



UCKFIELD TOWN COUNCIL

Council Offices, Civic Centre
Uckfield, East Sussex, TN22 1AE

Tel: (01825) 762774 Fax: (01825) 765757

e-mail: townclerk@uckfieldtc.gov.uk

www.uckfieldtc.gov.uk

Town Clerk – Holly Goring

A meeting of the **PLANS COMMITTEE** to be held on
Monday 30th January 2023
Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Uckfield at 7.00pm

AGENDA

Under the Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014, members of the public are able to film or record during a committee meeting.

1.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members and Officers are reminded to make any declarations of personal and/or prejudicial interests that they may have in relation to items on this Agenda. Should any Member consider that they require a dispensation in relation to any prejudicial interest that they may have, they are asked to make a written application to the Clerk well in advance of the meeting.

Notice should be given at this part of the meeting of any intended declaration. The nature of the interest should then be declared later at the commencement of the item or when the interest becomes apparent.

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

Members of the public are requested to notify the Town Council in advance of the meeting by emailing admin@uckfieldtc.gov.uk

3.0 APOLOGIES

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 9th January 2023.

4.2 Action List – attached.

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS – attached.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES – none.

7.0 TO START COMPILING A RESPONSE TO THE LEVELLING UP AND REGENERATION BILL: REFORMS TO PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION

Town Clerk
24th January 2023

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

WD/2023/0090/F 48 NEW ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SX

Demolition of existing substandard bathroom and erection of single storey rear extension incorporating enlarged kitchen and bathroom.

WD/2023/0077/LB THE MANOR HOUSE, REGENCY CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1DS

Internal alterations to second floor.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2022/2995/F

SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING FRONT EXTENSION

73 ROCKS PARK ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 2AU

WD/2022/2085/F

SINGLE STOREY ADDITION

LUXFORD DAY CENTRE, LIBRARY WAY, UCKFIELD, TN22 1AR

WD/2022/2916/F

PROPOSED FRONT AND REAR DORMER AND INTERNAL ALTERATIONS.

77 TOWER RIDE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1NT

WD/2022/2549/F

SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION TO DOMESTIC DWELLING HOUSE

45 HART CLOSE, UCKFIELD, TN22 2DA

WD/2022/2636/F

EXTENSION OF EXISTING CLUBHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED EXTENSION TO AND RE-ARRANGEMENT OF CAR PARK.

UCKFIELD RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB, NEVILL ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 1LX

WD/2022/3225/F

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY FRONT EXTENSION TO ENLARGE SHOWER ROOM

54 SELBY RISE, UCKFIELD, TN22 5EE

WD/2020/0732/F

DETACHED TWO-STOREY, 3-BED DWELLING HOUSE WITH PARKING, 1.7M HIGH FENCING TO THE SIDE, FRONT AND REAR OF THE GARDEN AND ADDITION OF SHED IN REAR GARDEN

LAND ADJACENT TO 6 DOWNSVIEW CRESCENT, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TG

Response to Town Council:

WD/2020/0732/F

DETACHED TWO-STOREY, 3-BED DWELLING HOUSE WITH PARKING, 1.7M HIGH FENCING TO THE SIDE, FRONT AND REAR OF THE GARDEN AND ADDITION OF SHED IN REAR GARDEN

LAND ADJACENT TO 6 DOWNSVIEW CRESCENT, UCKFIELD, TN22 1TG

The proposal represents an infill development similar to many others on the estate, and provides a dwelling commensurate with the size and design of its neighbours on a comparable plot, with an open-plan front garden. The proposed dwelling and hard surfacing would be outside the root protection area of trees within the adjoining public right of way, and the Highway Authority has confirmed that there are no highway safety concerns raised by the development.

Notice of Planning appeal:

WD/2021/1253/F

HEMPSTEAD OAST, HEMPSTEAD LANE, UCKFIELD, TN22 3DL

Proposal: SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO HOUSE AND CONVERSION OF ATTACHED GARAGING TO RESIDENTIAL ANNEXE WITH ASSOCIATED WORKS.

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/C1435/D/22/3304899 and APP/C1435/Y/22/3304929

Meeting of the Plans Committee

Monday 30 January 2023

Agenda item 7.0

TO START COMPILING A RESPONSE TO THE LEVELLING UP AND REGENERATION BILL: REFORMS TO PLANNING POLICY CONSULTATION

1.0 Summary

- 1.1 Members will be aware that the release of the consultation on the draft Wealden Local Plan has been delayed during the autumn/winter of 2022, whilst the local planning authority waited on further reviews at parliamentary and central government level on housing supply (housing targets) and associated methodology.
- 1.2 A letter was published by the Rt Hon Michael Gove on 6 December 2022, which reflected on planning and local control.
- 1.3 The intention of his letter was to '*place local communities at the heart of the planning system.*' This letter recognised that there were faults with the current planning system and it was proposed that a number of changes be set out in a consultation of the National Planning Policy Framework before Christmas.
- 1.4 A consultation opened on 22 December 2022 and is due to close on 2 March 2023, which members of full Council were made aware of at their Full Council on 23 January 2023.
- 1.5 The weblink to review the consultation text is as follows:
<https://www.gov.uk/government/consultations/levelling-up-and-regeneration-bill-reforms-to-national-planning-policy/levelling-up-and-regeneration-bill-reforms-to-national-planning-policy#scope-of-consultation>
- 1.6 There are up to 58 questions posed by central government as part of this consultation and within the context of the sub-headings. It was suggested that members of the Plans Committee review the consultation and ascertain whether committee members could focus on specific areas to formulate a response.
- 1.7 One further Plans Committee meeting will take place between this meeting and the deadline of the consultation on 2 March, so it may be that members need to undertake the work outside of the meeting to ensure a response is provided in time.

Contact Officer: Holly Goring

Appendices: Appendix A: Questions being posed through the consultation

Question Number	Question Wording
1	Do you agree that local planning authorities should not have to continually demonstrate a deliverable 5-year housing land supply (5YHLS) as long as the housing requirement set out in its strategic policies is less than 5 years old?
2	Do you agree that buffers should not be required as part of 5YHLS calculations (this includes the 20% buffer as applied by the Housing Delivery Test)?
3	Should an oversupply of homes early in a plan period be taken into consideration when calculating a 5YHLS later on or is there an alternative approach that is preferable?
4	What should any planning guidance dealing with oversupply and undersupply say?
5	Do you have any views about the potential changes to paragraph 14 of the existing Framework and increasing the protection given to neighbourhood plans?
6	Do you agree that the opening chapters of the Framework should be revised to be clearer about the importance of planning for the homes and other development our communities need?
7	What are your views on the implications these changes may have on plan-making and housing supply?
8	Do you agree that policy and guidance should be clearer on what may constitute an exceptional circumstance for the use of an alternative approach for assessing local housing needs? Are there other issues we should consider alongside those set out above?
9	Do you agree that national policy should make clear that Green Belt does not need to be reviewed or altered when making plans, that building at densities significantly out of character with an existing area may be considered in assessing whether housing need can be met, and that past over-supply may be taken into account?
10	Do you have views on what evidence local planning authorities should be expected to provide when making the case that need could only be met by building at densities significantly out of character with the existing area?

11	Do you agree with removing the explicit requirement for plans to be 'justified', on the basis of delivering a more proportionate approach to examination?
12	Do you agree with our proposal to not apply revised tests of soundness to plans at more advanced stages of preparation? If no, which if any, plans should the revised tests apply to?
13	Do you agree that we should make a change to the Framework on the application of the urban uplift?
14	What, if any, additional policy or guidance could the department provide which could help support authorities plan for more homes in urban areas where the uplift applies?
15	How, if at all, should neighbouring authorities consider the urban uplift applying, where part of those neighbouring authorities also functions as part of the wider economic, transport or housing market for the core town/city?
16	Do you agree with the proposed 4-year rolling land supply requirement for emerging plans, where work is needed to revise the plan to take account of revised national policy on addressing constraints and reflecting any past over-supply? If no, what approach should be taken, if any?
17	Do you consider that the additional guidance on constraints should apply to plans continuing to be prepared under the transitional arrangements set out in the existing Framework paragraph 220?
18	Do you support adding an additional permissions-based test that will 'switch off' the application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development where an authority can demonstrate sufficient permissions to meet its housing requirement?
19	Do you consider that the 115% 'switch-off' figure (required to turn off the presumption in favour of sustainable development Housing Delivery Test consequence) is appropriate?
20	Do you have views on a robust method for counting deliverable homes permissioned for these purposes?

- 21 What are your views on the right approach to applying Housing Delivery Test consequences pending the 2022 results?
-
- 22 Do you agree that the government should revise national planning policy to attach more weight to Social Rent in planning policies and decisions? If yes, do you have any specific suggestions on the best mechanisms for doing this?
-
- 23 Do you agree that we should amend existing paragraph 62 of the Framework to support the supply of specialist older people’s housing?
-
- 24 Do you have views on the effectiveness of the existing small sites policy in the National Planning Policy Framework (set out in paragraph 69 of the existing Framework)?
-
- 25 How, if at all, do you think the policy could be strengthened to encourage greater use of small sites, especially those that will deliver high levels of affordable housing?
-
- 26 Should the definition of “affordable housing for rent” in the Framework glossary be amended to make it easier for organisations that are not Registered Providers – in particular, community-led developers and almshouses – to develop new affordable homes?
-
- 27 Are there any changes that could be made to exception site policy that would make it easier for community groups to bring forward affordable housing?
-
- 28 Is there anything else that you think would help community groups in delivering affordable housing on exception sites?
-
- 29 Is there anything else national planning policy could do to support community-led developments?
-
- 30 Do you agree in principle that an applicant’s past behaviour should be taken into account into decision making?
-
- 31 Of the two options above, what would be the most effective mechanism? Are there any alternative mechanisms?
-
- 32 Do you agree that the 3 build out policy measures that we propose to introduce through policy will help incentivise developers to build out more quickly? Do you have any comments on the design of these policy measures?
-

-
- 33 Do you agree with making changes to emphasise the role of beauty and placemaking in strategic policies and to further encourage well-designed and beautiful development?
-
- 34 Do you agree to the proposed changes to the title of Chapter 12, existing paragraphs 84a and 124c to include the word 'beautiful' when referring to 'well-designed places', to further encourage well-designed and beautiful development?
-
- 35 Do you agree greater visual clarity on design requirements set out in planning conditions should be encouraged to support effective enforcement action?
-
- 36 Do you agree that a specific reference to mansard roofs in relation to upward extensions in Chapter 11, paragraph 122e of the existing framework is helpful in encouraging LPAs to consider these as a means of increasing densification/creation of new homes? If no, how else might we achieve this objective?
-
- 37 How do you think national policy on small scale nature interventions could be strengthened? For example, in relation to the use of artificial grass by developers in new development?
-
-
- 38 Do you agree that this is the right approach making sure that the food production value of high value farm land is adequately weighted in the planning process, in addition to current references in the Framework on best most versatile agricultural land?
-
- 39 What method or measure could provide a proportionate and effective means of undertaking a carbon impact assessment that would incorporate all measurable carbon demand created from plan-making and planning decisions?
-
- 40 Do you have any views on how planning policy could support climate change adaptation further, specifically through the use of nature-based solutions that provide multi-functional benefits?
-
- 41 Do you agree with the changes proposed to Paragraph 155 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework?
-
- 42 Do you agree with the changes proposed to Paragraph 158 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework?
-
- 43 Do you agree with the changes proposed to footnote 54 of the existing National Planning Policy Framework? Do you have any views on specific wording for new footnote 62?

-
- 44 Do you agree with our proposed Paragraph 161 in the National Planning Policy Framework to give significant weight to proposals which allow the adaptation of existing buildings to improve their energy performance?
-
- 45 Do you agree with the proposed timeline for finalising local plans, minerals and waste plans and spatial development strategies being prepared under the current system? If no, what alternative timeline would you propose?
-
- 46 Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements for plans under the future system? If no, what alternative arrangements would you propose?
-
- 47 Do you agree with the proposed timeline for preparing neighbourhood plans under the future system? If no, what alternative timeline would you propose?
-
- 48 Do you agree with the proposed transitional arrangements for supplementary planning documents? If no, what alternative arrangements would you propose?
-
- 49 Do you agree with the suggested scope and principles for guiding National Development Management Policies?
- 50 What other principles, if any, do you believe should inform the scope of National Development Management Policies?
-
- 51 Do you agree that selective additions should be considered for proposals to complement existing national policies for guiding decisions?
-
- 52 Are there other issues which apply across all or most of England that you think should be considered as possible options for National Development Management Policies?
-
- 53 What, if any, planning policies do you think could be included in a new framework to help achieve the 12 levelling up missions in the Levelling Up White Paper?
-
- 54 How do you think that the framework could better support development that will drive economic growth and productivity in every part of the country, in support of the Levelling Up agenda?
-
- 55 Do you think that the government could go further in national policy, to increase development on brownfield land within city and town centres, with a view to facilitating gentle densification of our urban cores?

56 Do you think that the government should bring forward proposals to update the framework as part of next year's wider review to place more emphasis on making sure that women, girls and other vulnerable groups in society feel safe in our public spaces, including for example policies on lighting/street lighting?

57 Are there any specific approaches or examples of best practice which you think we should consider to improve the way that national planning policy is presented and accessed?

58 We continue to keep the impacts of these proposals under review and would be grateful for your comments on any potential impacts that might arise under the Public Sector Equality Duty as a result of the proposals in this document.