

Meeting of the Planning Committee
Monday 27th April 2020

TO ADVISE ON THE TOWN COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS OUTSIDE THE USUAL CYCLE OF MEETINGS.

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 The report provides the Town Council's comments and observations on the applications listed that were not placed on an agenda as their date for response falls outside the usual cycle of Plans Committee meetings.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 At a meeting of Full Council on the 8th April 2013 a resolution was made on the procedure for the Town Council's comments and observations on applications for which Wealden District Council need a response that would fall outside the usual cycle of planning meetings. FC.77.04.13.

3.0 Procedure

- 3.1 The following applications were emailed to plans committee members for consideration.

Public notices were put up on the 7th April 2020:

WD/2020/0607/LB – 129, HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1EH

Replacement of bay windows to front of the property

WD/2020/0591/F – 59, LASHBROOKS ROAD, UCKFIELD

Front entrance porch

WD/2020/0332/F – DRAY HOUSE, OLIVES YARD, HIGH ST, UCKFIELD

Change of use from A1 to D1

WD/2020/0410/MAO – LAND OFF EASTBOURNE ROAD, UCKFIELD

Outline planning application for up to 90 residential dwellings (including up to 35% affordable housing), introduction of structural planting and landscaping, informal public open space and children's play area, surface water flood mitigation, vehicular access point from eastbourne road and associated ancillary work

4.0 Declaration of Interests

- 4.1 Councillor Macve declared a personal interest in WD/2020/0607/LB.

5.0 Comments

- 5.1 The Chairman gave the definitive response of the committee as follows:-

WD/2020/0607/LB – 129, HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1EH

Replacement of bay windows to front of the property

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** this application. The bay windows are in need of replacement and we are pleased to see that the street scene will be maintained.

WD/2020/0591/F – 59, LASHBROOKS ROAD, UCKFIELD

Front entrance porch

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** this application. It will not affect the neighbouring properties or adversely affect the street scene.

WD/2020/0332/F – DRAY HOUSE, OLIVES YARD, HIGH ST, UCKFIELD

CHANGE OF USE FROM A1 TO D1

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** this application. Plans Committee members were pleased to see another business in this part of the town and would like to ensure that the new business reiterates to their clients that parking is available in the town car parks and not in Olives Yard.

**WD/2020/0410/MAO – LAND OFF EASTBOURNE ROAD, UCKFIELD
OUTLINE PLANNING APPLICATION FOR UP TO 90 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (INCLUDING
UP TO 35% AFFORDABLE HOUSING), INTRODUCTION OF STRUCTURAL PLANTING AND
LANDSCAPING, INFORMAL PUBLIC OPEN SPACE AND CHILDREN’S PLAY AREA, SURFACE
WATER FLOOD MITIGATION, VEHICULAR ACCESS POINT FROM EASTBOURNE ROAD AND
ASSOCIATED ANCILLARY WORK**

It was **RESOLVED** to **strongly OBJECT** to this application on the following grounds:

(i) highway safety and concerns relating to volume of traffic:

- a new access is being proposed onto Eastbourne Road rather than using the existing roundabout. Why is this?
- in a previous application for this site, it was requested by ES Highways that assessments be undertaken on the impact of additional traffic on the junction of New Road where it joins both Lewes Road and Eastbourne Road. Have these been undertaken? With an increase in vehicle movements already in the pipeline for Ridgewood (1,000 homes) and Mallards Drive development (119 homes), this could bring this end of town to a standstill and see an increase in traffic congestion. We therefore hope that all traffic surveys and assessments take account of other nearby developments and assess the full impact on small narrow residential road (New Road) which is now going to be massively affected by all of these developments;
- the application states that ES Highways were previously satisfied with proposals to the previous application WD/2016/1081/MEA. The response we found which highlighted the above did not suggest this. ES Highways had in fact requested further more to up to date data from the developer.

(ii) lack of concern for archaeological matters on this site. We would expect a thorough geophysical survey to be undertaken in line with previous advice from the ESCC Archaeological department who previously stated that the archaeological significance of the site was undefined. The area of Mount Ephraim had long links to the brick making industry and its proximity to Ware’s pottery may have greater interest for industrial historians. The wider location also has connections with notable air incidents, most notably the loss of Eugene Seghers in 1944, but also the fatal incident following the pre-war mid-air collision of Gloster Gladiator aircraft.

(iii) Uckfield does not have the infrastructure to cope with this further development, with planning permission already being granted for 1,000 homes at Ridgewood Farm and a further 119 homes off Mallards Drive.

- the developer details the Applegate Dentist and Bird in Eye Medical services as being within walking distance of the site. The development off Mallards Drive is in closer proximity to Bird in Eye surgery, and for a surgery that is already at capacity, the impact of 119 homes off Mallards Drive, and a further 90 homes off Eastbourne Road will not be supported by those services currently detailed as being in walking distance. Further provision for medical services, public transport and footway/cycleways needs to be considered as part of or alongside any further development.

(iv) Sewerage capacity – it’s a shame the report was not included and available to read online. Having read feedback provided to the past application for this site, Southern Water stated clearly that they felt they could not accommodate the needs of a further 90 homes, without the development providing additional local infrastructure. They stated that any proposed development would increase flows into the foul sewerage system and as a result increase the risk of flooding in and around the existing area, contrary to paragraph 109 of the NPPF. It was requested at that time that if WDC approved the application that they add a condition that ‘*development shall not commence until a drainage strategy detailing the proposed means of foul and surface water disposal and an implementation table be submitted.*’ And, they requested that the developer enter into a formal agreement with Southern Water.

(v) drainage and flooding – furthermore, it stated that the land has low infiltration due to clay and shows that the area is in flood zone one, therefore it has to create more surface water run-off. The application states that the developer has been in discussion with the Environment Agency, but we don’t have sight of their report, which isn’t particularly helpful. The pond which is located behind the industrial estate may attract more surface water and possibly lead to overflowing into the gardens behind the houses on the edge of the land, and industrial estate.

(vi) existing landuse – the site is still being used as grazing land and therefore still needed for agricultural purposes.

We therefore feel a number of the issues identified by the relevant agencies in response to the previous application submitted in 2016, have not been addressed and merely swept over in this application. The submission of an application for a further 90 homes, after very recent applications for 1,000 homes and 119 homes all in close proximity to one another, does not give the town time to adapt to change, nor handle the impact on local infrastructure and increased volume in traffic.

6.0 Responses from Wealden District Council in relation to previously considered applications:

6.1 Application No. WD/2020/0205/F CONVERSION OF LOFT AND CONSTRUCTION OF REAR FACING DORMER 111 NEVILL ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 1LJ

Response to Town Council: The Town Council's comments are noted. However, although the property has been significantly extended in the past, and the proposed dormer is large and at the top end of what would ordinarily be considered acceptable, in this instance it is important to bear in mind that the proposed dormer would otherwise be allowed under permitted development, had PD rights not been removed. It is therefore unlikely that a refusal could be sustained on appeal when in all other regards the proposal would have been considered as acceptable under permitted development.

7.0 Recommendations

7.1 It is recommended that members note the report.

Contact Officer: Holly Goring