this has been sent to BLC members Shelley is happy to forward the Town Council's views as part of this process due to the working relationship established with her.

8.2 "We have been contacted by Govia to advise us that the Department for Transport will shortly begin the formal competition for the South Central rail franchise, which is currently operated by Govia as Southern. The current franchise ends on 20 September 2009. They are asking to begin an on-going process of communication between Brighton Line Commuters and Govia. They state that over the next few months, our thoughts and views will be warmly welcomed by Govia as they wish to gain a better understanding of our aspirations and ambitions for the next franchise.

For those of us who are not familiar with Govia, they have explained that they are a partnership between the Go-Ahead Group (which they describe as one of the UK's leading providers of passenger transport management services), and Keolis which is backed by SNCF, the French state railway. They describe Govia as the most enduring rail partnership between transport operators delivering rail franchises in this country, and state they are currently the UK's busiest rail operator, responsible for 28.7 per cent of annual passenger journeys. Their other franchises are South Eastern, which will introduce the UK's first domestic high speed rail service next year, and London Midland, which began operating last November.

Since taking over the business from Connex South Central in 2001, they say they have increased capacity on the Southern network at a time of continued passenger growth; they have also cut crime and achieved secure station status at 100 of their 161 stations – more than any other train operating company. They have also introduced a range of staff training programmes, winning a National Training Award for their in-house coaching programme, for example.

They believe they have made a success of running Southern and say that they are very keen to retain it. They say they want to understand our views about Southern so that they can incorporate them in their thinking about the new franchise.

They have asked to meet with our Committee in the near future to hear about the issues we feel are important and which they need to consider over the coming months as the bid process commences. They have also offered to outline Govia's approach to running rail franchises.

We will be arranging to meet them shortly and we would like to hear from you about your views on the current performance of Southern and what you think is important for the next franchise. Please let us know of any other issues you feel are important so we can build them into what we will say to them at the meeting."

8.2 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – will be considered as part of the draft response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – None.

9. TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 4 & 6 PARK ROAD

- 9.1 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 and was confirmed on 21 February 2008.

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No. 3)
Tree Preservation Order 2008
4 & 6 Park Road

- 9.2 Members discussed an application to fell this Cupressus Macrocarpa tree (08.00144.TCA) on 4 February 2008 when their observations were as follows:

"This tree is a very attractive part of the street scene and if it could be preserved this would be welcomed provided that the safety of pedestrians was not compromised. It was hoped that the Highway Authority would take this into consideration in their response to the Trees and Landscape Officer and look for alternatives to alleviate the heaving on the pavement."

9.3 West Sussex County Council Highways have recommended that the tree be felled. The Tree Preservation Order does allow time for other options to be considered and the Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council would welcome the Committee's comments.

9.4 **RECOMMENDATION**

- A) The comments of this Committee be forwarded to the Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council; and,
- B) a copy be sent to the West Sussex County Council Highways.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

10. **TREE PRESERVATION ORDER 41 ST JOHNS AVENUE**

10.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the following Tree Preservation Order was confirmed on 6 February 2008.

Mid Sussex District (Burgess Hill No. 4)
Tree Preservation Order 2007
41 St Johns Avenue

10.2 **RECOMMENDATION**

The contents of this report be noted.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 7 March 2008.

08.00318.FUL (CB) FRANKLANDS WARD
Cleves, Keymer Road (Mr & Mrs J McQuillan)

Ground floor front extension to kitchen and two storey rear extension to lounge and bedroom.

NOTE: This site was the subject of an application for a two storey side extension and alteration to access in 1989 (BH.212.89 refers).

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in October 1989.

08.00445.FUL (LW) MEEDS WARD
The Potters Arms Public House, 129 Station Road (Mr & Mrs Clark)

Retrospective planning permission for outside gazebo/bistro area.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.01.00271.FUL - an application for conversion of garage into kitchen to serve restaurant was considered by this Council in March 2001 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2001.

BH.05.02512.FUL - an application for retrospective permission for decking was considered by this Council in February 2006 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in March 2006.

BH.06.02435.FUL - an application for a proposal which involves enlarging an existing opening to accommodate a set of new bi-folding doors to the rear elevation, a new raised decking area complete with balustrade providing both a level threshold and ramped access to the existing adjoining timber decked area, a new retractable canopy above new doors was considered by this Council in December 2006 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in January 2007.

08.00466.FUL

(LW)

LEYLANDS WARD

58 St Peters Road

(Mr & Mrs Richard Bowles)

Two storey extension to the rear of the existing house and a single storey link between the existing house and the existing garage/utility room. All windows on the existing rear elevation will be replaced. Proposed associated hard and soft landscaping.

NOTE: This site was the subject of an application for a proposed new garage, utility room and front porch in 1991 (BH.290.91 refers).

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in January 1992.

08.00532.TREE

(DS)

ST ANDREWS WARD

2 Swann Close

(Mr & Mrs R Johnson)

Fell Oak (T76).

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 Oaks (T75 & T76) in the rear garden. Mrs Johnson stated that bits fall off the tree closest to the house (T76) and it “waives about a lot when it didn’t used to”.

This tree is actually in very poor condition with a large amount of dead wood throughout the canopy. Removal of this would then require the tree to be trimmed to balance and the result would not be particularly attractive. I suggested, therefore, that the tree should be removed. This would overcome the concerns that Mrs Johnson has and, more importantly, benefit the adjacent tree (T75) which is a much better specimen.

Although visible from the road, this tree is seen against the backdrop of T75. In the circumstances I do not consider that the proposal would have a significant impact on visual amenity in the locality.”

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 14 March 2008.

08.00293.FUL (SK) MEEDS WARD

Burnetts Printing Works Ltd, 34 Cyprus Road (Belfray Homes Ltd)

A three storey (with basement) building containing 7 apartments comprising 6 x 2 bed and 1 x 1 bed units with basement parking for 10 bicycles and 6 powered two wheelers together with refuse and recycling.

08.00520.FUL (AW) LEYLANDS WARD

10 St Wilfrids Road (Mr & Mrs A Gelli)

Conversion of attic into an ensuite bedroom including provision of dormer for staircase access.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.04.00441.FUL - an application for demolition of existing conservatory and the erection of a single storey pitched roof extension to the rear of the house to form a new kitchen was considered by this Council in March 2004 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in March 2004.

08.00553.FUL (SK) FRANKLANDS WARD

Folders Farm, Folders Lane (Crest Nicholson Residential South East Ltd)

Conversion of existing barn and change of use to one dwelling, demolition of outbuildings and erection of new garages.

08.00556.FUL

(LW)

FRANKLANDS WARD

14 Thatchers Close

(Shaun Miles)

Loft conversion with four dormers and one rooflight.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.00736.FUL - an application to demolish an existing porch and construct a single storey side extension was considered by this Council in May 2007 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in June 2007.

08.00635.TREE

(DS)

FRANKLANDS WARD

17 Pinehurst

(Mrs V Edwards)

Oak (within Group G14) - Remove lowest branch on western side.

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 Oak in the rear garden has a fairly low canopy which blocks out a lot of light at the end of the garden. I suggested that the lowest branch on the western side be removed. This would have no effect on the tree’s appearance but would aid light penetration. There are no visual amenity implications.”

08.00636.TREE

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

72 Nightingale Lane

(Mr & Mrs L Rees)

Fell Oak (T13)

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 & Mrs Rees who are, again, bothered by the Oak (T13) in the adjacent garden, No 72.

In 2003 an application to thin and lift the canopy was granted (BH/03/01124/TREE) but an application to fell (BH/03/01124/TREE) submitted at the same time was refused for the following reason:

“The tree is prominent above rooftops so that it makes an important contribution in the street scene. Its removal would have an adverse impact on visual amenity in the locality.”

Mr & Mrs Rees state that the tree (which is due south of the house) blocks out light, drops debris onto the roof and is too close to the house.

This is a semi-mature tree which does, indeed, overhang the house - a situation which can only get worse as it matures. If retained, it will need regular maintenance to prevent it touching the house. As a result it can never be allowed to reach its full potential.

The top of the tree is visible above the roof and has a softening affect on the skyline.

The trees on land to the south of the property (owned by this Council) contain young trees, mainly Pines, which are now maturing. These provide an important screen between Burgess Hill and open countryside to the south. Mr & Mrs Rees stated that these are now blocking out sunlight – a situation which will get progressively worse. They feel, therefore, that they should be allowed to remove the Oak.

I have some sympathy for this argument I have to say. At one time, the Oak would have provided screening in views from the south but this is now provided by the Pines. These Pines, will, in due course, grow tall enough to be seen above the properties in Nightingale Lane and provide an attractive skyline. However, it has to be said, this is likely to cause light loss problems.

In the circumstances I feel that the time has come to allow the Oak (T13) to be removed.”

08.00101.FUL

(SK)

HURSTPIERPOINT PARISH

The Dene, Gatehouse Lane, Goddards Green

(Partnerships In Care Ltd)

A new medium secure unit for 34 patients within the grounds of the existing facility.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

HP.02.01928.FUL - an application for an extension of existing ward area and additional car parking and new private swimming pool facility was considered by this Council in December 2002 when No Objections were raised.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in December 2002.

HP.03.02932.FUL – Members may recall that an application for a proposed new swimming pool building was considered at the previous meeting of the Committee held on 15 December 2003. Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine the application.

HP.03.03070.FUL - an application for extension to existing wards being a revised proposal to approval HP.02.1928.FUL was considered by this Council in January 2004 when Approval was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine this application.

HP.03.03070.FUL.AP - an application for extension to existing wards; revised proposal to approval HP.02.1928.FUL - Amended plans received showing an additional 25 car parking spaces was considered by this Council in March 2004 when the application was noted.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2004.
