



Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Committee held in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Uckfield on Monday 27 January 2025 at 7.00pm

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

Cllr. C. Macve (Vice Chair)
Cllr. S. Mayhew

Cllr. D. Bennett (to 7.42pm)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Linda Lewis – Administrative Officer
Minutes taken by Linda Lewis
2 members of the public

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. Bennett declared a prejudicial interest in the following application, under item 5.0 Planning Applications, as he was a committee member of AFC Uckfield Town:
WD/2024/2955/MAO Land off Eastbourne Road, Uckfield

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

P58.01.25 It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to allow a member of the public to speak. A resident wished to speak on Agenda item 5.0 Planning applications. He spoke firstly regarding application WD/2024/2949/F 11 Lyewood Way, Uckfield, TN22 5GL and commented that the road offered little on street parking, and that once these works were complete there would be insufficient space on the property to park two vehicles.

Secondly, the resident spoke regarding application WD/2024/2955/MAO Land off Eastbourne Road, and commented regarding safety concerns for the prospective number of vehicles emerging onto the Eastbourne Road.

He also gave calculations based on figures from the Office of National Statistics for the projected increase in the population. He calculated that for between 350 to 400 people on the development the water consumption required would be an additional 54,000 to 55,000 litres per day. This would be in addition to consumption from the houses at Ridgewood and those yet to be completed. He felt that Barcombe Treatment Works would not have the capacity to cope, and that another treatment works should be built along The Ouse before reaching Barcombe.

A member gave some interesting facts from East Sussex County Council's response into increasing Gatwick Airport. He read from the report that between 2020 and 2025 Wealden was expected to see the greatest increase in population, by some 22%. This would be an additional 43,600 people, all of which would put strain on the water supply as well as other amenities.

P59.01.25 It was **RESOLVED** reinstate Standing Orders.

3.0 APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Cllr. P. Ullmann due to work commitments.

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 6 January 2025

P60.01.25 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Plans Committee of the 6 January 2025, be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4.2 Action List

Members reviewed the action list and agreed that the following actions could now be removed:

CONSULTATION: ENVIRONMENTAL FRAMEWORK FOR EVENTS AND LICENSED BUSINESSES

WITHDRAWN APPLICATION WD/2020/1650/F CHARLWOOD MANOR
DEMOLITION OF EXISTING BUILDINGS AND CONSTRUCTION OF FIVE DWELLINGS WITH NEW ACCESS PROVIDED.

HIGHWAYS INTERNAL CONSULTATION REF. S1/450 COOPERS GREEN ROAD,
UCKFIELD PROPOSED S278 HIGHWAY WORKS

5.0 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

WD/2024/2899/FR 228 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD TN22 1RE

Reinstatement works to rear outbuilding following fire damage.

P61.01.25 It was **RESOLVED** to support the application as long as it was in accordance with the Conservation Officer. Members welcomed the return of a much valued business to the town.

WD/2024/2949/F 11 LYEWOOD WAY, UCKFIELD, TN22 5GL

Proposed garage conversion and internal alterations which include additional external windows to the side and changed windows to the rear elevation. With additional Velux windows to the garage roof.

It was discussed that most modern garages were not large enough to house modern vehicles and the garage was not used for parking. It was therefore felt that the conversion would not alter the available parking space. Members noted the resident's comments, however it was noted that there were no fixed legal requirements for a minimum number of parking spaces for new-builds.

P62.01.25 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** to support the application, subject to any concerns by ES Highways, on the following grounds,:

- The works would not affect the street scene;
- The works would not be detrimental to the neighbouring properties;
- A precedent existed as similar works applied for had been approved;
- There were no planning grounds to object to the application.

Cllr. Bennett reiterated his prejudicial interest in the following application and left the meeting room.

WD/2024/2955/MAO LAND OFF EASTBOURNE ROAD, UCKFIELD

Outline application for the erection of up to 145 dwellings with public open space, landscaping and sustainable drainage system (SUDS), vehicular access point and provision for suitable alternative natural green space (SANG). All matters reserved except for means of access.

A member stated that sadly the time to have objected to this application would have been at the Regulation 18 Consultation for the Draft Local Plan and acknowledged that, as this application was included in the Draft Local Plan, there was no doubt that this would go through irrelevant of what the Town Council said. Uckfield Town Council would respond to the application to ensure the applicant and the local planning authority were aware of local knowledge and expertise, and ensure key points were considered in the review of this application, to mitigate the impact on the local environment, and safety of road users.

Members felt they could have an input to the design and development particularly at the Reserved Matters stage.

Major concerns were raised regarding the speed of traffic along this section of Eastbourne Road and that there were no traffic calming measures, unlike that for the development of 90 houses off of Eastbourne Road, opposite Fernley Park. The entrance to that development had a roundabout next to it which would slow traffic. The proposed site within

this application was unlike the development opposite Fernley Park as there was no safe footpath to the town centre and it was in a more rural location, despite being off of the same road. Therefore, this application should be considered on its own merits by the local planning authority and not compared with the 90 home development opposite Fernley Park.

The application showed no mitigation for highway safety and there was no report from ES Highways.

The development lacked measures to: -

- slow the traffic along Eastbourne Road which had a 60mph limit;
Members would suggest to move the national speed limit to be beyond the Palehouse Common turning, and to amend the speed limit along this stretch of the Eastbourne Road to 30mph and introduce speed cameras and the use of SID units as currently vehicles travelled in the region of 50-60mph on this straight stretch of road;
- improve safety for those exiting onto the Eastbourne Road for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists;
- provide safe walkways and to provide provision to allow people to cross the road to the bus stop, potentially to provide a pelican crossing;
Members commented that the footpath on the southern side of Eastbourne Road was currently very narrow and not wide enough for a pram/buggy;
- consider the impact to Uckfield AFC Football Club and the dangers of pulling out from the football club, especially at night, particularly with the bend in the road hindering the ability to judge on-coming vehicles;
- consider the detrimental visual impact the development would have to Framfield Place which was a Grade II Listed Building mentioned in the National Archives. A member quoted NPPF 20D and NPPF11 that there needed to be a strong reason 'how to mitigate to protect assets.'
Lighting that would be necessary to light the Eastbourne Road for pedestrians and within the development itself would also be detrimental to the visual impact of landscaped garden at Framfield Place;

As previously stated, an up to date Sustrans report was needed for East Sussex, as the last one had been approximately 6 years ago.

Concerns for the increased traffic onto New Road were also raised.

One member had walked the route from the site into the town centre and concluded that social isolation would be far worse than for the Ridgewood development. The site was totally divorced from the town since there was no other housing close by.

The Chair had partially read the Sussex Police and Crime Commissioner's report which stated that Police in Sussex would need financial contributions from developers to provide the right number of police and facilities at Uckfield Police Station. Although the town council would not have a similar document the town would need financial contributions.

Through Section 106 an opportunity needed to be made to address the needs of the Town Council to financially support the infrastructure of the town, to support the increased use of facilities of the Civic Centre, provision and increased demand for allotment space and the provision for green recreational space. At present, there was no indication if the applicants were intending to contribute to adjacent sports provision at the Oaks (Uckfield AFC Football Club), or Framfield Fisheries, or indeed the town's sport and recreation provision.

P63.01.25 It was **RESOLVED** to **strongly object** to the application for all of the above reasons. There was a lack of consultee reports to fully consider the application, especially as there was no report from ES Highways. It was to be noted that members had no communication from Gladman Developments Limited and it was felt that this application had been rushed through. Had the developer contacted the Town Council, members could have provided this information at an earlier stage in pre-application discussions with the local planning authority.

It was also worth noting that also previously, (*because of the lack of communication between the Town Council, the applicant developer and Wealden District Council*) the Town Clerk had attended Planning Committee North to put forward the views of the Town Council. Comparisons made in relation to road safety and the position of the development on Eastbourne Road was incorrect by Wealden DC Officers and therefore at Committee gave the wrong impression of how safe the road was and where it was in relation to the town.

Cllr. Bennett was unable to rejoin the meeting due to a prior appointment and left the meeting at 7.42pm.

WD/2024/2743/FA 20A LEWES ROAD, RIDGEWOOD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5SN

Variation of conditions 5, 10, 15 and 17 of WD/2021/2398/F (demolition of existing workshop and barns, construction of 9 no. residential units comprising of 1 no. 5 bedroom house, 6 no. 3 bedroom houses and 2 no. 4 bedroom houses) to enable removal of car port to house types a and A.1, revised car parking/refuse vehicle turning arrangements and amended landscaping.

Members questioned why there were significant changes to a planning application which had already been agreed and why this would not come under planning enforcement. Condition 5 was to do with remediation of contaminated soil and it was queried what this applied to.

P64.01.25 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** that members were unable to comment on the above application since they did not have the technical knowledge to understand the variation of the conditions and why it was necessary for these variations to be made.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2024/2793/F

PROPOSED SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION
50 DOWNSVIEW CRESCENT, UCKFIELD TN22 1SA

WD/2024/1798/F

CHANGE OF USE OF OFFICE UNIT TO FORM ONE 2-BED DWELLING, INCLUDING REPLACEMENT EXTERNAL DOORS WITHIN REAR (SOUTH) ELEVATION AND PROVISION OF EXTERNAL RAILINGS TO FORM PATIO GARDEN
SUITE C, PORTLAND HOUSE, 60-64 FRAMFIELD ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5AR

Members noted the Decision Notices.

7.0 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

Uckfield New Town TM/2025/0004/TPO

CROWN REDUCE ONE SYCAMORE TREE BY UP TO 2M WITHIN TREE
PRESERVATION

ORDER (UCKFIELD) NO 23, 1982
5 OAKLEA WAY, UCKFIELD TN22 2BL

Members noted the Tree Preservation Order.

8.0 TO CONSIDER PROCESS FOR RESPONDING TO SURVEY ON EAST SUSSEX RIGHTS OF WAY ACCESS PLAN

Together members went through each question of the survey and gave answers which the committee clerk was instructed to complete online before the deadline of the 14th March.

The meeting closed at 8.13pm.