

UCKFIELD TOWN COUNCIL



Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Committee held in the Weald Hall, Civic Centre, Uckfield on Monday 24th October 2022 at 7.00pm

Cllr. K. Bedwell (Chair)
Cllr. B. Cox

Cllr. C. Macve (Vice-Chair)
Cllr. J. Love

Cllr. D. Bennett

IN ATTENDANCE:

15 members of the public + 1 at 7.17pm

Cllr Gary Johnson

Holly Goring – Town Clerk

Linda Lewis – Administrative Assistant

Minutes taken by Linda Lewis

1.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and officers were reminded to make any declarations of personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to any item on the agenda.

Cllr. Love declared a personal interest in WD/2022/2216/MAO Horstedpond Farm as she knew the farmer.

Cllr. Bedwell declared a prejudicial interest in WD/2022/2216/MAO Horstedpond Farm as Chair of Ridgewood Village Hall Committee. The Village Hall had been referenced within the application paperwork as potentially having opportunity to utilise Section 106 monies, although not confirmed at this early stage of the application.

The Chair stated that when the committee later discussed the Horstedpond planning application, she would take no part in the debate and would not vote on the resolution and that Cllr. Love would be able to speak but not able to vote on the resolution. The Vice Chair of Plans, Cllr. Macve would be managing that section of the meeting.

The Chair explained the procedure of the meeting to the public present, stating that they could only speak on applications within the agenda under item no 2.0.

2.0 STATEMENTS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC ON MATTERS ON THE AGENDA AT THE CHAIRMAN'S DISCRETION

P60.10.22 It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to allow for members of the public to speak.

Resident 1 spoke in objection to the Horstedpond Farm application proposed by Castlefort homes.

He spoke on behalf of four residences in the middle of the site; one Grade II listed building and three farm building conversions, whose residents had formed The Horstedpond Farm Action Group, of which he was a founder member. He stated that these four homes would be completely surrounded by the 400 proposed homes and that their current access road would be compromised by the access road that would be built for the proposed development.

The proposed development of Horstedpond and Ridgewood Place would see south Uckfield conurbation extend along the A22 with no green fields left. He felt that the

1000 homes that had been given permission on the Ridgewood Farm site would be more than enough to meet the housing requirements for Uckfield.

He was not happy with the consultation process and felt that the developer's efforts to communicate their plan had been woefully inadequate. He stated that the developer made no alert to them to advertise the introduction of an online public exhibition on 15 June 2022. It was not until 15 September that the developer advised that their planning application had gone live, which left only four weeks to study the many online documents compiled on behalf of the developer, to create a website and to compile an objection and reach out to like-minded neighbours.

He felt that Wealden District Council's planning webpages were not user friendly and that it was difficult to find how to comment on the application.

He referenced the group's points of objection. In 2006, Wealden District Council placed an Article 4 Order on Horstedpond Farm which stated that development of the site would seriously damage the rural character of the area and the setting of Horstedpond House; the Grade II listed building, which made a moderate high-level contribution to the heritage significance of the site. The Horstedpond Action Group disagreed with the ludicrous conclusions of the 'desk top traffic analysis' which stated that traffic levels in south Uckfield and Uckfield in general would be marginal. They felt that traffic movements should be measured on the ground and at different times of the day in order to assess the true impact of traffic levels. The direct route from the development into the town centre would be either down Lewes Road or with a slight detour down New Road. Many homes along these roads had no driveways and therefore cars parked on the road, creating a single line of traffic down both of those roads, which would lead to rights of way problems for traffic in both directions.

The resident suggested that the 2014 data which Wealden District Council were working to, (which called for 1200 new homes to be built each year) was out of date. He stated that The Office of National Statistics data projections for population increase, and the need for new residences indicated that perhaps only a third of that number was now required per annum. He quoted that Wealden had 8,000 inbuilt permissions and therefore, according to the latest Office of National Statistics projections Wealden has enough inbuilt homes to meet its target for the next 20 years. He concluded that the need for new homes was in the manufacturing centres of the Midlands and the north, where construction of new homes would align with the needs of levelling up legislation. The Wealden area, which comprised two thirds of The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty was never going to be a manufacturing centre and he felt that we did not need any further homes for the moment in this part of the country.

Resident 2 also from Horstedpond Action Group stated that they were delighted that the Woodland Trust objected to the application on the basis of indirect impact to two ancient woodlands, and that there should be a larger buffer zone of 50m to ensure adequate protection of ancient woodland adjacent to the site boundary. Where further mitigation was not achievable, then the application should not be taken forward. The Action Group noted that Natural England had also been contacted to comment on the proposed SANG to which they were in favour subject to their advice. However, Natural England had not been asked to comment on the loss of farmland, which for several years had been, and was being farmed in accordance with their guidelines for Countryside Stewardship, which looked after the environment to maximise ecological benefit. The loss of this habitat would be extremely detrimental to the ecological balance which had been created and now existed, and they had since advised Natural England of how it is farmed.

The resident noted that a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) produced by Ryder Landscape Consultants had been submitted by Castlefort Homes. He suggested perhaps this was biased as he had assumed that Castlefort Homes would have paid for this. He stated that he had not been able to read the entire report however, regarding the south west corner by Little Horsted roundabout he disagreed with the findings of the report for this area which stated that for A22 road users the sensitivity would be medium/low/moderate to minor. He argued that the visual impact from the A22 would be 'horrendous' as 'three storey' homes were proposed only 15m from the A22 boundary, where there were no trees or hedgerows along the A22 for the whole of the field.

One member of the public joined the meeting (7.17pm).

Resident 3 spoke to also object to the Horstedpond application on the grounds that the proposed development and current development would place an unsustainable demand on currently available water sources. He referenced statistical information from South East Water and Water.org.uk that Uckfield's population of 15,000 currently consumed 2,340,000 litres of water per day. He estimated from statistical data that with the current development at Harlands Farm, proposed developments at Downlands Farm, Mockbeggars, Bird in Eye, the Gladman proposal to develop land adjacent to Fernley Park, Ridgewood Farm and Cysleys Farm would mean a total increase of 51% on the present demand. He described the abstraction methods and said that any increase above the current demand would be unlikely to be met via abstraction methods, for which the amount of available water is set by the River Authority. This resident suggested that Wealden District Council and the developer should take note of the UK Government plans which set out to reduce water demand, protect wildlife areas and create new habitats for nature, by introducing a Water Neutrality Scheme. Such a scheme was used in Horsham, in parts of Kent and in the Norfolk Broads. Essentially the aim was that the total demand on the public water supply (in a defined area) was the same after development as it was before. He doubted that Southern Water could cope with the waste water also and said that there was no mention ever made as to how Southern Water planned to handle increases in the amount of effluent it would be expected to treat.

P61.10.22 It was **RESOLVED** to reinstate Standing Orders

3.0 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllrs. J. Beesley and S. Mayhew

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 26th September 2022

P62.10.22 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Plans Committee of the 26th September 2022, be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2 Action List

Members noted the Action List.

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

WD/2022/2216/MAO HORSTEDPOND FARM, LEWES ROAD, LITTLE HORSTED, TN22 5TR

Outline planning application proposing the development of land for the erection of up to 400 dwellings with creation of new roundabout access from Lewes Road, 16.45ha. of new open space and SANG provision alongside new pedestrian linkages.

Cllr. Bedwell reiterated her prejudicial interest in the application and handed the role of Chair to Cllr. Macve for this agenda item. Cllr. Bedwell took no part in the discussions

that followed nor in the vote and Cllr. Love who also reiterated her personal interest in the application, had been given permission to speak on the application but would not vote.

Cllr. Macve as Chair invited members of the Committee to speak on the application.

Cllr. Love was first to give her thoughts. Referencing the proposed access point (the roundabout) and the design from the map Cllr Love raised her concerns. The road had already received permission for traffic calming measures to support the Ridgewood Farm S106 agreement. The designs from Castlefort Home did not reflect these additions or the two bus stops and build out that had been agreed within that scheme. Cllr Love would not want to see Lewes Road closed again and noted that the roundabout design was too off-set which would result in traffic driving in towards the development and then back out again. ES Highways were yet to submit their report.

There was a proposal to include a footpath on the western side of Lewes Road adjacent to Ridgewood Farm. There was a strip of classified ancient woodland along the western side of Lewes Road, and this would need to be accounted for and an appropriate buffer put in place to reduce the impact. Therefore the proposed location of the footway may not be suitable.

The suggestion to introduce a shuttle bus service was not the first time this had been considered by applicants for large scale developments around Uckfield, and although a positive proposal for sustainable transport solutions, it was questionable how this would work in practice.

Cllr. Love queried the position shown for the emergency access point on the bypass side of the site as she would assume that emergency services coming to the site would come from New Town.

Referencing the SANGS and connection to Millennium Green, the area around Ridgewood Stream did flood and the areas above it, did get waterlogged. She was keen to see more than a desktop survey. In particular, reflecting on a resident's consultation response, if there were European Eels and Swan Mussels, these needed to be taken into account.

The archaeological response listed various things that they wished to see further investigated. There was a Grade II listed building within the farm as well as the other farm buildings and she was concerned that nothing has been documented or discussed to preserve that historical medieval setting which had been in private hands since the 16th Century.

She had concerns regarding sewage; the developer must do more than a 'desk top assessment' regarding sewage and carry out a detailed on-site assessment to know what the system could and couldn't cope with. Residents of Forge Rise already struggled with issues of flies and odour and the system could not cope with more development without the system being improved.

She agreed with the Woodland Trust that a 50m buffer area should be included to protect the adjacent ancient woodland, as there is only 2% of ancient woodland left.

Cllr. Macve reminded members that this application was purely for outline planning permission for 400 houses and traffic access, which as we were yet to see the ES Highways report it was very difficult for the Town Council to comment on. The drawings illustrated that on the western side of Lewes Road, they would have to build a retaining wall to support the footpath which would inevitably cause damage and

disturbance to the ancient woodland. Also, in order to construct the proposed roundabout at the entrance, the land laid considerably lower than Lewes Road (10-14ft lower), they would need to build a very large retaining wall or earth embankment, both of which would encroach onto the flood plain and cause further restriction to the flow of the Ridgewood Stream when in flood.

Cllr. Bennett – thanked residents for speaking of their concerns and the concerns for Uckfield's residents as a whole. He questioned how the proposed bus service would be effective, especially with the reduction in bus services in general. It was a fact that people did not use local estate bus services and questioned what would happen to the service once the developer no longer funded a non-profitable service. Although the SANGS was promoted as a beneficial gift it was usually an area that was unsustainable for profitable use.

He stated his concerns regarding clay contamination of the Ridgewood Stream, and subsequently the River Uck as a result of the construction of the large clay bunds and highway works. Clay contamination and silt deposits would be of grave detriment to the salmonoid species of the upper Ouse river. It was important that the water remained aerated.

He recalled that nearly 20 years ago a Section 4 (Article 4 Order) was put on this piece of land when there was a proposal to build an eco-friendly set of log cabins which was an innovative idea at the time. At that time although the Town Council were in support, Wealden District Council objected to it as they deemed it to be detrimental to the environment and the aesthetic value of the site. He found it interesting that 20 years later Wealden has a completely changed view on this.

Cllr. Macve mentioned that the drawings showed a remarkable degree of inconsistency in relation to the SUDS and the retention ponds which would need to be looked at and resolved at a later date under Reserved Matters.

Cllr Cox would keep it brief as he felt that members had covered a number of points that he would have also said. However, he felt missing was the fact that if the Town Council were considering the application for 400 homes in isolation, the council could come to conclusion, however the combination of sites coming to the area, particularly in the south of the town together with more rainfall would ultimately cause more localised flooding.

Congestion in the south side of Uckfield was already an issue and therefore adding an extra 1,500 homes to the area would be a 'nightmare' and would be over development of the site. He recalled that when the new SANGS of Horsted Green was being constructed, there was a lot of rain fall clay run-off with a lot of damage caused to the waterways and adjacent woodland. He again called for a full flood review.

Cllr. Love again spoke regarding Cllr. Macve's point that the area of the access point had to be raised and agreed that this needed to be highlighted and would cause detrimental impact to the land so close to the Ridgewood Stream. She also mentioned that the traffic analysis did not account for vehicles that could use the SANGS area. Knowing the high usage of Horsted Green SANGs, this was important.

Cllr Love also asked if anyone had contacted the Town Council to discuss use of the Ridgewood Village Hall car park, as it was likely that usage of this car park would increase with people using a new SANGs.

Cllr. Macve considered alternative access into town for residents would be via the A22 By-pass, which would then see further congestion at Copwood Roundabout and Tesco roundabout.

Cllr. Cox stated that with the development being at the far south of the town's boundary and away from the town, it could affect community/social cohesion of the young people which he was well able to speak of as he was on the board of the Uckfield Youth Trust. There was a risk of isolation for young people this far south of the town centre, and the potential to see anti-social behaviour as a result.

Cllr. Bennett agreed saying that it would be impossible for the young people residing on the development to access the facilities within the town.

Cllr. Macve said he found it of concern that the town was moving southwards and this would dis-encourage residents to use Uckfield as a key economic centre. It was possibly easier to reach Lewes.

Cllr. Macve wished to conclude discussions. He reminded attendees once again that the application was for outline planning permission with all matters reserved but access. However he knew that it was not possible to look at access alone, so he would look to incorporate all points raised during the meeting. The applicants had taken time to engage with the Town Council prior to the submission of their application, which had been appreciated.

Although situated at the bottom edge of the parish boundary, the development would sit adjacent to other sites planned for or anticipated to see development such as Ridgewood Farm, Land off Eastbourne Road, and Ridgewood House and therefore will not sit in isolation from the town like other recent proposals i.e. Downlands Farm. Although this placed the site in a more favourable position, the feedback received highlighted that there were concerns with the highway/pedestrian proposals, there was limited information upon which to make an informed decision due to the lack of Environmental Impact Assessment and full study of the biodiversity of this site. There were also concerns with regard to the handling of foul drainage.

P63.10.22 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** to object to the application on the grounds given below:

(i) Location and linkages between the proposed development and Uckfield Town

- Although the main access point had been placed onto Lewes Road to ensure connectivity with the town, the southern location of this site would naturally encourage residents to travel elsewhere for work and retail via the A22 rather than support their local market town;
- Wealden DC's SHELAA 2019 did not reference this site;

(ii) Preserving heritage

- Reference had been made to an Article 4 Direction placed on this site in 2006, in order to control works that could alter the character of an area and decrease protection of a heritage asset. With Horstedpond Farmhouse being Grade 2 Listed, this development could impact on the setting and landscape of this building;

(iii) Highway access and pedestrian safety

- There was only one vehicular entrance into the site, this was not considered acceptable for a site and scale of a development of up to 400 properties and the levels of the land adjacent to the proposed roundabout would require substantial earth movement;

- The longevity of the proposed shuttle bus service and management of this raised concerns. In bad weather most people drove to work or school and resulted in queues at Highlands roundabout and down the hill of New Town to reach work and school. The numerous new developments all leading onto Lewes Road would cumulatively impact traffic flows on Lewes Road and New Town morning and night, as well as Bell Farm Road and Tesco roundabout from those vehicles using the A22 by-pass;
- The proposed siting of a puffin crossing between the new roundabout and Little Horsted roundabout raised concerns as it could cause tailbacks onto Little Horsted roundabout thus impacting the flow of traffic on an important trunk road (A22);
- The Block Plan 'Lewes Road linkages' was missing reference number 5 - the zebra crossing. Perhaps this style of crossing would be more suitable on Lewes Road, as it only created a temporary delay to traffic flows. From experience of involvement in the considerations for Ridgewood Farm related traffic calming measures, the bus company were not favourable towards delays being added to their journey times;
- The Town Council were still awaiting the report from ES Highways, and without this were unable to comment further;
- The same plan did not indicate the placement of any footway from the new roundabout to the puffin crossing on Lewes Road, or Little Horsted roundabout;
- General concerns had been raised for traffic flows on Lewes Road, with the introduction of four new access points onto the road (Siggs Yard, Ridgewood Farm x 2 and Ridgewood House) plus a new roundabout to the Horsted Pond site, along with bus stops and a build-out traffic calming measure;

(iv) Environmental impact on important ecological habitats and ancient woodland

- The site comprised grade 3 agricultural land, adjacent to extensive areas of ancient woodland but as a result of this land being private, the true understanding of its biodiversity is uncertain;
- The need to protect areas of high landscape quality e.g. NPPF 15 (174(a));
- This was an important green corridor, and any development would see the loss of arable agricultural land along with a number of species of wildlife:
 - a local ornithologist recorded 115 species of birds there in the past 10 years;
 - local residents had seen herds of up to 50 of deer;
 - the European Eel which was linked to the Shortbridge Stream had also been seen in Ridgewood Stream, along with Swan mussels;
- Need to identify, map and safeguard rich wildlife habitats (NPPF 15 179a);
- The proposed works to Lewes Road to provide adequate highway and pedestrian access would sit adjacent to a strip of ancient woodland on the western side of Lewes Road. Measures were needed to mitigate the impact on the ancient woodland required;
- The Woodland Trust objected on the basis of deterioration of the adjacent ancient woodland and veteran trees, and requested a larger buffer zone to minimise impact. They felt it would fragment ancient woodland sites;
- The Native Space Newt Officer identified that this was a red zone for great crested newts, and wished to see strict stringent compliance conditions;

(v) Limited consideration of amenity space and facilities to support the size of development and north of town

- The proposed amenity open space was very small for the scale of the development. Uckfield Town Council had expressed already that a play area/open space and SANG for developments of this size in the town was not

acceptable. To support population growth, improvements were needed to or new sports facilities, community facilities, allotment space, support with extending the local cemetery? With the scale of development proposed for Ridgewood, developers needed to work together to provide for the local community;

- The proposed SANG extension and Millennium Green would require specific expertise to manage drainage issues onsite and Ridgewood Stream;

(vi) Concerns with drainage, groundwater and risk of foul flooding

- Concerns had been raised by statutory authorities and members of the public on the lack of proposals or information for the handling of foul drainage;
- Southern Water had only undertaken a desktop study at this point, but raised their concerns with the potential for an increased risk of foul flooding from the sewer network;
- When assessing flood risk zones, the Environment Agency had this address recorded as “*an area with critical drainage problems notified by the Environment Agency, and identified as being an increased flood risk by the local authority’s strategic flood risk assessment*”

(vii) Housing mix

- Uckfield Town Council supported the response from Wealden DC’s Housing department to provide 35% affordable, align any housing mix with the needs of the community, and to give consideration to starter homes, and accessible homes to meet a variety of needs.

The public left the room, apart from two people that remained seated.

Cllr. Macve then handed the Chair back to Cllr. Bedwell.

WD/2022/2061/F 35 KELD AVENUE, UCKFIELD, TN22 5BW

Removal of existing conservatory and construction of new single storey extension to include retrospective decking to rear.

Changed description.

P64.10.22 It was **RESOLVED** to support the application as there would be no detrimental effect to neighbours and there were no neighbour objections.

WD/2022/2639/F PICKLES, EASTBOURNE ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5ST

Erection of close boarded fence at perimeter of front garden adjoining Eastbourne Road.

P65.10.22 It was **RESOLVED** to support the application as there would be no detrimental effect on the adjoining property.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2022/1644/F

DROP KERB TO FRONT OF PROPERTY

132 FRAMFIELD ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5AU

WD/2022/2110/F

ERECTION OF A SINGLE AND TWO STOREY REAR EXTENSION.

66 STREATFIELD ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 2BQ

WD/2022/1777/F
SIDE EXTENSION, INTERNAL & EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS INCLUDING
LANDSCAPING.
7 LASHBROOKS ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 2AY

WD/2022/2119/F
ERECTION OF FRONT PORCH WITH GROUND FLOOR WC.
18 WOODLANDS CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TS

WD/2022/0908/F
NEW WAREHOUSE AND RELOCATION OF 6 NO. EXISTING STORAGE
CONTAINERS.
KENNEDY HYGIENE PRODUCTS LTD, BROOKSIDE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1YA

WD/2022/1995/F
EXTENSION TO FRONT AND CONVERSION OF GARAGE TO OFFICE AND PLAY
ROOM, ERECTION OF PORCH
11 ELLIS WAY, UCKFIELD, TN22 2BT

Refused:

WD/2022/0820/F
NEW BUILD, END OF TERRACE TWO-BEDROOM HOUSE TOGETHER WITH NEW
PORCH AND ACCESS TO EXISTING DWELLING.
63 THE DRIVE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1DB

WD/2022/1465/F
PROPOSED NEW 2 BEDROOM SINGLE STOREY DWELLING
30 SYCAMORE COURT, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TY

Withdrawn:

WD/2021/1764/MAJ
CONVERSION AND EXTENSION OF THE EXISTING CARE HOME AND THE
DEMOLITION OF THE EXISTING BUNGALOW AND GARAGE BUILDING TO ALLOW
FOR THE CREATION OF 17 NO. DWELLINGS, 6 NO. OF WHICH ARE
AFFORDABLE TENURE. THE CREATION OF A NEW ROAD ACCESS, CLOSURE
OF THE EXISTING ACCESS AND ASSOCIATED WORKS.
CHARLWOOD MANOR, SNATTS ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 2AR

Members noted the decision notices.

**7.0 TO ADVISE ON THE TOWN COUNCIL'S OBSERVATIONS AND COMMENTS ON
PLANNING APPLICATIONS OUTSIDE THE USUAL CYCLE OF MEETINGS –
WD/2022/2003/F BELL WALK HOUSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 5DQ**

Convert two existing parking spaces to rapid electric vehicle charging bays, along with associated equipment.

Uckfield Town Council would support the application in principle; however, members would query the answers given to the following questions within the application, under the heading 'Assessment of Flood Risk', in which answers state that the area was (1) not in the area at risk of flooding and (2) not within 20 metres of a watercourse. The Town Council believes this area 'is' prone to flood, although not often, and is within 20metres of the River Uck.

**WD/2022/1913/F WESTMINSTER HOUSE, BOLTON CLOSE, BELLBROOK
INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PH**

Extension of existing warehouse.

Uckfield Town Council cannot support this application at this time due to the comments within the Highways reports, of lack of information and their requirement for a Swept drawing to show the development would not have a severe impact on the local highway, car parking numbers and cycle parking.

Members would also request to be able to view correspondence from the Environment Agency to be satisfied that the Agency's comments had been actioned, which would ensure that should a licence be required, this factor would already be in place.

For both these points it would be necessary for the relevant documents addressing these issues to be available on the Planning Application Display of the Wealden District Council website.

WD/2022/1810/F 23 WOODLANDS CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TS

Dormers on front and rear elevations, roof and fenestration alterations to existing rear extension.

Uckfield Town Council noted that the large size of the rear dormer still had still not been addressed and therefore our comments for this application remained as previously submitted. We would object on the following grounds:

- This would result in the reduction of availability of bungalows for the elderly or disabled, for which these were originally built to promote a mixed community;*
- The size of the dormer would not match the adjoining property and would create an imbalance to the building;*
- Would not be in keeping with the street scene.*

WD/2022/2119/F 18 WOODLANDS CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TS

Erection of front porch with ground floor WC.

Uckfield Town Council support the application as similar works have been carried out to other houses in the vicinity, thereby a precedent existed, and there would be no detrimental impact to the street scene.

WD/2022/2032/F HIGHLANDS INN, EASTBOURNE ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SP

Proposed works to beer garden comprising extension to decking area with pergola over, landscaping and fencing.

Uckfield Town Council decline to comment on this application until they are able to view correspondence from the Tree Officer and are able to define how the existing trees would be affected and the effect to wildlife.

Members also felt that the proposed re-siting of the memorial, (disconnected from its surrounding and being fenced off at the end of a parking bay) was inappropriate, disrespectful and unsympathetic.

WD/2022/2071/LB MILTON COTTAGE, PUDDING CAKE LANE, TN22 1BU

Retrospective alterations and repainting of the building.

Uckfield Town Council decline to comment on this application until consideration is able to be given to the Conservation and Design Officers report yet to become available on the website.

WD/2022/1663/F AND WD/2022/1664/LB THE FARMHOUSE, 26 HARLANDS MEWS, UCKFIELD, TN22 5JQ

Full planning permission with listed building consent for a new dwelling in the garden of a grade 2 listed farmhouse.

*Members accepted that a precedent had been set, however **RESOLVED** to object on the following grounds as previously submitted and as below. We would add that regard should be given to the preservation of the existing garden wall.*

- Over development of the site;*

- Concerns for increased traffic congestion and access issues within the very small cramped site;
- Concern for the heritage of the site and would request engagement with the Conservation Officer with regards to the scale and mass of the proposed;
- Concerns for the heritage of the site, particularly the wall.

WD/2022/1674/DC STREATFIELD HOUSE, SOUTHVIEW DRIVE, UCKFIELD TN22 1UP

Demolition of existing buildings; erection of 4 no. apartments and 16 no. houses (100% affordable) with associated car parking, landscaping and access works.

As per our previous comments members were in support of the application and were pleased that the comments of the Town Council regarding the entrance block roof have been actioned, and that this now incorporates a pitched roof. In order to be 'in keeping' with the street scene and the properties immediately opposite, we would request the use of natural slate.

However, members concerns remained regarding the following:

- *The hedge height was much higher in the original presentation. This would be preferred, as not only would this give privacy to the occupants it would also soften the street scene;*
- *That the drawings supplied now show two cuttings through the bank which again differs from the presentation previously given. We would therefore request clarity on this;*
- *Due to the variety of different ownerships within the development, we have concerns regarding the maintenance of communal areas in the long term, including the management and care of the cedar roof;*
- *We would request that the bat survey encompass the wooded area at the back;*
- *Noted that the proposal showed no finished floor level of Streatfeild House as opposed to the proposed finished floor levels of the properties. How do the proposed levels relate to the existing levels? If the new properties are higher this would be detrimental to the buildings in Lime Close;*
- *Concerns that the occupant of Plot 20, which would have access onto Southview Drive, would suffer access difficulties at times of congestion i.e. at school drop off and pick up times;*
- *Concerns that in busy times of school pupil drop off and pickup, people would find Southview Drive more congested and use the layby which in turn would take away parking from the shops at the top of the town. Members also felt that visitor parking was inadequate and would lead again to parking on Southview Drive causing more congestion;*
- *Concerns for the road surface condition of Southview Drive itself following works to Uckfield College, which still needed to be addressed before any further development works are undertaken in this area.*

WD/2022/1853/F LAND ADJACENT TO 37AA NEVILL ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PE

Proposed dwelling attached to 37AA Nevill Road.

Uckfield Town Council found no changes within the application to affect the original decision to object to the application as follows:

- *Over development of the site and would detrimentally affect the open plan nature of the award-winning design of the estate;*
- *Vehicular access to the garage, being on a bend would be dangerous.*
- *Concerns that this would exacerbate flooding, which was known to happen in this area due to drainage issues with run-off of water;*

- *Concerns that a main sewer was reportedly running very close to the proposed building.*

WD/2022/2297/F JACARANDA, HIGHVIEW LANE, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SY

Extensions and associated alterations.

Uckfield Town Council object to the application on the following grounds:

- *Over development of the site;*
- *The extension would not be in keeping with the neighbouring properties and the surrounding area;*
- *The alterations are not in character with the existing building.*

WD/2022/2289/F 52 MANOR WAY, UCKFIELD, TN22 1DG

Vehicle crossover and off-road parking area.

Uckfield Town Council support the application as it would reduce on street parking.

WD/2022/2238/F 48 CHURCH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1BT

Repairs to roof and facias of timber garden chalet within rear garden.

Uckfield Town Council support the application as the works would maintain the integrity of the building to prevent further decay.

**WD/2022/2339/F PLOT 111, HARLANDS PARK
(LAND NORTH OF MALLARD DRIVE), UCKFIELD, TN22 5NF**

Garden shed.

Uckfield Town Council support the application as there would be no adverse impact to the adjoining property.

Members noted the report.

The meeting closed at 8.01pm.