



Minutes of the meeting of the Plans Committee held in the Council Chamber,
Civic Centre, Uckfield on Monday 3 August 2026 at 7.00pm

Cllr. J. Love (Chair) Cllr. C. Macve (Vice Chair)
Cllr. K. Bedwell Cllr. K. Butler

IN ATTENDANCE:

Wealden District Councillor D. French
Wealden District Councillor B. Reed
4 members of the public
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. Love and Cllr. Bedwell each declared a personal interest under item 5.0 for Planning applications WD/2026/1336/FA Molesey Cottage, Hempstead Rise, Uckfield, TN22 1QX as the applicant was a friend.

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

P28.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** to suspend Standing Orders to allow members of the public to speak under item 5.0 planning application WD/2026/1348/MAO land to the north of Bird-In-Eye Hill, Uckfield.

District Councillor D. French addressed the Committee and advised that she had been working with Cllr. Reed in their capacity as District Councillors for Wealden District Council to prepare a joint report. Their stance would be in objection to the application and would support the objections raised by Framfield Parish Council at their recent meeting. The report would be submitted to the local planning authority – Wealden District Council.

Cllr. French expressed concern that the proposed development would increase flood risk within the area. They also raised concerns about the cumulative impact of traffic generated by the proposed application, together with the previously approved Bird-in-Eye South development. It was noted that the additional housing would significantly increase vehicle movements along Framfield Road, which was already heavily used and constrained by on-street parking on both sides.

Cllr. French commented that, although the development was located within Framfield Parish, the application identified Uckfield as the nearest service centre, meaning future residents would be likely to rely on Uckfield's facilities and services. She noted that the application made no reference to the use of Framfield Primary School and expressed concern that the development would place additional pressure on Uckfield's infrastructure. She also stressed the importance of retaining existing on-street parking for current residents, as its loss would exacerbate existing highway safety issues along Framfield Road.

Resident 1 explained he was a resident of Greenfields, and addressed the Committee in objection to the application. Whilst acknowledging wider concerns regarding infrastructure and the cumulative impact of development, he focused his comments on four key issues.

Flood Risk - he expressed concern that the proposed drainage measures would be insufficient during extreme weather events and could increase flood risk downstream. He noted that flooding already affected Mill Lane, restricting access to nearby sheltered accommodation and associated facilities, and felt the development could exacerbate this.

Sewage infrastructure – the resident stated that the existing sewerage network was already under significant pressure, with frequent and prolonged sewage spills into the local watercourse during periods of heavy rainfall. He expressed concern that the cumulative impact of the proposed development alongside Bird in Eye South would further overload the system and increase the risk of sewage flooding.

School provision and pedestrian access – he stated that local primary schools would become oversubscribed as a result of cumulative development. He also raised concerns that the pedestrian routes to local schools were unsuitable due to the narrow nature of Framfield Road, the lack of footways, and flood risk. He stated that the application did not provide the strategic pedestrian links previously identified as necessary.

Traffic and highway safety - he expressed concern that the additional traffic would place further pressure on Framfield Road, which he described as a narrow road with passing places and limited capacity. He also highlighted concerns regarding on-street parking and restricted visibility at the Keld Drive/Framfield Road junction.

Resident 1 urged the Committee to include these matters within its formal objection to the application.

In response to a question from Cllr. Love regarding the extent of flooding experienced at the rear of his property during the January 2026 flood, Resident 1 advised that the January flooding had not been the most severe experienced and stated that he held photographs of more significant flooding which had occurred two years previously where the water level at The Mill came to the top of the protection gates. He was asked to forward these to the committee's clerk. *(Once the Town Council are in possession of these images they will be forwarded directly to Wealden District Council. The images highlighted the height of the water behind Keld Avenue and the spread and depth of water along Mill Lane around the old Mill and coming towards Millington Court).*

Resident 2 addressed the Committee in objection to the application and endorsed the concerns raised by previous speakers.

Highways and construction traffic - he expressed concern about the limited width and capacity of Framfield Road, stating that it was already difficult for vehicles to use. He considered that the additional traffic generated during the construction phase, particularly heavy goods vehicles transporting building materials through Uckfield town centre and along Framfield Road, would create significant difficulties and place further pressure on the local highway network.

School access and pedestrian safety – the resident raised concerns regarding access to local schools. He stated that children from the proposed development would be likely to attend schools on the Manor Park estate and believed they would take the most direct route by crossing the railway line, which he considered to be dangerous. He expressed concern that the application did not appear to include measures to provide a safe pedestrian route for school children.

District Councillor B. Reed - addressed the Committee as a local resident, a Wealden District Councillor and a member of Uckfield Town Council's Environment Committee. She thanked members of the public for their contributions and acknowledged the work of the Committee in considering the application.

Cllr. Reed explained that she and Cllr. French were working together regarding policy matters in order to put together a report to send to Wealden District Council in objection to

the planning application. She went onto highlight some of the points which would be included.

She noted that residents parked at the Mitchell and Cooper site off Framfield Road during the evenings due to existing pressures and difficulties with parking capacity in this area, and this needed to be taken into consideration for any assessments. She highlighted that vehicles were already parking on footways and at the Keld Drive junction, creating accessibility issues for wheelchair users and those with mobility impairments. She also expressed concern about the impact of construction traffic and utility works on Uckfield's road network.

Cllr Reed expressed concern that local schools were already oversubscribed and that the cumulative impact of further development had not been adequately addressed.

Concerns regarding the current experience at Boothland Wood and potential impact to nearby ancient woodland that construction dust from the site would cause, concerns regarding the water table, and the capacity of the sewage treatment works. She also stated that their report would include their concerns of the potential effects on the Grade II listed landscape at Buxted Park. She referred to the risks posed to riparian habitats, increasing sewage-related fly infestations, and within the groundwater vulnerability zone in part of the site, which she considered required further assessment.

P29.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** to reinstate Standing Orders.

3.0 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D. Bennett and P. Selby.

4.0 MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2026

P30.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Plans Committee of 13 July 2026, be taken as read, confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

4.2 Action List

Members noted that there was no change to the action list.

5.0 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

Members supported the proposal of the Chair to bring planning application WD/2026/1348/MAO forward to the start of this agenda item due to the public present, and scale of the application.

WD/2026/1348/MAO LAND TO THE NORTH OF BIRD-IN-EYE HILL, UCKFIELD

Outline application with all matters reserved (except access) for a development comprising demolition of existing buildings and provision of up to 215 no. dwellings (use Class C3), including affordable dwellings, with associated suitable alternative natural green space, public open space, landscaping and infrastructure works.

Following detailed consideration of the application, each member addressed the Committee and raised objections to the proposal.

P31.08.26 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** to **object** to the application, (which sought outline planning permission for the proposed development, with approval sought for access and land use only), on the following grounds:

Suitability of the site

Members considered that the site was unsuitable for a development of 215 dwellings. They expressed concern that the proposal represented a significant loss of open countryside and agricultural land, and would extend the urban edge of Uckfield into Framfield thus eroding the rural gap between these settlements. It was noted that the development occupied a prominent valley slope overlooking the River Uck and would have a substantial visual impact, particularly during the winter months when proposed planting would provide limited screening. Members felt the proposal would harm the landscape character of the area and the setting of nearby heritage assets. It was noted that the BIES units were set away from

the street scene whereas this application would alter the street scene as the illustrative map showed housing alongside the main road.

Historic Grade 2 listed building The Mill, Hempstead Farm, the Buxted Estate, The Oast Farm and the historical elements of Framfield would need to be considered closely.

The illustrative design was just an illustration, it didn't show what it would look like and members felt that a more in-depth drawing should be supplied at this stage to show exactly what the site would look like.

Highways and means of access

Members considered the proposed means of access to be inadequate and raised significant concerns regarding highway safety. It was noted that the proposed access was located on the brow of a hill, on a bend and in close proximity to the Bird in Eye South roundabout; creating potential safety risks. Members also considered Framfield Road to be unsuitable to accommodate the additional traffic generated by both the construction phase and the completed development due to its narrow width, limited passing places, existing parking on the carriageway and footways, and congestion at peak times.

Concerns were also raised regarding the lack of detailed mitigation for construction traffic, the impact on Sandy Lane, New Town traffic signals and other surrounding junctions. Members considered that the proposed traffic calming measures and chicanes near the site access would not improve safety and could instead create further congestion.

Members questioned the accuracy of the Transport Assessment. In particular - the stated walking distances to the town centre, from what point the calculations had been taken and also noting that the quoted distance of the site was 600m "as the crow flies" rather than by the routes residents would actually use. It was also considered that existing pedestrian routes and footways were inadequate and unsafe, particularly for children travelling to local schools.

Members were opposed to the chicanes at the new proposed design access as they felt it was not safe. Traffic calming measures too near to the access did not work (from experience of the Taylor Wimpey site in Lewes Road). It would be very congested at peak times.

Flooding, drainage and water infrastructure

Members expressed significant concern regarding flood risk, particularly the impact of the development on the River Uck, Framfield Stream and surrounding areas, including Framfield Road and nearby residential properties. Members did not accept the applicant's suggestion that flooding was principally caused by highway drainage issues, noting that all surface water ultimately discharged into the River Uck and therefore contributed to flood events.

This was explained further that at present, developments in Uckfield incorporated their own rain water storage facilities. If there was prolonged or heavy rainfall this would cause them to reach capacity simultaneously, resulting in a significant and cumulative impact on the volume of water entering the River Uck at the same time. This would lead to extensive flooding, and pose a significant risk to the town centre.

Members considered that insufficient information had been provided regarding the proposed sustainable drainage system (SUDS), the speed at which floodwater would accumulate, flood storage capacity and the long-term management of flood risk were of concern. Concerns were also raised regarding the potential effects of relocating pumping stations and the need for improved filtration measures to protect water quality going into the River Uck.

Members wished to include a drone photograph of the January 2026 flooding, provided by a local resident which is inserted below. In the distance Bird In Eye land can be seen.

As highlighted:

Red = roughly where the edge of the proposed development will reach;

Blue = shows what the applicant describes as being part of the SANGS and also the whole of the water area to the right of the red line;

Yellow indicates roughly where they are proposing to install a substation.



Utilities and infrastructure

Members considered that the application failed to demonstrate that sufficient utility infrastructure existed to support the development. Concerns were raised regarding the capacity of the foul sewerage network, the absence of confirmation from Southern Water regarding sewer capacity, the lack of evidence from UK Power Networks on electrical capacity, and the absence of detailed proposals for substations, power supply routes and associated infrastructure. Members considered that too many important technical matters had been deferred until after outline consent.

Members wished to know the exact route, the time frames, and any construction issues and recalled the placing of electric cables for the Ridgewood Farm site through the town, which created chaos. This needed a full survey and full details along with anticipated timescales.

Ecology and environmental Impact

Members expressed concern regarding the impact on ancient woodland, mature hedgerows, Grade A trees and wildlife corridors. It was considered that the proposed buffer zones of 15m were inadequate and that a minimum 50-metre buffer should be provided to protect these habitats. Members also questioned the submitted ecological surveys, noting the absence of detailed surveys for breeding birds, bats and protected species, and sought clarification regarding the claimed biodiversity net gain, questioning whether the Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) had been counted twice. There were no calculations relating to people using the SANGS with domestic pets – on and off leads or the effects of domestic cats.

Concerns were also raised regarding potential impacts on groundwater, hydrology, the River Uck catchment, water quality, light pollution, construction dust and recreational pressure on ancient woodland.

More detailed bats surveys needed to be carried out due to the commuting of the bats to the site. And the surveys undertaken, needed to be of better quality than those received for Land at Mockbeggars Farm.

Landscape and design

Members considered that the illustrative masterplan did not provide sufficient detail to properly assess the development. They expressed concern that previous illustrative layouts on other developments had differed significantly from the schemes ultimately constructed. Members also noted that the proposed development would be highly visible from Bird in Eye Hill, the River Uck valley and surrounding public rights of way, and considered that the number and height of dwellings should be reduced to lessen the visual impact. At present the proposed application would affect key vistas within the town.

There were queries regarding the cycle storage at the back of a garage and at the back of the garden which did not meet the correct standards.

Community infrastructure

Members questioned whether existing education provision would be sufficient once all committed developments within the area had been completed and requested updated pupil forecasts from East Sussex County Council to reflect cumulative housing growth. They also noted the absence of proposed allotments within the development.

Transport assessment

Members wished to highlight the number of faults within the Transport Assessment and Travel Plan as much of it was conducted six years prior. This was therefore out of date and should be redone. In 2020 there was not a regular double decker bus route along Framfield Road and parking was now much worse. It was mentioned that the number of movements recorded in the town centre had been detailed at 12/1400 movements daily and the town has a further peak time of 3-345 when education facilities closed for the day.

Planning process

Members considered that the application relied excessively on future Reserved Matters, technical approvals and mitigation measures, rather than demonstrating that the required infrastructure could be delivered. They also expressed concern that no Statement of Common Ground had been provided between Bird in Eye North, Bird in Eye South and the other strategic developments to demonstrate how the cumulative impact of highway and infrastructure changes would be addressed.

Members requested details of the proposed Section 106 and Section 278 agreements before any planning permission was determined.

The following policies referred to member objections

NPPF

Paragraph 135 of the NPPF – Well-designed Places: -

- Did not respond to the character – this was urban expansion into open countryside;
- Urbanisation of the River Uck Valley;
- No 'relationship' with existing rural landscape.

Paragraph 187 – conserving and enhancing the natural environment: -

- Did not protect valued landscape;
- Proximity to ancient woodland;
- Impacts on wildlife corridors;
- Cumulative urbanisation of the River Uck Valley.

Saved Wealden Policies

EN8 – Low Weald – conservation re low rolling agricultural landscape: -

- Loss of open agricultural land;
- Change to landscape character.

EN12 – Protection of Trees and Woodland:-

- Pressure on retained woodland;
- Increased recreational use;
- Long term degradation

- Re: the effects on Nightingale Wood and Boothland Wood
- EN13 – Ancient semi-natural woodland
- Although buffers were proposed, there were still concerns for indirect impacts of: -
- Lighting
 - Domestic pets
 - Increased public access
 - Hydrological changes.
- EN14 – Landscaping: -
- Landscaping should be integrated into the surroundings;
 - Immediate visual harm;
 - Mitigation planting would take years to mature and ecological recovery would not.
- EN27 – layout and design – development must respect surroundings.
- Scale of development and density showed no respect for surroundings as this would be an urbanisation of a rural area.
- EN29 – Light pollution
- Urban lighting affecting wildlife;
 - Impact on rural area.
- TR3 – Traffic impact
- Development must not create unacceptable traffic conditions.
- WCS 12 – Biodiversity Net gain
- Concerns that the figure quoted for Biodiversity net gain (which fell under WCS 12). would be inaccurate when they take into effect the footfall through the SANGS with dog walkers, residents' pets etc.
- WCS 13 Green Infrastructure and protection

Members also raised the following questions: -

Where were the survey data reflecting lapwing, skylarks, linnet and other red listed farmland wildlife. This site was prime agricultural/open grassland.

Where were the breeding birds survey results for mature trees, hedgerows, and the River Uck, and how would it be impacted by this development?

How was the statement of low ecological value of the site reached?

How would the recreational pressures of the ancient woodland have been properly mitigated?

Buffer proposals should be increased and align with the Wealden Draft Local Plan, in a similar nature to that of Owlsbury Farm within their outline application.

Why had the BS 4142 assessment been made on the pumping stations?

Why had no operational assessment been made on capacity of electric supply?

Where were the proposed plant locations?

How would the low frequency plant noise be controlled?

What would happen during a power failure?

How would the emergency overplays be protected?

Have Southern Water confirmed sewer capacity, as there was no report available from them?

What size would the substations be?

Has UKPN confirmed there is electrical capacity?

Where were the winter visual impact statements, for the development? The reliance on screening was noted to mitigate the landscape impact.

How quickly would mitigation planting take effect as the visual impacts to the River Uckfield Valley would be immediate?

Where was water going to come from? South East Water Resources Management Plan says it was unlikely they could accommodate the growth on their plan from 2024.

How would the movement of the pumping stations affect flooding on Framfield Road and impact the Framfield Stream, particularly as the new 119 houses for Mallard Drive, go directly into the stream, which then went through that pumping station. Members knew that the pumping station had previously flooded and caused flooding to Eagle Close at the back of Mallard Drive, when the flow was impacted the pumping station backed up.

There were no proposals for allotments to support increase in demand within the town.

There was a comment that it was 600m from this development as the crow flies into the town. This was not accurate, nor reflected the route a pedestrian would take to reach town.

What mitigation was given to the speed of the water and the flooding anticipated down the River Uck, and into the SANG? The Town last year learnt of three ladies that had to be rescued at Hempstead Meadows LNR, because the river level increased so quickly. If that happened to people walking through the SANG, they would be washed away.

It was noted that there was still a small capacity for schools and the forecast even to 2030, for secondary school was 3%, and for primary schools was 7%. However, members wished to see an updated pupil forecast report for primary and secondary schools, to include all permitted housing developments, including Bird In Eye North. Did the current forecast take account children from the new homes built at Ridgewood Place, Seghers Place, Mallard Drive, Horsted Pond Farm and Bird in Eye South?

There appeared to be no mitigation for extra traffic and construction traffic to pass on Framfield Road.

So, why would it be appropriate to grant an outline planning application when so much essential information and essential infrastructure had yet to be considered, prepared and incorporated?

Members would welcome the agreements that have been made under section 106 and section 278.

WD/2026/1299/F 15 NEVILL ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PG

Erection of a detached garden room to provide a home gym and a beauty and aesthetics treatment room ancillary to the existing dwelling (with ancillary class E(e) use).

P32.08.26

It was **RESOLVED** to **support** the application on the following grounds, subject to the applicant obtaining any necessary planning permission for a change of use if the building was to operate as a commercial business.

- The proposal was not considered to have an adverse impact on neighbouring properties;
- The building would be positioned alongside the boundary fence, minimising its visual impact;
- The proposed materials would match the existing dwelling;
- The business would operate by appointment only, limiting vehicle movements and associated disturbance;
- Members wished to support a local start-up business, provided all relevant planning requirements were met, including any necessary change of use from residential to commercial.

WD/2026/1336/FA MOLESEY COTTAGE, HEMPSTEAD RISE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1QX

Variation of Conditions 2 and 3 of WD/2024/1760/F (replace flat roof to existing garage with new pitched roof. To provide ancillary accommodation) to allow alternative roof finish.

Cllrs. Love and Bedwell reiterated their personal interests in this application, which resulted in them being unable to comment. As there were then only two members eligible to comment, this fell below the quorum required for the Committee. Consequently, no comments could be given for the application.

WD/2026/1343/MAJ CROWSON HOUSE, BOLTON CLOSE, BELLBROOK INDUSTRIAL ESTATE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1PH

Replacement of existing roof, including installation of enhanced insulation, resulting in a minor increase in roof height, together with associated alterations to the gable elevations.

P33.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** to **strongly support** the application on the following grounds: -

- The minor increase in roof height was not considered to have any harmful impact;
- The proposal would enable the business premises to be modernised to meet current operational needs;
- Improved insulation would enhance the building's environmental performance and reduce its environmental impact;
- Members considered it important to support local businesses within the Bellbrook Industrial Estate.

WD/2026/1355/P26 49 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1AN

Change of use of part ground and first floor from commercial (use Class E) to residential (use Class C3) to create 3 no. self-contained flats.

P34.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** to **object** to the application on the following grounds: -

- Members would have been in support of conversion of the first floor only, but objected to the loss of commercial space at ground floor level;
- This proposal would result in the loss of valuable commercial premises on the High Street;
- Retaining commercial premises within the town centre was considered important to support local employment opportunities for the growing population;
- Members also considered that preserving High Street businesses would encourage people to work locally, reducing the need to travel and thereby providing environmental benefits;
- The proposal failed to provide any parking for the new residential units, increasing pressure on existing parking provision in the town.

WD/2026/1375/P26 77 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1AP

Change of use of class E space to form 2 no. apartments.

Members felt that the same reasons for objection to WD/2026/1355/P26 49 High Street also applied to this application.

P35.08.26 It was subsequently **RESOLVED** to **object** to the application on the following grounds: -

- Members would have been in support of conversion of the first floor only, but objected to the loss of commercial space at ground floor level;
- This proposal would result in the loss of valuable commercial premises on the High Street;
- Retaining commercial premises within the town centre was considered important to support local employment opportunities for the growing population;
- Members also considered that preserving High Street businesses would encourage people to work locally, reducing the need to travel and thereby providing environmental benefits;
- The proposal failed to provide any parking for the new residential units, increasing pressure on existing parking provision in the town.

WD/2026/1469/F 18 ROCKS PARK ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 2AX

Removal of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension combined with single storey rear extension element. associated internal & external alterations.

P36.08.26 It was **RESOLVED** to **support** the application on the following grounds: -

- Similar extensions had been carried out on a number of neighbouring properties, establishing a clear precedent;
- Adequate off-street parking would remain available on the driveway;
- The removal of the garage was not considered to adversely affect parking provision, as members noted that domestic garages were often not used for vehicle parking because they were generally too small to accommodate many modern vehicles.
- The design was considered acceptable and would not be detrimental to the character or appearance of the street scene.

6.0 DECISION NOTICES

Approved:

WD/2026/1008/FA

VARIATION OF CONDITION 4 OF WD/2022/2636/F (EXTENSION OF EXISTING CLUBHOUSE AND ASSOCIATED EXTENSION TO AND RE-ARRANGEMENT OF CAR PARK) AMENDED PLANS AND DRAWING NUMBERS FOR CHANGES TO THE DESIGN. UCKFIELD RUGBY FOOTBALL CLUB, NEVILL ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 1LX

WD/2026/0942/F

SIDE ADDITION COMPRISING OF GROUND FLOOR ROOMS AND BEDROOM WITHIN ROOF SPACE
11 THE JAYS, UCKFIELD, TN22 5YG

WD/2026/0954/F

PROPOSED SIDE GROUND AND FIRST FLOOR EXTENSION
22 ALEXANDRA ROAD, UCKFIELD, TN22 5BB

WD/2026/1060/A

EXTERNALLY ILLUMINATED MAIN FASCIA SIGN AND HERITAGE PROJECTING SIGN. INTERNALLY ILLUMINATED SIGNAGE COMPRISING DIRECTORY OF SERVICES AND BANKING AVAILABILITY POSTER, AS WELL AS TWO MARKETING POSTERS. ADDITIONAL SIGNAGE COMPRISING COMMUNITY AND OWNERSHIP MESSAGE AND TO THE ENTRANCE DOOR A DDA SIGN, CCTV SIGN AND OPENING HOURS SIGN.
15 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1AG

TM/2026/0079/TPO T1

52 GOLDCREST DRIVE, UCKFIELD, TN22 5QG
The removal of X1 Hornbeam at 52 Goldcrest Avenue.

Refused:

WD/2026/0918/A

PART RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR PROJECTING HALO-ILLUMINATED SIGN ON FRONT ELEVATION, SECONDARY WALL-MOUNTED WAYFINDING SIGN ON SIDE ELEVATION WITHIN OLIVES YARD WITH DISCREET LED TROUGH ILLUMINATION, PAINTED DIRECTIONAL LETTERING ON CORNER PILASTER (NON-ILLUMINATED) AND AWNING VALANCE LETTERING (NON-ILLUMINATED).
128 HIGH STREET, UCKFIELD, TN22 1QR
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/2026/1026/F LAND TO THE REAR OF 21A, 21B, 21C, 23, 25 AND 27 HIGH STREET, ACCESSED OFF BELL FARM LANE, UCKFIELD, TN22 1AG

Erection of building containing 8 no. flats with associated access, parking and landscaping works.

Members noted the report.

The meeting closed at 8.43pm.