



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>

31 October 2007

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

A **MEETING** of the **PLANNING & TRANSPORT COMMITTEE** will be held in the Council Chamber on **MONDAY, 5 NOVEMBER 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, 15 October 2007 (copy previously circulated).

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

8. **REVIEW OF MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE ARRANGEMENTS**

9. **ROAD NAMING**

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

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

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

13. **EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

14. **PLANNING CONSULTANT**

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

- 7.1 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 15 October 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. **REVIEW OF MID SUSSEX DISTRICT COUNCIL PLANNING COMMITTEE ARRANGEMENTS**

- 8.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that they are reviewing their current planning arrangements with a view to improving their services to the community. The views of the Planning and Transport Committee are welcomed by Wednesday 7 November.

- 8.2 Views on the following areas are particularly welcome:

- a) the role of the Town Council in the planning application process;
- b) the views/feedback from the local community relating to the arrangements of the planning committees; and
- c) any improvements to the arrangements that would help facilitate the Town Council's specific role in the planning process.

- 8.3 The consultation was discussed at the meeting of the Mid Sussex Association of Town Councils where concerns were expressed that there was currently no dedicated planning officer team in the central area. It was also agreed that the current structure of three Area Committees and three dedicated officer teams to serve them had worked well and should be retained. In terms of customer service these committees were valued by residents as they were held locally and Members from the area were involved who understood the issues. Members suggested that a Call-in system should be introduced for town and parish councils as there needed to be greater trust and joint working over planning issues. In addition, it was agreed that better feedback should be given when the MSDC view differed from that of the local council. This could easily be achieved by extending the matrix at the back of the current area committee agendas.

8.4 **RECOMMENDATION**

The Committee's views are sought.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation from a partner organisation.

9. ROAD NAMING

9.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the following road names have been confirmed.

- a) Planning & Transport meeting of 21 May 2007 (Minute 11 refers).
Land at Folders Farm, Folders Lane
1-111 Sycamore Drive, Burgess Hill, RH15 0GG
2-70 Sycamore Drive, Burgess Hill, RH15 0GH
- b) Planning & Transport meeting of 18 June 2007 (Minute 31 refers).
Land at Junction Road
1-14 Fairway Mews, Junction Road, Burgess Hill, RH15 0GZ

9.2 RECOMMENDATION

The contents of this report be noted.

Environmental Charter Implications – None.

Financial Implications – None.

Implications to Partner Organisations – Consultation by a partner organisation.

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

10.1 Notification has been received from the Secretary of State for the Environment that the Appeal in respect of the following application has been ALLOWED.

BH.06.02638.FUL

Appeal by: (K Macpherson)

Land at: **134 Lower Church Road**

Proposed Development: Conversion of house into 2 no. 2 bed flats.

Appeal Ref: APP/D3830/A/07/2042006

10.2 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.

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

11.1 Notification has been received from Mid Sussex District Council that the hearing for the planning appeal lodged by Fitzhardings Estates in respect of “Land Rear of Mellow Cottage, Freshfields and Holford, Keymer Road (BH.06.01031.FUL)” will be heard at 10.00 hours on 7 November 2007 in Room 1, Town Hall, Haywards Heath Town Council, 40 Boltro Road, Haywards Heath.

11.2 **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.07.01079.FUL
Gems Newsagents, 135 Royal George Road
Installing Roller Shutters.
BHTC – Recommend Approval.
MSDC –Refused.
- b) BH.07.02609.TCA
26 Silverdale Road
Fell 1 Lawson Cypress.
BHTC – Objected.
MSDC – No Objection.
- c) BH.07.02611.TREE
Land adjacent to 10 Kings Way
Southernmost Oak - remove one lower branch. All others - trim back to boundary of 10 Kings Way.
BHTC – Objected.
MSDC – No Objection.

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.

13. **EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

In view of the confidential nature of the business about to be transacted, it is proposed that, in the public interest, the public and press be temporarily excluded and they be requested to withdraw from the meeting.

SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 2 November 2007.

BH.07.02558.FUL.AP (LW) FRANKLANDS WARD

Derwen, 34 Folders Lane (Belmont Design)

Proposed three no detached dwellings with garages - minor amendments.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.06.02707.FUL - an application for the erection of three detached houses with an access drive at 34 Folders Lane and land rear of 34/32 Folders Lane was considered by this Council in January 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – a motion to hold a recorded vote to recommend refusal on this application was proposed by Andrew Landriani and seconded by Mrs Gill Balsdon. The motion was accepted by two votes (Andrew Landriani and Mrs Gill Balsdon) to one (Mrs Kathy Dumbovic) and three abstentions (Mrs Anne Jones, Mr John Merrill and Mr Andrew Barrett-Miles).

Some of the housing would be visible from Folders Lane and would have an adverse impact on the street scene. Traffic congestion would be increased on this East/West route and there would be a detrimental impact on mains services for sewage and water, where there were already problems providing a service to existing properties.

If this application and BH.06.02633.FUL and BH.06.02714.FUL were considered together the street scene would be adversely affected. If the three sites were developed as one there would be a request for affordable housing. There would also be a need for an environmental survey as the gardens were deep and provided a habitat for wildlife. The cumulative effect of the development of these smaller sites would be to contribute to existing infrastructure problems such as mains services and traffic congestion. The additional traffic and exit points onto the Highway would necessitate the urgent provision of the traffic calming measures and 30 mph speed limit agreed for Folders Lane. These proposals were premature in light of the Town Wide Master Plan.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2007.

BH.07.02813.FUL

(TM)

FRANKLANDS WARD

Riffams, Keymer Road

(Mr & Mrs M Richards)

Proposed re-submission of lapsed approval for extension to side of property.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

This site was the subject of a 2 storey extension in 1982 (BH.141.82 refers).

BH.02.00613.FUL – an application for a first floor side extension was considered by this Council in April 2002 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal. The proposal is unneighbourly and would have a detrimental effect on the property to the north of it due to a loss of light.”

This application was WITHDRAWN in May 2002.

BH.02.01385.FUL – an application for extension to side (Revised application following Refusal of BH.02.00613.FUL) was considered by this Council in July 2002 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval. The revised application addresses the previous concerns of the Council.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in August 2002.

BH.02.02009.FUL – an application for a conservatory to the rear was considered by this Council in October 2002 when the following comments were made:

“If Mid Sussex District Council is minded to approve this application, it needs to satisfy itself that there is no loss of light to the adjoining property.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in October 2002.

BH.03.00313.FUL - an application for proposed side extension to house was considered by this Council in March 2003 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal. The proposed side extension is unneighbourly and would have a detrimental effect on the property to the north of it due to a loss of light. The terraced nature of the proposal completely changes the visual character of the property.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in March 2003.

BH.07.03035.FUL (CB) MEEDS WARD

79 Potters Lane (Mr & Mrs G A Caston)

Front porch.

BH.07.03081.FUL (AW) LEYLANDS WARD

23 Leylands Park (Mr & Mrs Kelly)

Construct second storey rear extension.

BH.07.03124.FUL (TM) DUNSTALL WARD

6 Coulstock Road (Mr & Mrs Roberts)

First floor extension over existing utility room and rear of garage enlarging existing bedroom.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

HP.107.99 - an application for a single storey extension was considered by this Council in October 1999 when No Objections were raised.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in November 1999.

BH.04.00523.FUL - an application to convert one garage into a study was considered by this Council in April 2004 when APPROVAL was recommended.

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in April 2004.

**Sidney West Recreation Ground,
Leylands Road**

(GPG No 3 & Dr RF Miarkowski & Dr D L Wells)

Amend condition 19 of planning permission BH.07.00200.COND. to read 'the premises shall not be open to patients except between the hours of 08:00 hours to 21:00 hours Monday to Friday and 08:00 hours to 17:00 hours on Saturdays'. (The current condition states that "the premises shall not be open to patients except between 08.00 hours to 19.00 hours Monday to Friday and 08.00 hours to 13.00 hours on Saturdays.)

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.00200.COND - an application to amend condition number 19 (Hours restriction) of application BH.06.1696.FUL to include Saturday mornings (0800 to 1300). The condition currently states the unit shall not be open to patients except between 08.00 hours to 19.00 hours Monday to Friday. It was considered by this Council in February 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Approval. It was essential that a doctor’s surgery was open when people needed it.”

Mid Sussex District Council APPROVED this application in March 2007.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Lewes District Council is 8 November 2007.

LW.07.0732 AP

(PB)

WIVELSFIELD PARISH

At Land off Theobalds Road

(George Wimpey South West Thames Ltd)

Residential development comprising seventy-two dwellings, associated parking and landscaping, together with access via the Downscroft estate following the demolition of 25 and 26 Downscroft. Revisions to layout and design, including reduction in height of flattened block and selected other plots.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

LW.05.2451 - an application for residential development comprising 72 dwellings associated parking and landscaping, together with vehicular access via the Downscroft Estate, following the demolition of 25 and 26 Downscroft was considered by this Council in February 2006 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – access to the proposed development is

inadequate, through already congested streets, and there is a need for a second access in line with Highways Departments' requirements. The proposed access is through a residential road and it is not suitable for access purposes. At present it is difficult for emergency vehicles to gain access due to existing on-street parking. The proposal shows a loss of carriageway, for traffic calming purposes, which will exacerbate the problem. In addition, Theobalds Road is not suitable as an emergency access.

The proposed development would exacerbate existing flooding problems in Downscroft and Worlds End basin. There is no use of porous road surfaces and the required balancing pond is not provided.

Mid Sussex District Council had agreed to halt further development east of the railway until flooding problems were solved. The proposed housing layout is challenged as three storey blocks of flats are out of keeping with the whole area. In addition, the affordable housing is not "pepper potted" throughout the development.

This development is premature and will result in a piecemeal development of "Burgess Hill". As part of the Local Development Framework a master plan for Burgess Hill is currently being prepared and consideration of any significant development should be deferred until this process has been completed. In addition, any development of this size must include consideration of the impact it will have on the future development of the community. The development of this site will result in a major impact on the infrastructure and services provided in Burgess Hill. If Lewes District Council is minded to approve the application then the Section 106 contributions must be invested in Burgess Hill on the development of existing services and facilities including public open space, schools, the Help Point, library, highways, drainage, public transport and related issues."

This application was WITHDRAWN in April 2006.

LW.07.0732 - an application for residential development comprising seventy-two dwellings, associated parking and landscaping, together with access via the Downscroft estate following the demolition of 25 and 26 Downscroft was considered by this Council in July 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Strongly Recommend Refusal – This application is premature. The outcome of the small scale housing inquiry (which includes the Keymer Tile Works and Manor Road sites) and the Town Wide Master Plan should be awaited before decisions on this site are made. There is a need to avoid piecemeal development, the consequences of which are illustrated by this application, which needs to demolish 25 and 26 Downscroft in order to provide access to the site. In addition, any development of this size must include consideration of the impact it will have on the future sustainability of the community. The development

of this site will have a major impact on the infrastructure and services provided in Burgess Hill.

The proposed development would exacerbate existing flooding problems in Downscroft and the Worlds End basin, which have been well documented and are evidenced by the developer in the application. In addition, the capacity of this area to take additional sewage and surface water is low. The proposals in the application for drainage using underground water storage with break systems would cause problems down stream with the flow rate proposed. There is a need for a drainage master plan for the Worlds End basin. This has been identified by West Sussex County Council during recent interim drainage works in the area.

Concern was expressed that the impact on traffic flows of the Haywards Heath Relief Road on Rocky Lane had not been taken into account in the application. This plus the traffic from the development could only compound the situation at the junction from Valebridge Drive onto Valebridge Road, which was near to or over capacity when the previous application was submitted. The traffic from the development would also have an impact at the roundabout at Worlds End, which is also at capacity. It is essential that the traffic assessment goes beyond 2008 and takes into account the relief road, other small scale housing sites and traffic from the proposed Theobalds development. The developer should be requested to provide an up to date, accurate transport assessment of the area that would include public transport and the increase in traffic generated from the new Bolnore Roundabout on the Haywards Heath relief road.

On Page 7 of the 2005 transport assessment it is stated that “the road layout (of the existing estate) is one with wide carriageways and good quality footways which are suitable to support additional development.” The Downscroft estate is residential and the roads were not designed to be “through roads”. Currently, cars illegally park on the pavements to leave sufficient room for vehicles on the narrow carriageways. This situation is problematic for emergency vehicle access and increased traffic flows will compound this. The additional traffic flows generated by the proposed development would have an adverse effect on the existing residents.

Concern is also expressed about the effect of the development on the badgers, trees and the bio diversity of the area.

Three storey buildings are out of character in an out of town development.

If Lewes District Council is minded to approve the application then:

- the applicant needs to be provide accurate and up to date information, particularly on transport;
- the Section 106 contributions must be invested in Burgess Hill on the development of existing services and facilities including public open space, schools, Town Council services (including the voluntary sector), library, highways, drainage, public transport and related issues; and
- the plans need to show that provision has been made for any potential future growth i.e. access and infrastructure.

Lewes District Council has yet to determine this application.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Lewes District Council is 9 November 2007.

LW.07.1194.AP (AH) DITCHLING PARISH

St Georges Retreat, Ditchling Road (Augustinian Care)

Erection of three nursing homes (Amendment to approval LW.04.2480 amending layout and design).

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

LW.99.1751.F/LW.99.1952.F – an outline application for a new continuing care/retirement village comprising 60 bed nursing home, 60 bed residential care home, 74 sheltered flats with extra care, 90 retirement flats & 216 retirement cottages. Refurbishment, conversion and reconstruction of St George’s Retreat buildings to provide 32 sheltered flats with extra care, 24 bedroom care home accommodation and leisure, health and restaurant facilities. The farm buildings will be demolished and re-provided in a new location was considered by this Council in November 1999 when the following comments were made:

“The Town Council supports the principle of the continuing care/retirement village on this site, but was concerned on the following issues:

- * road safety – poor site access and egress on a fast main road;
- * traffic generation – additional traffic would be generated by the development and this would have an adverse effect on Janes Lane, Worlds End and the two east/west routes through Burgess Hill;
- * consideration be given to the construction of a new roundabout adjacent to the entrance to the development;
- * the development would be reliant on the infrastructure in the east of the town, which was already deficient;

- * an age range condition was vital to prevent alternative uses at a later date; and,
- * concern was also expressed on the impact of this and the proposed housing development in Wivelsfield Green would have in Burgess Hill. Therefore in this respect, neither should be considered in isolation.”

The application was WITHDRAWN in September 2000.

LW.00.1614.L – an outline application for refurbishment and redevelopment of St George’s Retreat and associated land and buildings to provide retirement homes, development of St Marys to provide nursing home, residential and extra care accommodation, reconstruction of farm buildings was considered by this Council in October 2000 when the following comments were made:

“The Town Council reiterates its previous comments, which are:

“The Town Council supports the principle of the continuing care/retirement village on this site, but was concerned on the following issues:

- * road safety – poor site access and egress on a fast main road;
- * traffic generation – additional traffic would be generated by the development and this would have an adverse effect on Janes Lane, Worlds End and the two east/west routes through Burgess Hill;
- * consideration be given to the construction of a new roundabout adjacent to the entrance to the development;
- * the development would be reliant on the infrastructure in the east of the town, which was already deficient;
- * an age range condition for residents was vital to prevent alternative uses at a later date; and,
- * concern was also expressed on the impact of this and the proposed housing development in Wivelsfield Green would have in Burgess Hill. Therefore in this respect, neither should be considered in isolation.””

Lewes District Council APPROVED this application in June 2004.

LW.00.1614.L.AP – an outline application for refurbishment and redevelopment of St George’s Retreat and associated land and buildings to provide retirement homes, development of St Marys to provide nursing home, residential and extra care accommodation, reconstruction of farm buildings was considered by this Council in November 2000 when the following comments were made:

“The Town Council supports the principle of the continuing care/retirement village on this site. It acknowledges that improvements have been made to traffic matters, but concerns are still expressed on the following issues:

- * traffic generation – additional traffic will be generated by the development and this will have an adverse effect on Janes Lane, Worlds End and the two east/west routes through Burgess Hill;
- * there is still a problem of access out of Janes Lane at a busy junction;
- * consideration be given to the construction of a new roundabout adjacent to the entrance to the development;
- * the development will be reliant on the infrastructure in the east of the town, which is already deficient, especially the medical facilities;
- * an age range condition for residents is vital to prevent alternative uses at a later date;
- * concern is also expressed on the impact on Ditchling Common; and,
- * Section 106 Agreement – financial contributions should be sought for Burgess Hill and West Sussex.

The Council welcomes the opportunity to continue working with the developer and Lewes District Council.”

Lewes District Council APPROVED this application in June 2004

LW.00.1614.L.AP2 - an Outline application for refurbishment and redevelopment of St Georges Retreat and associated land and buildings to provide retirement homes, development of St Marys to provide nursing home, residential and extra care accommodation, reconstruction of farm buildings; Amended plans received was considered by this Council in December 2001 when the following comments were made:

“The Town Council supports the principle of the continuing care/retirement village on this site but concerns are still expressed on the following issues:

- * traffic generation – additional traffic will be generated by the development and this will have an adverse effect on Janes Lane, Worlds End and the two east/west routes through Burgess Hill;
- * there is still a problem of access out of Janes Lane at a busy junction;
- * consideration be given to the construction of a new roundabout adjacent to the entrance to the development;
- * the development will be reliant on the infrastructure in the east of the town, which is already deficient, especially the medical facilities;
- * an age range condition for residents is vital to prevent alternative uses at a later date;
- * concern is also expressed on the impact on Ditchling Common; and,
- * Section 106 Agreement – financial contributions should be sought for Burgess Hill and West Sussex.

The Council welcomes the opportunity to continue working with the developer and Lewes District Council.”

Lewes District Council APPROVED this application in June 2004.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 9 November 2007.

BH.07.02954.FUL (TM) FRANKLANDS WARD

48 Wheelwright Lane (Mr W Terry)

Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of replacement single storey extension to rear and new single storey to side.

NOTE: The closing date for comments on the following applications to Mid Sussex District Council is 16 November 2007.

BH.07.02916.FUL (SM) FRANKLANDS WARD

Burdocks Farm, Marlborough Drive (Fitzharding Estates Ltd)

Proposed residential development of two new detached dwellings.

BH.07.02966.FUL (AW) VICTORIA WARD

209 London Road (Mr & Mrs Westgarth)

Rear dormer and front rooflights in connection with a loft conversion and ground floor rear extension.

NOTE: The previous history is as follows:

BH.07.01248.FUL - an application for first floor extension, rear single storey extension and alterations to replace existing windows; also, proposed front rooflight was considered by this Council in June 2007 when the following comments were made:

“Recommend Refusal – overdevelopment of the site and unneighbourly to Nos 219 and 221. It would be detrimental to the view from the Conservation Area. It is a very congested cul de sac and no on-street parking is available for cars.”

Mid Sussex District Council REFUSED this application in July 2007.

BH.07.03220.LDC

(AW)

ST ANDREWS WARD

4 Woodland Crescent

(Mr J Bruce)

Two storey side extension and front entrance 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.

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 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 on 1 October 2007.

BH.07.03221.FUL (TM) VICTORIA WARD

58 Western Road (Mr B Ashdown)

New conservatory.

BH.07.03249.TCA (DS) MEEDS WARD

48 Park Road (Sarah Duckworth)

Re-pollard line of Willows.

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 line of Willows along the rear boundary were last pollarded in 2001 (BH.01.02428.TCA refers). They have grown considerably since then and have begun to break up. Clearly there are safety concerns because of the adjacent public footpath and electricity sub-station.

I advised that the trees be re-pollarded. They would look stark to begin with but would soon grow a new canopy.”

BH.07.03250.TCA (DS) MEEDS WARD

31A Park Road (U H Bond)

Eucalyptus - Lift canopy on western side 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:

“A large Eucalyptus on the western boundary overhangs the garden of No 31. This in itself is not a problem but one very low branch is somewhat of a nuisance.

Lifting the canopy by up to 2m would overcome the low overhang and there would be no visual amenity implications.”

BH.07.03251.TREE

(DS)

DUNSTALL WARD

23 Foxglove Close

(Mrs S Martirosian)

Oak (T9) - Trim back canopy on eastern side 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 Oak (T9) in the rear garden of 23 Foxglove Close was trimmed back on 22 March 2000 without consent although no action was taken.

The tree has grown significantly since then and, again, hangs over the garden significantly.

Trimming back to the previous cut points is acceptable and will not affect the tree’s overall appearance or visual amenity value.”
