



HEATHFIELD AND WALDRON PARISH COUNCIL
PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY 1st JULY 2024, IN THE MAIN HALL OF HEATHFIELD COMMUNITY CENTRE AT 6.30pm

Present: Cllrs Coffey (Chair), Draper, Dunstall, Garnett, Leney, Stemp and Whitehouse
Also in attendance was Wealden District Councillor Gadd

The Assistant Clerk was in attendance

5 members of the public were present

The meeting started at 18.40pm due to the prior Waldron Recreation Ground Committee meeting

Minutes

24/174 **Public questions-** To **resolve** to close the meeting to enable questions from the Public to be taken, (no more than 15 minutes in total and a maximum of 3 minutes per person)

A member of the public has raised significant objections to the proposed development under application WD/2024/1122/F. The proposed development would severely impact her property and the surrounding area.

They raised the following key concerns:

- 1. Scale, Mass, and Height- The development is proposed to be three storeys high and would extend right to the edge of the boundary. This scale is considered excessive and out of keeping with the character of the area.*
- 2. Privacy and Overlooking- The south-facing back elevation windows would directly overlook the objector's garden and property, eliminating her current privacy.*
- 3. Construction Impact- The construction process would intrude on her property and the public highway. There are concerns about where construction materials and vehicles will be stored. The noise from construction would significantly impact neighbouring properties.*
- 4. Foundation and Land Intrusion- The proposed foundations could intrude onto her land, raising concerns about potential damage and significant effects.*
- 5. Lack of Preservation Measures- There is no information provided on how the developer plans to preserve and safeguard the area during construction.*
- 6. Impact on Tunnel and Restrictive Covenant- The development would be constructed over a tunnel, raising concerns about subsidence from foundation works. The objector has a restrictive covenant on her property that would hold implications for the proposed development.*

7. *Parking Issues- There is no allocated parking for the proposed flats. The area lacks available on-street or 24-hour off-street public parking. Placing bins on the High Street would also cause obstruction and is not feasible due to the lack of available space.*
8. *Access and Safety- The current access onto the High Street is already considered dangerous. The proposed building would block the current visibility, exacerbating safety concerns by creating a blind spot.*
- While the member of the public does not oppose development in principle, the proposed scale of this project is excessive and out of keeping with the area. The objector calls for a proper ground survey by a professional to assess subsidence risks and requests support for her objections.*

Members asked the following questions:

- *What will be the ridge height of the proposed development? The member of the public confirmed it would be 9.9 metres, but noted that, due to the slope, it would appear visibly higher. The member then asked, "Is it the height or the mass that is your main concern?" The member of the public responded, "Both, as it is all just excessive".*

Another member of the public objected to planning application WD/2024/1122/F, emphasising the same concerns as the previous objector. They noted that the proposed development is excessive in scale, mass, and height, and is not in keeping with the character of the area. Additionally, they raised concerns about the safety of the tritten due to the increased number of cars that would occupy the road. They argued that the development would spoil the area, negatively impact the tritten, overlook neighbouring properties, and depreciate the value of houses in the area.

Members has no further questions

Cllr Gadd reported the following:

- *He will raise the concerns mentioned by the members of the public regarding the above application.*
- *The application near the market entrance, at LAND AT OAKLANDS FARM, has been refused.*
- *A new water leak has appeared but has been quickly investigated and fixed.*

24/175 **Apologies for Absence**

*Apologies had been received from Councillors Mian and Thomas
These were noted*

24/176 **Disclosure of Interests in matters on the Agenda**

All Councillors had a disclosable pecuniary interest in planning application WD/2024/1122/F the Assistant Clerk gave all of them a dispensation.

Cllr Leney declared a personal interest in WD/2024/1325/F as he knows the neighbours on both sides of the property.

Cllr Leney declared that in planning application WD/2024/1122/F, the applicant is listed under the name of the Vivian Brown Discretionary Settlement Trust 2023, which cannot be found. The application should be submitted by an individual. Therefore, the application is defective, as members cannot identify any personal interest due to the incorrect application details.

24/177 **To receive and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 10th June 2024 (previously circulated)**
The minutes of the meeting held on the 10th June 2024 were approved and signed by the Chairman of the Committee.

24/178 **Action points from previous minutes**
The committee members discussed the previously circulated notes and approved for the SID to be recycled.

24/179 **To consider Planning Applications received since the last meeting (list attached)**

WD/2024/1122/F- HIGH STREET, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8JA DEMOLITION OF EXISTING SINGLE STOREY BUILDING. erection of three storey building with class E retail unit on ground floor and 4 no. residential flats above.

OBSERVATIONS: - *The committee members object to the application for the following reasons:*

- *The proposed development would have a negative effect on neighbours and neighbouring properties.*
- *The proposed development incorporates excessive scale, bulk and massing for the size of the site in relation to the immediate locality.*
- *The proposed development encroaches up to boundaries, with potential issues relating to encroachment by foundations and eaves, as well as all constructional requirements, including scaffolding, parking, deliveries and unloading.*
- *Adverse impact on adjoining properties from all aspects of construction activity.*
- *Concerns regarding refuse collection arrangements and deliveries to the site in relation to the busy and constrained nature of this town centre location and return frontage.*
- *Parking provisions are essential for the scale of the property, and none have been considered in an area with little available unrestricted on street parking or 24/7 off-street public parking. It is wholly unrealistic to expect residents not to require the use of a car. The nearby Tilsmore Court development was required to provide parking to full standards notwithstanding its similar town centre location.*
- *Serious concerns exist regarding the side entrance to the shop, as continuous car movement into the twitten would cause obstruction and impact to the area.*
- *The design and appearance, particularly the excessively large roof, and inappropriate frontage with Mansard roof, are not in keeping with the locality and the High Street. The development would cause a significant and adverse change to the street scene.*
- *The foundations would have negative effects on the area and the tunnel, and general concerns over the impact on the tunnel under the site, as indicated in covenants affecting development in this area.*
- *Constructional considerations have not been adequately addressed. There are potential catastrophic implications for the area and houses during construction, particularly concerning boundaries and neighbours.*

First-floor windows overlook neighbouring properties.

- *Concerns regarding the lack of measures for trade waste or effluent, despite indications that there would be none; there would need to be provisions for trade waste bins.*
- *Windows in the west elevation of 81 would overlook existing windows in the east elevation of 83.*
- *Concerns exist regarding access onto the High Street which has poor visibility and which would be exacerbated by the proposals.*
- *Commercially unviable nature of the shop, with inadequate or non-existent loading, servicing, parking and storage facilities.*
- *Clarification is needed on whether the development complies with BNG (Biodiversity Net Gain) requirements.*

WD/2024/1284/F- HILLSIDE, POOK REED LANE, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0XP. Insertion of 2no. dormer windows to front elevation and 1 no. dormer window to rear.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members support this application and consider the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality. They are pleased that the materials match the existing dwelling and feel it is satisfactory to the street scene.*

WD/2024/1142/F- WILD OAK COTTAGE, OLD HEATHFIELD ROAD, CADE STREET, HEATHFIELD, TN21 9BN. Proposed single storey rear side extension and alterations.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members object to the application for the following reasons:*

- *There is no design and access statement submitted with the application, with lack of justification for the proposals, nor were pre-application discussions carried out with the Council.*
- *The proposed development is out of keeping with the area, not least in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).*
- *The overwhelming appearance of the building is disproportionate to the existing structure; doubling its size and would constitute overdevelopment.*
- *The architectural design of the existing building is significantly prejudiced by the proposed development, including the fat roof with exposed dummy pitches, resulting in a poor design quality overall, where a pitched roof would be more in keeping.*
- *Furthermore, concerns raised regarding the amount and scale of glazing, again in the context of the location in the AONB, and 'Dark Skies' policies.*
- *Concerns regarding the potential impact on neighbouring properties, particularly as a result of the proximity to the boundary, differences in levels, and imposing nature of the development.*
- *Loss of garage with no evidence submitted of the adequacy of the parking available to the property, which should provide at least 2 practicably usable spaces.*

WD/2024/1322/F- ROCK HILL HOUSE, BURWASH ROAD, BROAD OAK, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8XG. Proposed change of use from residential garden to a mixed use of residential garden and campsite (up to five pitches), including reuse of parts of existing outbuildings as shower and toilet facilities.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members object to the application for the following reasons:*

- *Members feel that the absence or lack of clarity in the proposal is unhelpful, and the available facilities, hygiene standards, and site disposal are unsatisfactory.*
- *The plans submitted are inadequate as all toilet facilities are not shown.*
- *Waste disposal methods have not been adequately explained.*

- *There is a lack of information regarding parking and access, and the details as shown do not show adequate parking or access, given the potential usage of the premise by up to 5 large pitches as well as the existing dwelling.*
- *Concerns over noise, activity and light pollution affecting neighbours in the area and the adjacent countryside due to the proposal of up to five large yurts close to the boundaries, with little or no available screening.*
- *The proposed use would be out of keeping with the existing residential use of the property, and concerns raised that the change of use is not clearly defined and requires clarification, not least the juxtaposition between residential and tourism uses.*
- *Lack of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) information for this site.*

WD/2024/1325/F - HILL WATERS, FIRGROVE ROAD, CROSS IN HAND, TN21 0QL.

Proposed infill extension to existing outbuilding containing garage, store rooms and ancillary accommodation; internal & external alterations; 3 no new dormer windows; removal of existing staircase

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members supported this application, and welcomed the amendments, which were considered an improvement on the existing, subject to the following condition: the implementation, and protection, of the proposed screening before any construction commences, with maintenance ensured thereafter; the removal of permitted development rights for the southwest elevation; also, subject to the use of the building to be expressly used for the stated purposes only, ancillary to and in connection with the use of the existing dwellinghouse.*

WD/2023/0762/O- DALTOP HOUSE, CROSS IN HAND, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0TA. Proposed bungalow to be built on the land to the front of the main dwelling house.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members object to the application for the following reasons:*

- *Insufficient information provided to make informed comments.*
- *In particular, lack of details regarding the design and layout of the scheme, and impact on trees, with no clarification provided on tree-related matters.*
- *The principle of a new dwelling in this locality would be out of keeping with the area and neighbouring properties, potentially setting a precedent.*
- *It is in an unsustainable location, poorly related to settlements and their services.*
- *The proposal would represent a cramped form of overdevelopment, out of keeping with the general spacious pattern of development in the locality.*
- *Concerns it would cause additional hazards for access onto the main road.*
- *Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) considerations have not been adequately addressed.*
- *Absence of wildlife reports,*

WD/2024/1454/LBR- LITTLE BIGKNOWLE FARM, BIGKNOWLE HILL, BROAD OAK, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8UU. Part retrospective application for renovation of existing dwelling, including demolition of outbuilding and erection of single storey extension to southern elevation, plus detached garage to replace dilapidated outbuilding and associated external works.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members support this application and considers the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality.*

The design and proposals are deemed acceptable. To facilitate efficient review and understanding, a concise and easily readable summary of proposed changes would have been beneficial and greatly appreciated by the members.

WD/2024/1162/FR- LITTLE BIGKNOWLE FARM, BIGKNOWLE HILL, BROAD OAK, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8UU. Part retrospective application for renovation of existing dwelling, including demolition of outbuilding and erection of single storey extension to southern elevation, plus detached garage to replace dilapidated outbuilding and associated external works.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members support this application and considers the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality.*

The design and proposals are deemed acceptable. To facilitate efficient review and understanding, a concise and easily readable summary of proposed changes would have been beneficial and greatly appreciated by the members.

NO CONSULTEES but comments from personal knowledge are allowed

WD/2024/1174/LDP - HUGLETTS FARM, HUGLETTS LANE, CADE STREET, HEATHFIELD, TN21 9BY. Construction of pool house and swimming pool.

OBSERVATIONS: **This was noted by members**

24/180 To consider Planning Applications after the agenda was published

WD/2024/0814/O - LAND TO THE EAST OF 1 HEATH COTTAGE, CROSS IN HAND ROAD, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0SJ. Development of 4 low carbon semi-detached dwellings.

OBSERVATIONS: *The committee members continue to object to the application on the same grounds as previously: (It was not considered that the submitted amended plans addressed any of the concerns previously raised, or improved the scheme in any way).*

- *The existing historic housing allocation for Cross in Hand has already been significantly exceeded resulting in a serious impact with sewage and surface flooding;*
- *The provisions for surface water dispersal will create an excessive load on an already struggling sewage system;*
- *Any proposed SUDs proposal will be ineffective by reason of the geology in the location;*
- *The design is out of keeping and out of character for the locality, not least in this prominent location.*
- *Highway concerns in particular in that the proposals do not allow for sufficient visibility splays and further concerns that the splays required cannot be achieved due to the horizontal and vertical elevation and configuration of the road. From the evidence submitted members are not convinced this can be achieved.*
- *It will be in breach of NPPF 174 (e) in creating unacceptable levels of water pollution;*
- *NPPF 176 considerations should outweigh any others in favour of development*
- *There will be significant biodiversity loss, and it has not been demonstrated that safeguarding of the protected species habitats has been addressed.*
- *Concerns for potential loss of an important substantial hedgerow at the frontage.*

- *The access depicted on the drawings is inaccurate, as there is no access whatsoever in that specific area.*
- *There are concerns regarding the reduction of existing screening, particularly regarding the removal of hedges, trees and undergrowth that has already begun.*
- *There are insufficient parking provisions, which conflict with the High Weald Design Guide and are not in character with the area.*
- *The area is deemed unsustainable due to the absence of footpaths at certain points, and the existing ones are not wide enough to ensure pedestrian safety, posing a danger to those who use them. There is no footway link to Heathfield town furthermore*
- *The draft Local Plan does not allocate this land, and it fails to meet the criteria for windfall housing in any respect in this context.*
- *Additionally, it lies outside any existing or proposed settlement boundary.*
- *The application lacks sufficient information in any respect regarding layout plans, designs, bedroom numbers, landscaping, low carbon housing, parking, access, and drainage, making it very difficult to assess the acceptability and viability of the scheme.*
- *The designs are out of character with Heath Cottages*
- *Granting permission for the development will create a precedent for further such development in the locality*

Members have noted discrepancies in the application: it states "2 Heath Cottages," while the above refers to "1 Heath Cottage." Additionally, the application describes the land as garden land, which it is not.

24/181 **Planning applications approved: Parish Council Comments are in *Italics*. Please note any decisions that vary from the parish council comments are attached.**
None

24/182 **Planning applications refused:**

WD/2024/0748/F - GRANARY, NEW POND HILL, CROSS IN HAND, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0LX.
Erection of three detached houses. Refuse/*Object*

WD/2024/0790/F- LAND AT OAKLANDS FARM, NEWICK LANE, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8PU. Change of use of land for the storage of plant, machinery and materials associated with road construction together with vehicular access, hardstanding and erection of storage building. Refuse/*Object*

These were noted by members

24/183 **Planning appeals**

APP/C1435/W/24/3341961- SILVER BIRCHES, STREET END LANE, BROAD OAK, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8TS. Development of 4no.dwellings- 2no 4 bed traditional style houses, and 2 no.3 bed traditional style chalet.

Appeal Decision: - **TM/2022/0156/TPO** - LAND SOUTH WEST OF GHYLL ROAD, HEATHFIELD. Dismissed

These were noted by members

- 24/184 **Tree Works**
TM/2024/0118/TPO- 9 REGENT PLACE, HEATHFIELD TN21 8TJ. Fell one red cedar within tree preservation order (Heathfield/Waldron) No.82, 1989
- TM/2024/0112/TPO-** LAND AT FALLOW DRIVE, CROSS IN HAND ROAD, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0FY. Remove deadwood from one Oaktree (T2) and reduce height of one oak tree (T3) by 4m, reduce crown to east and south by 3m and remove deadwood within tree preservation order No31, 1996.
- TM/2024/0073/TPO-** 96 SPRINGWOOD ROAD, HEATHFIELD TN21 8JX. Remove one Scots pine tree within tree preservation order (Heathfield) No 13,1991
- TM/2024/0125/TPO-** 8 REGENT PLACE, HEATHFIELD TN21 8TJ. Reduce 3 ash trees by 2m within tree preservation order (Heathfield/Waldron) No.82, 1989
These were noted by members
- 24/185 **Streetlights**
The committee members noted the update report and requested that the works order be updated to reflect a change in lamplight colour and effect. This matter will be revisited at the next Planning and Highways Committee Meeting for further consideration.
- 24/186 **Blocked footpath**
This was noted by members.
- 24/187 **Water leak Firgrove Road, Cross in Hand**
The members discussed the letter received from a resident and agreed for the Assistant Clerk to request further information from the resident. Additionally, the Assistant Clerk will ask East Sussex County Councillor Chris Dowling to investigate the matter and provide advice or assistance to the resident.
- 24/188 **Publication of the High Weald Management Plan 2024-2029**
This was noted by members.
- 24/189 **Environment** – to identify agenda items where the environment has been considered by the Council/Committee in their deliberations and decision making
The Committee considered the environment in all of the planning applications and other matters
- 24/190 **Crime & Disorder Act 1998 Section 17** – to consider effects (if any) arising from items on the Agenda.
Streetlights and parking inadequacies in planning applications were considered
- 24/191 **Risk Management:** -To consider effects (if any) arising from items on the Agenda
Tunnel, High Street shops and concerns over development were considered.
- 24/192 **The next Planning and Highways Meeting will be held on Monday 22nd July 2024 at 6.30 pm in the Main Hall, Heathfield Community Centre, Sheepsetting Lane.**
This was noted by members

Meeting closed at 20.20pm