



Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Committee held in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Uckfield on Monday 11th March 2024 at 7.00pm

Cllr. K. Bedwell (Chair)
Cllr. J. Love

Cllr. C. Macve (Vice Chair)
Cllr. D. Bennett

Cllr. S. Mayhew
Cllr. P. Ullmann

IN ATTENDANCE:

8 members of the public

Cllr. B. Reed

Linda Lewis – Administrative Officer

Minutes taken by Linda Lewis

1.0 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

Cllr. K. Bedwell declared a personal interest relating to agenda item 5.0, in application WD/2023/3035/FR LINSTEAD, Linden Chase, Uckfield, TN22 1EE, as she knew a family member living at the address very well;

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

P73.03.24 Members **RESOLVED** to suspending Standing Orders to allow members of the public to speak.

Resident 1 – spoke on item 5.0 planning applications and addressed the committee regarding application WD/2023/3035/FR LINSTEAD, LINDEN CHASE, UCKFIELD TN22 1EE

As the resident of Hempstead House, he objected to the raised walkway which had been placed behind his rear boundary, due to the loss of privacy and adverse impact. He explained that the walkway was 700mm above ground level and that his neighbours were walking 500mm above his rear fence. He could see his neighbours walking backwards and forwards and they were able to look through his windows.

He stated that the decking was in breach of policy EN27 creating an unacceptable adverse impact on the privacy of adjoining neighbours, scale, height, form and noise, and was in opposition to the development plan.

He had spoken with District Councillor. K. Williams who did not agree that people looking 500mm over the fence was a privacy issue, which he thought was incredible. Along the rear boundary of the Hempstead House there were only two trees and a fence; there was no 2.5m evergreen hedge as Cllr. Williams had stated and Cllr. Macve verified this from his recent visit to the site.

If raised decking were to be granted, he felt that he would seriously consider moving as he would be unable to cope with the loss of privacy. He mentioned that three neighbours had already moved.

Resident 2 – spoke on item 9.0, to consider a motion from the Chair regarding road safety.

He addressed the committee stating that he and his neighbours who were present at the meeting lived in the new development at Ridgewood Place, which was expanding rapidly and they had the pleasure of living on Red Clover Road, which was on a very steep hill.

Besides two 20 mph speed limit signs in locations not clearly visible, there was nothing to restrict the speed of vehicles coming down from the top of the hill, from the final build of phase 1 of the development.

There were approximately seven residents that used the hill at speeds of 50-60 miles per hour as well as delivery drivers. The driveways of Red Clover Road were not visible to vehicles and the properties were flush with the kerb. Young children rode their bikes and scooters and walked across to a green space.

There were no line markings anywhere within the development; no parking bays (just indents in the road), and no speed limit signs. This was not the case in other Taylor Wimpey developments.

The resident had purchased three 20 mph speed limit signs at £30 each, two of which had been taken down and only one remained.

He had been in correspondence with Taylor Wimpey for approximately 18 months. They did not acknowledge that there was a problem since the final phase was opened. Their response was that the speeding delivery drivers were not their problem and that it was only a couple of residents that were speeding. They had not accepted his request to make a site visit and were not willing to take action as the development had been approved.

Residents had door camera videos of vehicles ‘burning rubber’, and he stated there had already been accidents. He recalled only three days previous that a cat had been hit by a vehicle on the road at such speed that it landed on a driveway.

There was also a dangerous issue that the right of way between Red Clover Road and Meadow Lane was unclear as it was not marked.

He had written to Taylor Wimpey Head of Customer Services, their CEO and COO but had not received a response

He had extreme safety concerns and called for speed bumps, traffic calming measures and road markings to be introduced before an accident occurred.

P74.03.24 Members **RESOLVED** to re-instate Standing Orders.

3.0 APOLOGIES
None.

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 19th February 2024

P75.03.24 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Plans Committee of the 19th February 2024, be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

4.2 Action List
Members noted no change to the action list.

The Chair with the agreement of the committee brought forward Agenda item 9.0

9.0 TO CONSIDER A MOTION FROM THE CHAIR, COUNCILLOR KAREN BEDWELL

The Chair informed members of the background to the motion.

She, together with District Councillor. B. Reed and County Councillor. C. Dowling had met with a resident, to look at Red Clover Road in detail.

She had written to an officer of ES Highways whose response was that once adopted the development would be subject to a 30mph limit. It was not their practice to place posted limits of 20mph.

She had also been in contact with Chris Bending, Director of Wealden DC who advised that this was not a planning matter, but was an issue of highway site safety, initially the responsibility for ES Highways and then the Health and Safety Executive.

She informed members that Cllr. Love had found the Active Travel Consultation Report, for the next phases, from the 'reserved matters' application from February 2024.

She felt that members would agree that the following points from that document were relevant to Phase 1 which she read to the committee:

Point 2.0 Summary concerns raised regarding the straight lengths of road through the site and whether raised tables could be implemented to minimise vehicle speed in line with the guidance provided in Manual for Streets.

From that same document it stated from *paragraph 82 of the National Design Guide (2021)*:

Priority is given to pedestrian and cycle movement, subject to location and the potential to create connections. Prioritising pedestrians and cyclists mean creating routes that are safe, direct, convenient and accessible for people of all abilities.

These are designed as part of attractive spaces with good sight lines, and well-chosen junctions and crossings, so that people want to use them.

A key requirement of gear change is to set the following expectations for new cycling infrastructure:

- *Separation from volume traffic*
- *Separation from pedestrians.*

On 15 January 2024, ES Highways ran a consultation regarding Phase 2 reserved matters and officers had released a Holding Response which said that:

Traffic calming features should not really be necessary if the proposed road layout has design speeds of 20mph, and although raised tables do assist in controlling speeds, they do result in drainage issues with surface water pooling and long-term maintenance.

Recently an officer of ES Highways had made it clear that this development would be 30mph, and as for speed humps causing drainage issues, this would not be the case on the hill of Red Clover Road.

The final paragraph of the East Sussex Highways Holding document stated that further opportunities for discussion were welcomed and revised plans to assist progressing the content of this application. The Chair felt that as ES Highways would adopt all the roads on site including Phase 1, the discussion was relevant and hence the motion was put forward by the Chair.

The Chair put to the committee that as Phase 1 had not been completed, they could push back on 'reserved matters'. By bringing this as a motion, concerns regarding highway safety would be in the public domain and all concerned, would therefore have some culpability should an accident occur.

A member stated that Harlands Estate had road bumps, and markings at the junctions placed after the estate was built, and this could be seen to set a precedent.

It was thought that improved safety measures must form a part of ES Highways adoption process, as times have changed since 2006 with increases in the speed of traffic.

The comments by ES Highways that speed humps could hinder drainage were irrelevant as they would just stop the speed bumps 12 inches away from the kerb line in order that the water would travel around it. Red Clover Road had a steep incline and water would easily drain away.

Two Councillors asked if the letter would come from Full Council, or just the Plans Committee. The Chair confirmed that initially the letter would come from the Plans Committee of the Town Council and suggested that if there were no suitable responses then it could be raised as a motion at Full Council, and then to request a meeting with ES Highways and representatives of Taylor Wimpey and Full Council.

A Member questioned if the video footage from residents should be shared with ES Highways.

The committee were advised that residents led a petition which received 170 signatures that had been forwarded to Taylor Wimpey with no result.

A member suggested that it would be a good idea to copy in Taylor Wimpey's Customer Service email, in order to follow the company's formal complaints procedure.

A member stated that Taylor Wimpey had a duty of care to provide safe housing, safe areas, a safe site and this needed to be put to them as they were providing a setting for family homes.

P76.03.24 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** that the Chair should draft two letters that would be sent to members and the Town Clerk by email for their approval.

Letter 1 to be an adaptation to the draft letter attached to the agenda papers, to include additional comments of the committee and of resident no 2 at this meeting:
This letter would be addressed to ES Highways
With copies to Sussex Police; ES Highways; CEO of Taylor Wimpey; and MP Nus Ghani.

Letter 2 to be addressed to Taylor Wimpey Customer Services regarding their duty of care and their duty to provide a safe site environment.
With copies to the Health and Safety Executive; CEO of Taylor Wimpey; and MP Nus Ghani.

All members of the public from the audience left the meeting, except for the first resident who spoke under agenda item 2.0 and District Councillor, B.Reed.

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

WD/2024/0162/F CHINTHURST COTTAGE, PUDDING CAKE LANE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1BU

The change of use from annexe to dwelling that may also be rented independent of Chinthurst Cottage.

Members raised concerns of people parking in the entrance to the lane and that there were often problems with visibility when pulling out into Church Street. The additional residents would potentially see an increase of three vehicles emerging from the lane onto Church Street where visibility was poor to the west. There was also the problem of a pinch point where the road narrowed and where traffic would sit at busy times. There were no passing places at the top on the lane for vehicles entering and leaving. There was also concern that there would be additional emissions from more vehicular movements in this small area.

An earlier application for a turntable in the garden of Milton House on Church Road had not been granted however.

It was noted that previous conditions from Wealden DC said that this must not be made into a separate dwelling.

One member felt that it was difficult to conclude as residential capacity in the town was needed and this was a brownfield site. Other members felt that the dangers of access visibility and safety were the major overriding concerns for this proposal and overrode conservation concerns raised by another member.

The owner of the property did approach the Town Mayor at one of the town council events who asked how to put her thoughts forward and was advised to put her statement forward, but noted this was not included in the documentation.

As there were no consultation responses visible on the planning portal from ES Highways, the Chair read out the ES highways report from the last application which had been withdrawn (WD/2023/0114/FA). The report referred to WD/2022/1993/F in relation to access and visibility onto Church Street from 101 High Street. The issues were considered to be similar. The comments referring to 101 High Street made by ES Highways were acknowledged by members.

P77.03.24 It was **RESOLVED** to object to the application on the following grounds:

- Concerns that increased traffic along the lane would be dangerous;
- Concerns that there was poor visibility from the lane onto Church Street in both directions, especially to the west;
- Concerns for access and highway safety;
- Concerns for emissions at peak times.

The Chair with the agreement of the committee brought forward the following application. As she had a personal interest in the application, she handed the role of Chair to Cllr. Macve.

WD/2023/3035/FR LINSTED, LINDEN CHASE, UCKFIELD TN22 1EE

Part retrospective application for raised decking, balustrading and steps to front and side of static caravan located in rear garden.

Cllr. Macve reminded members that this application had appeared in the previous committee agenda of the 19 February 2024. The committee's queries were put to Wealden DC by the committee clerk to the planning officer and the response was received on Thursday 7 March.

Cllr. Macve had shared the response from a Wealden DC Planning Officer with resident 1, which was as follows and shown during the meeting on the screen:

The stationing of a caravan within the domestic curtilage of the dwelling house for use incidental to the enjoyment of the main dwelling house does not constitute a material change of use. Therefore, it does not constitute development as defined under

Section 55 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended), and planning permission is not required. The decking and balustrading are freestanding and not fixed to the caravan.

I can confirm that the case officer undertook a site visit and has assessed the application on that basis.

In accordance with the scheme of delegation, a decision is likely to be issued on Monday (the Local Ward Member has given his approval). The Town Council will be informed of the officer response to their comments in the usual manner.

Having visited the resident and sat in his property Cllr. Macve was in full agreement with Resident 1 who spoke earlier in the meeting, that their household had suffered loss of privacy and was being overlooked.

Cllr. Macve had been in correspondence with the District Councillor. K. Williams and had written proposing a solution – to install a path to the caravan at ground level and steps up to the building. In Cllr William’s response he referred to properties adjoining in Linden Chase not being significantly impacted, which was not the case for the resident of Hempstead House, Hempstead Lane who would experience a serious impact and loss of privacy.

Cllr. Love reminded members of the deceptive angle of the photograph within the application.

Points raised regarding the hedging were not accepted as this was not a permanent screen.

- P78.03.24** It was **RESOLVED** to object to the application on the following grounds:
- Concerns that there would be loss of privacy to of the householders of Hempstead House, Hempstead Lane as described above;
 - Concerns for noise disturbance to the householders of Hempstead House;
 - Members would not accept that hedging was a permanent screen;
 - Members would further propose that there should be a path to the caravan at ground level and steps leading up to the building rather than a raised walk way.

Resident No 1 left the meeting at 8.01pm.

The role of Chair was handed back to Cllr. Bedwell.

WD/2024/0312/F 9 MOORHEN PLACE, UCKFIELD, TN22 5NF
Single story extension and roof deck to north elevation.

As this was a new property it was questioned if the owner would need the permission of the developer.

- P79.03.24** It was **RESOLVED** to object to the application with regards to the roof deck on the following grounds:
- Concerns of creating overlooking directly into neighbour gardens and into their windows, causing loss of privacy to the neighbouring households;
 - Concerns for noise disturbance to neighbours due to the open nature of the roof deck, which would be used for gatherings;
 - The elevated roof deck would be detrimental to the street scene.

WD/2024/0216/F 3 NIGHTINGALE RISE, EASTBOURNE ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5ST

Proposed conversion of garage to annexe with dormer together with proposed storage/bike store.

The committee clerk had advised members that his has been re consulted as the bike storage was not on the description of the first consultation. As the description had to be amended it had to be readvertised and reconsulted on.

Other than that there were no changes to the previous application.

P80.03.24 It was therefore **RESOLVED** as previously responded, to support the application with a condition that the annexe must stay in the original curtilage of the existing property and not sold off as a separate dwelling

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2023/0930/MRM

RESERVED MATTERS (APPEARANCE, LANDSCAPING, LAYOUT AND SCALE) PURSUANT TO OUTLINE PERMISSION WD/2020/0410/MAO (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 WORKS).
LAND OFF EASTBOURNE ROAD, UCKFIELD

WD/2024/0058/F

REMOVAL OF EXISTING VELUX ROOF LIGHT - NEW VELUX ROOF BALCONY
2 SAND RIDGE, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5ET

***Response to Town Council:** The Town Council's concerns are noted. However, the proposed Velux balcony is retractable and would not ordinarily require planning permission. In addition, the orientation of the application property, and the projection of 1 Sand Ridge further southwards, mean the views into the garden are restricted.*

Appeal allowed and planning permission granted:

WD/2022/1808/F 31A FRAMFIELD ROAD, UCKFIELD, EAST SUSSEX TN22 5AH

Precis of Issues

- The living conditions of occupiers of 33, 35 and 37 Framfield Road and 1 Alexandra Road, with regard to privacy,
- The Ashdown Forest SPA and Special Area of Conservation (SAC)

Withdrawn:

WD/2023/2887/LB

RETENTION OF UNAUTHORISED BASEMENT EXTENSION. REMOVAL AND REPLASTERING OF THE LOWER GROUND STOREROOM, AND THE PROVISION OF A VENT TO THE FLUE WITHIN THE CHIMNEY BREAST
2 BUCKSWOOD GRANGE, ROCKS ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 3PU

Notice of Appeal:

Town and Country Planning Act 1990

Appeal by Lawson Commercial (the Appellant)

WD/2023/0680/LB 1 CORNFORDS YARD, THE GRANARY, HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1RJ

ERECTION OF PHOTOVOLTAIC PANELS ON EXISTING ROOF AREAS TO CURTILAGE LISTED CONVERTED OFFICE BUILDING

Planning Inspectorate Ref: APP/C1435/Y/23/3334617

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/2024/0008/F HIGHLANDS INN, EASTBOURNE ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SP Installation of 2no new roof lights and alterations to pub fenestration.

WD/2024/0058/F 2 SAND RIDGE, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5ET Removal of existing Velux roof light - new Velux roof balcony.

Members noted the report and response to Wealden District Council.

8.0 TO CONSIDER THE PROPOSED STREET NAMES FOR THE NEW DEVELOPMENT LAND OFF EASTBOURNE ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD

Members were not favourable to the street names suggested by the developer and a number of ideas were put forward but no consensus was reached.

The Chair gave members until the 20th March to advise the clerk of their suggestions.

The meeting closed at 8.20pm.