



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>

30 July 2008

To: **MEMBERS OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE**

A **MEETING** of the **PLANNING COMMITTEE** will be held in the Council Chamber on **MONDAY, 4 AUGUST 2008** at **19.00 hours**, when your attendance is required.

David Carden
Town Clerk

NOTE: Under Standing Order 57 h) all Members of the Council are eligible to attend and vote at this meeting.

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**

An apology for absence has been received from Simon Hicks.

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

3. **SUBSTITUTES**

Mrs Anne Jones will substitute for Simon Hicks.

4. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

In respect of any matter on the agenda.

5. **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

6. **MINUTES**

To consider the Minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on Monday, 21 July 2008, copy previously circulated.

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

8. **WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL [(MID SUSSEX DISTRICT) (PARKING PLACES AND TRAFFIC REGULATION) (CONSOLIDATION NO.2) ORDER 2006] (AMENDMENT NO. *) ORDER 2008 - VICTORIA ROAD/YORK ROAD LINK ROAD - BURGESS HILL**

9. **PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION PROPOSED VODAFONE INSTALLATION CS 60234 BURGESS HILL WEST**

10. **DWELLING SPACE STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

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

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, 21 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.

8. **WEST SUSSEX COUNTY COUNCIL [(MID SUSSEX DISTRICT) (PARKING PLACES AND TRAFFIC REGULATION) (CONSOLIDATION NO.2) ORDER 2006] (AMENDMENT NO. *) ORDER 2008 - VICTORIA ROAD/YORK ROAD LINK ROAD - BURGESS HILL**

- 8.1 Following West Sussex County Council's informal consultation, authorisation has been granted to publish this proposed traffic Order and comments of the Planning Committee are welcomed by 15 August 2008.

The effect of which will be to:-

- (i) introduce a prohibition of waiting along the entire length of the new link road between Charles Avenue and Victoria Road, and,
- (ii) introduce a prohibition of waiting on length of both sides of Victoria Road at its junction with the new link road.

Planning permission has been granted to construct a new link road between Charles Avenue and Victoria Road. The function of the link road is to provide direct access between Jane Murray Way and the Victoria Industrial Estate. Currently traffic accessing this part of the industrial estate use Victoria Avenue which is a residential street. The link road will also provide direct access for heavy goods vehicles servicing the estate, as an alternative to using Victoria Avenue.

It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines along the length of the new link road and on lengths of Victoria Road to ensure that on-street parking does not restrict the free-flow of traffic. These restrictions are required to maintain safety and improve visibility for drivers exiting the link road at the Victoria Road junction.

Members will be aware that BH 5/3 of the Burgess Hill Local Plan, which is now a saved policy, stated:

“A new link between Charles Avenue and Victoria Road shall be constructed as shown on the Proposals Map. As soon as this and a link from Charles Avenue to the Western Distributor Road is available, the Highway Authority will impose a width restriction on Victoria Avenue at the point

shown on the Proposals Map in order to exclude lorries from the residential area.”

The plans will be displayed in the Council Chamber.

8.2 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee’s views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

9. PRE-APPLICATION CONSULTATION PROPOSED VODAFONE INSTALLATION CS 60234 BURGESS HILL WEST

- 9.1 Vodafone is looking for a suitable site for a radio base station and has invited this Council to comment prior to planning submission on 5 August 2008.

The site is required to provide 3G coverage for recreational, industrial and residential areas in this region of Burgess Hill West which has poor or no 3G coverage. The site search area is rather specific due to the location of the existing surrounding Vodafone sites.

A number of options have been assessed and are shown on the map (which will be displayed at the meeting) in respect of the site search process and the preferred Vodafone options are as follows:

West Street Streetworks, (northeast side of the roundabout) West Street
NGR: 530023,119687

They feel a slimline ‘telegraph pole’ design is the best option due to the surrounding street clutter, including street signs, another Telecoms site, street lamps and telegraph poles. The localised trees and hedgerow will screen the pole from many views, although this design is a vertical structure familiar within the street scene. The pole has been kept to a minimum of 8m to the base of the antennas while balancing the requirement for coverage in this area. A ground cabinet will be used, placed against the wall further blending the site into the street scene.

Alternative options considered and rejected are as follows:

The Weald Pub, Royal George Road

NGR: 530135,119400

This site is closer to the centre of the search area, but would be rather prominent in the locality due to the lack of trees in the vicinity of the proposed location.

Customwest, Victoria Avenue

NGR: 530020,119005

This option is based on a building within the industrial estate and would be located on the building. This could create design issues and technical coverage problems due to the large trees at the back of the site. The Landlord is not interested in Vodafone's proposal.

Victoria Way Streetworks, Victoria Way

NGR: 530618,118910

This site is a Streetworks option outside Network Technologies. This location is topographically low in the search area and very close to the existing Vodafone site 8227, therefore not providing coverage to the northwest area of the search area and creating overlapping coverage in the southeast.

Other sites were investigated, including the other industrial buildings to the southeast of the search area, which were too close to the existing Vodafone site 8227; the Woolpack Pub; the Parish Church of St Edward the Confessor and the Southway Junior School. Other industrial units were considered, Ingenia/Rexroth, Serene Paints, Cirrus Lazer Ltd, Growtivation, Link up Properties and Quentin Press. Also, other streetworks options were considered along Victoria Avenue, Royal George Road, Southway and West Street. These sites were reviewed and discounted due to owing to poor positioning in the search area, reduced coverage (topography, high trees and buildings blocking potential signal) and the landlord being uninterested in Vodafone's proposal.

9.2 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – Will be considered in the response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by Vodafone.

10. **DWELLING SPACE STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – CONSULTATION DRAFT**

- 10.1 The Committee's views are sought by Mid Sussex District Council on the consultation draft of the Dwelling Space Standards Supplementary Planning Document by **Thursday, 4 September 2008**.

The document forms part of Mid Sussex District Council's Local Development Framework and includes the following:

- Consultation Draft.
- Background Document.
- Sustainability Appraisal Report (Incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment).
- Consultation Statement.

- 10.2 In recent years there has been a growing concern that some of the dwellings being proposed in Mid Sussex are not of an adequate standard, particularly with regards to their size. In order to address this issue, the Council has begun preparing a Dwelling Space Standards SPD to set out space standards for all new residential dwellings whether they are formed from new build, sub-division or conversion. All comments received during the consultation period will be taken into consideration when revising the SPD and its supporting documents prior to adoption.

10.3 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – To be considered in the draft response.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

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

- 11.1 Notification has been received that the following appeals have been made to the Planning Inspectorate.

- A) BH.07.03543.FUL
Appeal by: (Mr Rod Lockyer)
Land at: **1 Millers Close**
Proposed Development: The widening of an existing driveway.
Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/08/2078960/WF

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

- “1. The proposal would result in a loss of a landscaped area and an increase in hardstanding at the site which would be detrimental to the character of the area and contrary to Policy B1 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.
2. The proposal would result in a loss of amenity to the occupiers of the property to the north by the increased disturbance from the parking space being adjacent to the mutual boundary. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy B3 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan.”

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

“Recommend Refusal – Members reiterated their previous comments which were:

“This would be detrimental to the street scene, unneighbourly and out of keeping with the area. The plans did not make it clear whether the whole plot would be cleared and concern was expressed that the widening of the drive would exceed the guidance on the maximum amount allowable for parking. It was thought that this was communal land on which a planning condition may have been breached and if this were the case, enforcement of the condition should follow.

It was acknowledged that there was no room for parking on or off site on this small estate and that it was a good example of urban cramming.””

B) 08.01452.FUL
Appeal by: (Mr James Bruce)
Land at: **4 Woodland Crescent**
Proposed Development: 2 storey side extension.
Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/08/2078697

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

“The height and associated scale of the proposed side extension would be harmful to the visual amenities of the area by virtue of unbalancing the symmetry and appearance of the existing terrace and infilling the gap between the groups of terraces that is important in characterising this part of the street scene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy DEV1 of the West Sussex Structure Plan and Policies B1 and H9 of the Mid Sussex Local Plan, which promote high quality design, layout and spacing in new developments.”

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

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

11.6 RECOMMENDATION

The Committee is recommended to:-

- A) reiterate their previous comments to the Planning Inspectorate; and,
- B) request copies of the appeal decision letters.

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 8 August 2008.

08.01362.FUL (LW) VICTORIA WARD
Servecorp, 76 Victoria Road (Servecorp Limited)

Renewal of expired temporary consent for extension of times of use of building in addition to those permitted under consent BH.80.94.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.080.94 – an application for change of use from B1 (Light Industry) to B8 (Warehousing/Storage). Provision of forklift access to 74 Victoria Road was considered by this Council in May 1994 when No Objections were raised.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in June 1994 and the relevant conditions are as follows:

“5. Noise from operations conducted on the premises shall not exceed 52 db(A) LEQ (15 mins) as measured at the northern or eastern boundaries of the application site between the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 hours on Mondays to Fridays, 08.00 and 13.00 hours on Saturdays and 44 db(A) LEQ (15 mins) at any other time.

Reason: To safeguard the environment from excessive noise and protect the amenities of adjacent residential properties.

6. Operations within and deliveries to/from the warehouse shall be restricted to between the hours of 07.00 and 19.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 – 13.00 hours on Saturdays. The use of the office floorspace shall be restricted to between 07.00 and 22.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 to 17.00 hours on Saturdays. No use of the building shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the amenities of neighbouring properties.”

BH.01.02078.FUL – an application for extension to times of use of building in addition to those permitted under consent BH.80.94 was considered by this Council in January 2001 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval – for a temporary trial period only. It is suggested that the District Council carries out regular monitoring of noise and smell emanating from the building. The District Council is also requested to ensure that the back door is shut and there are no vehicular movements during the evening. In addition, the District Council is asked to ensure that all neighbours are fully informed.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in December 2001.

BH.02.02634.FUL - To renew temporary consent for extension of times of use of building in addition to those permitted under consent BH.80.94.

“Recommend Approval. It is felt that the conditions of the temporary consent have been satisfied and that a permanent application should therefore be submitted.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in January 2003.

08.01388.FUL.AP (SA) FRANKLANDS WARD

Land at Folders Lane (Charles Church Southern Ltd)

Development of 78 no. dwellings. Amended plans received showing revisions to various plots and layout.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

This site has an extensive history with Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd as the applicant in 2002/03 which is available in the planning trolley.

BH.07.01814.FUL - an application for 69 dwellings including vehicular access, associated infrastructure, open space and landscaping was considered by this Council in September 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal. The Council’s views are summarised as follows:

- a. The key documents to consider were those supporting the application, The Mid Sussex Local Plan, Mid Sussex Land Availability Assessments, Planning Policy Statement 3, the Mid Sussex Small Scale Housing Allocations Submission Document, the appeal decision on the application site dated December 2003, and the MSDC Open Space Assessment 2006.

- b. The site was not allocated for residential development in a Development Plan and there remains a presumption against permission.
- c. The site has “significant locational attributes” but should not be released for development other than through the Development Plan process.
- d. Burgess Hill was singled out in paragraph 4.14 of the Small Scale Housing DPD, together with Hassocks, as being an area where there were “exceptional infrastructure needs” and it would be incorrect to grant permission whilst the strategic and collective suitability of proposed allocations in Burgess Hill was still to be decided by an independent Inspector.
- e. The council’s land supply was only marginally short of government requirements and the suitability of the site for housing was very much in doubt. Therefore, the council were not compelled to grant permission to satisfy the requirements of PPS3 in respect of Land Availability.
- f. Further development should not be allowed off Folders Lane until existing traffic problems have been resolved.
- g. Access to adjoining play facilities must be secured.
- h. The proposal was well supported by a Design and Access statement (DAS) and the detailed proposals for building materials and design of individual house types were acceptable.
- i. Paragraph 16 of PPS3 requires that development is “*well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of density, layout and access*”
- j. A substantial proportion of the development was relatively tall and bulky with relatively less space between buildings and the development did not satisfy these important criteria.
- k. Adequate space would not be retained between the substantial dwellings on plots 22-26 facing Birchwood Grove Road, and 7 trees along the site frontage were to be removed. The proposal would adversely affect the setting of the adjoining Conservation Area.
- l. Since only 15 (22%) of the dwellings were small (1 or 2 bed) there was not an appropriate mix of dwellings types and sizes.

- m. The proposal should be refused because inadequate space had been retained for a replacement landscaping scheme on the Folders Lane frontage in accordance with the wishes of the Inspector in the December 2003 appeal decision.
- n. There were deficiencies in respect of the arrangements for access to the adjoining Folders Meadow play area and there was an imbalance in proposed parking provision.
- o. The development was premature in light of the Town Wide Master Plan and building on a Greenfield site was to be deplored.

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in September 2007.

08.01388.FUL - an application for the development of 78 no. dwellings was considered by this Council in May 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – the Committee asked to defer their comments and to seek a report from the Town Council’s retained planning consultant. Their initial views were that they objected to the application on the following grounds.

- a) The Small Scale Housing Development Plan Document suggested that Greenfield sites could be held back from development until housing numbers on Brownfield and Windfall sites were known. This Greenfield site application was premature, as it was being considered in advance of Brownfield sites such as Keymer Tile Works. In addition, the current application to develop the Former Sewage Works and proposed Town Centre housing development (both Windfall sites) could provide over a thousand dwellings. A clear assessment of the housing numbers for Burgess Hill was urgently needed.
- b) Burgess Hill had an exceptional infrastructure deficit which needed to be addressed holistically and not in a piecemeal manner. Mid Sussex District Council were currently undertaking an infrastructure survey and a survey of green spaces. It was noted that water pressure was low in this area and this needed to be addressed in the survey.
- c) The existing traffic problems needed to be resolved and the impact of the Small Scale Housing Sites identified. It was understood that West Sussex County Council were considering the holistic implications of the Small Scale Housing Site Allocations on road capacity and road safety.

- d) The sustainable travel plan in the application was disappointing and it was asked if all developers of large sites could be required to produce a Travel Information Plan for each resident that could include information on public transport and money off vouchers for e.g. bicycles.

Apart from improvements in open space provision it was felt that there was little difference between this application and the one before and the previous comments were reiterated as set out in a) - o) on BH.07.01814.FUL.”

Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine this application.

08.01668.FUL (SK) MEEDS WARD

115 Lower Church Road (Jason & Caroline Atkins)

Change of use of ground floor from A1 (retail) to A3 (restaurants and cafes) or to B1 (offices) and change of use of first and second floors from B1 (offices) to C3 (residential).

08.01975.FUL (CB) MEEDS WARD

135 Station Road (Mrs C Hodgson)

Rear extension to property, comprising part single storey, part two storey.

08.02097.FUL (RB) MEEDS WARD

**St Wilfrids RC School,
School Close** (The Governors of St Wilfrid's Catholic Primary School)

Replacement windows to Hall.

08.02101.FUL

(LW)

ST ANDREWS WARD

48 Brookway

(Mrs Holmes)

Ground floor single storey rear extension with door repositioned in front porch from previous planning application 05.00728.FUL with WC in front porch.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.05.00728.FUL – An application for a single storey front extension where the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Refusal.** This would set a precedent of development in front of the building line. It would also restrict light for neighbouring properties.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in May 2005.

08.02275.FUL

(AW)

MEEDS WARD

171 Lower Church Road

(Gavin Willis)

First floor extension to existing single storey dwelling.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.03.03077.COU - an application for change of use from office/shop to residential was considered by this Council in January 2004 when the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Approval.** Concerns were expressed that there was only an entry and exit point at the front of the building and no entry or exit point at the back.”

BH.03.03077.COU.AP - an application for change of use from office/shop to residential. Amended plans received showing the removal of the bay window and garden wall to the front of the property.

This was considered by this Council in February 2004 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED the Amended Plans in March 2004.

08.00585.FUL - an application for a first floor extension and loft conversion was considered by this Council in March 2008 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal. - The proposal requires very accurate plans and drawings as it is difficult to see how it could be built. It needs to be attached to two buildings and a roof goes over the where the developer wants to build.

The proposed development would be overlooking, unneighbourly and cause loss of light. It would be overdevelopment of a small complicated site which does not lend itself to this development. There is a lack of on-road parking in this area and the application is premature in light of the Town Wide Master Plan.”

Mid Sussex District Council has yet to determine this application.

08.00585.FUL.AP – an application for first floor extension and loft conversion. Amended plans received. This was considered by this Council when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – this proposal still requires accurate plans and drawings. The second floor would overhang 173 Church Road and would be overlooking, unneighbourly and cause loss of light. It would be overdevelopment of a small complicated site which does not lend itself to this development. There is a lack of on-road parking in this area and the application is premature in light of the Town Wide Master Plan.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in May 2008.

08.02328.FUL (LW) VICTORIA WARD

35 Victoria Road (Supply On Demand Ltd)

Subdivide industrial unit. New enclosed canopy. New roller shutter doors. New vehicle crossover and hardstandings. New fence and gates.

08.02335.TREE (DS) MEEDS WARD

52 Nightingale Lane (Mrs R Tuppin)

Oak (T6) - Thin canopy by 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:

“I suggested this (as an alternative to felling) and am happy with the application.”

08.02337.TREE

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

52 Nightingale Lane

(Mrs R Tuppin)

Oak (T6) – Fell.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as follows:

“I cannot support this proposal. It is a very visible tree and makes a significant contribution to visual amenity. Refusal recommended.”

08.02378.TREE

(DS)

LEYLANDS WARD

41 Petworth Drive

(Mrs J Strong)

1 Oak (within Group 3) - Trim back canopy on north, west and south sides by up to 3m.

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 (within group G3) overhangs the gardens of 34 & 36 Marle Avenue significantly so that light loss is a real problem.

I suggested that the northern, western and southern sides of the canopy be trimmed back by up to 3m. This would not unbalance the canopy as it is heavier on these three sides anyway.

There would be no significant impact on the tree’s visual amenity value.”

08.02396.TCA

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

29 Park Road

(Paul Donaldson)

Fell 1 Ash.

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:

“This tree is too close to the house. Although visible from the road it is seen against a backdrop of larger trees to the rear so that its removal would not be that significant.”

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 15 August 2008.

08.02127.FUL

(AW)

VICTORIA WARD

Former Just Words Commercial Unit, Portland Road (Linkspan Properties)

Demolition of existing redundant commercial unit, formation of 4 No. 2 bedroom apartments with associated parking replacing previous approval for 2 No. semi-detached properties.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.03.03124.OUT - an application for demolition of existing commercial unit and the erection of 4 flats in a two storey hipped roof dwelling was considered by this Council in January 2004 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal. Whilst it is felt that residential accommodation is appropriate at this location, the proposed flats constitute an over-development of the site and are out of keeping with neighbouring properties, both in terms of their positioning and scale. Concerns are also expressed that the proposals will exacerbate the on-street car parking difficulties which already exist in this private road.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in February 2004.

BH.06.01769.FUL – An application for demolition of existing commercial unit and erection of 2 No two bedroom semi detached dwellings. This was considered by this Council when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – Concerns were expressed over the design of the application which was not in keeping with existing properties in a Conservation Area. The Committee requested that the wall should be retained for architectural purposes and not demolished as in the plan.

The Committee felt that two houses was a step in the right direction, however the design of the buildings should enhance the value of the Conservation Area.”

Mid Sussex District Council approved this application in October 2006.

08.02128.CON

(AW)

VICTORIA WARD

Former Just Words Commercial Unit, Portland Road (Linkspan Properties)

Demolition of existing redundant commercial unit, formation of 4 No. 2 bedroom apartments with associated parking replacing previous approval for 2 No. semi-detached properties.

NOTE: The previous history is as for application 08.02127.FUL above.

08.02224.FUL

(LW)

FRANKLANDS WARD

29A Greenlands Drive (Ms Nicola Vowles)

Erection of single storey 2 bedroom dwelling on land to the rear of existing property. All as per approved application 03.03127.FUL.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.01.00699.OUT – an Outline application for a single storey dwelling with ancillary first floor living area was considered by this Council in May 2001 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – this proposal is totally unacceptable, un-neighbourly and will be an over-development of the site. The application is in a vulnerable strategic site. Concerns are expressed regarding the height of the dwelling, as it is inappropriate and will be detrimental to the neighbouring properties. Concerns are also expressed over the loss of trees and the impact on the south boundary. It is recommended that before the District Council makes a decision that a full planning application needs to be submitted.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in September 2001.

BH.01.00699.OUT.AP – Amended Plans of an Outline application for a single storey dwelling with ancillary first floor living area showing reduced size of proposed dwellings was considered by this Council in July 2001 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – this proposal is totally unacceptable and un-neighbourly. This is a vulnerable strategic site and therefore the proposed height of the building is unacceptable. It is inappropriate and out of keeping with neighbouring properties. Concerns are also expressed over the loss of trees and impact on the south boundary. It is recommended that before the District Council makes a decision a full planning application is submitted.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in September 2001.

BH.01.01821.FUL - an application for the erection of a single storey dwelling was considered by this Council in September 2001 when the following comments were made:

“No Objections. The Council welcomes the full application with a reduction in size and height of the dwelling. This proposal is more in keeping with the surrounding properties. The strategic value of the site is important and the visual impact from the Green Crescent should be minimised. If the District Council is minded to approve this application a condition should be added precluding any further extension.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in October 2001.

BH.03.03127.FUL – An application for proposed construction of a new single storey hipped roof two bedroom dwelling was considered by this Council in February 2004 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval. The strategic value of the site is important and the visual impact from the Green Crescent should be minimised. If the District Council is minded to approve this application a condition should be added precluding any further extension.

It is recommended that the Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council is requested to look at this application as it is necessary to ensure that the proposed construction will not endanger other trees on the site.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in February 2004.

08.02259.FUL

(SK)

FRANKLANDS WARD

70 Junction Road

(Mr & Mrs M Locke)

Proposed rear conservatory.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.00.000551.FUL – an application for extension to existing dwelling and new porch was considered by this Council in March 2000 when Approval was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2000.

BH.02.00252.FUL – an application was made for Creation of new vehicular access was considered by this Council in April 2002 when Approval was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in May 2002.

08.02381.FUL

(CB)

DUNSTALL WARD

23 The Gilligans

(Mr M Robinson)

Add first floor extension above garage. Internal alterations to gain access to extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

08.01195.FUL – an application was made to extend width to boundary, of existing single storey garage/playroom, add first floor extension over garage/playroom and internal alteration to gain access into first floor extension in April 2008 where the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Refusal** – the extension to the boundary would be unneighbourly. It is also possible that an oak tree would need to be moved.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in May 2008.

08.02385.FUL

(MR)

LEYLANDS WARD

3 Noel Rise

(Mr S West)

Single storey pitched roof extension to form new family room, utility and wc.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.01.02249.FUL – an application for single storey side extension and loft conversion with rear dormer was considered by this Council in December 2001 when the following comments were made:

“**Recommend Refusal.** This is an over development of the site as it doubles floor space. It is un-neighbourly and will ruin the street scene.”

Amended plans were considered by this Council in January 2002 when the Committee’s previous comments were reiterated.

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in January 2002.

BH.02.00333.FUL - an application for a loft conversion with front and rear dormers was considered by this Council in March 2002 when APPROVAL was recommended.

This application was WITHDRAWN in April 2002.

08.02389.FUL (CB) MEEDS WARD

22 Mill Road (Mr G Harris)

Convert existing three bedroom end of terrace house into two 1 bedroom flats.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

08.01829.FUL - an application to convert existing three bedroom end of terrace house into two 1 bedroom flats was considered by this Council in June 2008 when APPROVAL was recommended.

This application was WITHDRAWN in July 2008.

08.02457.TREE (DS) FRANKLANDS WARD

12 Titchfield Close (R H Smith)

Reduce canopies of two Oaks (T38 and T39) to previous cut points.

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 have been reduced a number of times over the years (with consent). This is just another application to carry out similar work so that the trees are kept in scale with the small gardens surrounding them.”

08.02474.TREE

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

34 Nightingale Lane

(Mrs D D Maskell)

Oak (T1) – Fell.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as follows:

“The Oak (T1) in the rear garden was last trimmed in 2004/5 (BH/04/02805/TREE).

Mrs Maskell stated that it dropped a lot of leaves and acorns which cost a lot to clear up. In addition, it dropped sticky stuff on her conservatory roof. It also blocks out sunlight for much of the day.

Her ideal solution would be to fell the tree but I advised that I was not likely to support this. Instead, I suggested that an overall reduction of the canopy by 20%-25% and thinning by up to 15% would be more acceptable.

This is a very prominent tree whose loss would have an adverse impact on visual amenity in the area. However, it is very close to the house and needs keeping under control.”

08.02476.TREE

(DS)

MEEDS WARD

34 Nightingale Lane

(Mrs D D Maskell)

Oak (T1) - Reduce overall canopy by 20% -25% and thin by up to 15%.

NOTE: The Trees & Landscape Officer of Mid Sussex District Council has no objections to the work being carried out and his comments are as application 08.02474.TREE above.
