



**HEATHFIELD AND WALDRON PARISH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON**  
**MONDAY 2<sup>nd</sup> SEPTEMBER 2024, IN THE MAIN HALL OF HEATHFIELD COMMUNITY CENTRE**  
**AT 6.30pm**

Present: Cllrs Coffey (Chair), Draper, Garnett, Stemp, Leney, Mian, Pert and Thomas.  
Also in attendance were Wealden District Councillors Collins and Gadd and East Sussex County Councillor Anne Cross.

The Assistant Clerk was in attendance

Estimated 35 members of the public were present

**Minutes**

The Chair paid tribute to the late WDC Officer Graham Kean at the start of the meeting, and the District Councillors also expressed their condolences and respect in memory of him.

24/234 **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 spoke in objection to planning application WD/2024/1678/O, raising the following concerns:

- Public Opposition: There are currently 28 objections on the Wealden District Council planning site.
- Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB): The site is within the AONB/NL, and the Local Planning Authority has a duty to enhance and preserve this area.
- Local Plan Compliance: The site is not allocated for development in the local plan.
- Unsuitability for Development: The site is considered unsuitable and unsustainable for development.
- Ecological Impact: The site has a rich ecosystem, including wildlife and flora, which needs protection.
- Infrastructure Deficiencies: There is a lack of infrastructure to support additional development.
- Flooding and Drainage Risks: There are concerns about flooding and drainage, as the area has already experienced flooding that has affected residents.
- Sewage Facilities: Concerns were raised about the lack of information regarding sewage facilities and whether proposed measures would be adequate.
- Road Infrastructure and Safety: The current road infrastructure is already strained, and additional traffic would have an adverse effect, raising safety concerns.

- Housing Surplus: There is already a surplus of housing in Heathfield and the surrounding area, making additional development unnecessary.
- Environmental Net Gain: There are doubts about whether the proposed net environmental gain can be achieved.
- Dependence on Cars: The development seems to rely on homeowners using cars rather than walking, contrary to what is suggested in the plans.
- Dark Skies: The development would negatively impact dark skies due to increased noise and light pollution.
- Conflict with NPPF: The development's impacts would outweigh its benefits, conflicting with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)'s provisions relating to acceptable sustainable development.

A member asked the following question:

Is the historical building adjacent to the land listed? The members of the public believe these buildings are listed.

Another member of the public also objected to planning application WD/2024/1678/O on the same grounds as previously mentioned and made the following additional points:

- Ecological and Biodiversity Concerns: It is a statutory requirement to propose a biodiversity gain. However, the mitigation measures suggested by the developers are not feasible, as they would require ongoing supervision, and the developer would not be on-site to ensure their implementation. Additionally, the issue of Great Crested Newts has not been addressed.
- Flooding Risks: The nearby fish lakes and stream, which connect to the Cuckmere River, have already suffered from flooding. This is a sensitive and protected area, and further development would exacerbate the damage. The proposed holding pond is inadequate, as it is designed to hold only one-third of the water, leaving the remaining two-thirds to flow downhill and pollute nearby watercourses, streams, and lakes.
- Sewage Concerns: The sewage is proposed to be pumped into the main sewer at Sandy Cross Lane, where sewage spills have already occurred. The existing system is unable to cope with current demands, and additional housing would only worsen the situation.

Members asked the following questions:

Would the water runoff also come from the Green Lane Estate? The member of the public believes it is contributing to the issues in this area as well.

What is the groundwater level on this site? The site is sloping and naturally wet, but the exact water level is unknown, though it is believed to be high.

Another member of the public also objected to planning application WD/2024/1678/O on the same grounds as previously mentioned and made the following additional points:

- The proposed site is bordered by a stream, which is understood to be a source of the Cuckmere River, and has its origin in nearby Heathfield Park. According to South East Rivers Trust "Ancient Woodlands have protected the headwaters (of the Cuckmere River) in the upper catchment for hundreds of years and their flora and fauna demonstrates their undisturbed hydrology."
- The immediate area is rich in wildlife including: a wide variety of birds – I have counted 55 species from my back garden, deer, foxes, badgers, voles, field mice, slow worms, common

lizards, smooth newts, frogs and grass snakes. The Preliminary Environmental Appraisal- Assumes 6 proposed dwellings, the proposal is for 9 dwellings. It took place during one visit on 13<sup>th</sup> November 23 and states that “seasonal variations cannot be observed” and “only a selection of all species that potentially occur within the site have been recorded”

- Did not conduct a full assessment of the bordering Ancient Woodland as this was beyond the boundary of the site.
- The Outline Planning Application states that: The site has an “array of urban characteristics present in this location; the area is not particularly tranquil or unspoilt” Para 1.6 I believe the above evidence contradicts this view.
- The Developer proposes 35 parking spaces – for residents and visitors Para 3.11 indicating the volume of extra traffic which would be created on an already overloaded Country Lane.

A member of the public spoke in objection to planning application WD/2024/1726/F, raising the following concerns:

1. **Overbearing Height and Intrusiveness:** The proposed development would result in three-storey houses with large, floor-to-ceiling windows facing directly into the gardens and homes of Glendean and neighbouring properties on Waldron Thorns. This design would create an intrusive and overbearing impact, significantly affecting the privacy and views of existing residents. The roofline of the new houses would be approximately 14 metres (45 feet) above the elevation of the back patios of Glendean and neighbouring homes, exacerbating the issue.
2. **Drainage and Flood Risk:** Despite claims in the application, the development poses a significant risk of increased flooding. Nearby developments have already demonstrated how altered land drainage can lead to waterlogging and surface water problems for properties downhill. The proposed permeable surfaces will not adequately mitigate this risk, especially given the steep slope of the site.
3. **Pedestrian Access Concerns:** The proposal includes reopening and paving a disused accessway along the side of Glendean’s back garden, creating a new pathway for the development’s residents. This change is likely to introduce noise, disturbance, and potential security risks for existing residents, particularly for Glendean. The responsibility for maintaining any security measures would be impractical and unreliable.
4. **Biodiversity Loss:** The claim of a 10% increase in biodiversity seems unrealistic. The development would likely lead to the reduction or removal of trees and vegetation to improve views, contradicting the intended biodiversity gain. Additionally, the conversion of much of the land to driveways, pathways, and buildings further undermines the claim of environmental enhancement.
5. **Traffic and Safety on Tilsmore Road:** The development would increase traffic on Tilsmore Road, a route already known for being dangerous with limited pedestrian pathways. Any additional traffic would exacerbate these safety concerns.
6. **Out-of-Character Development:** The proposed houses are completely out of character with the surrounding area, which is predominantly composed of quiet, private gardens. The introduction of four identical three-storey houses would dominate the landscape and significantly alter the character of the neighbourhood, to the detriment of the existing community.

Members asked the following questions:

What currently exists where the new pathway is proposed? It is full of shrubs and trees, very narrow, and currently blocked off.

Was this area ever used as a right of way? It may have been many years ago, but there has been no known usage since the current residents moved to the property.

Another member of the public also objected to planning application WD/2024/1726/F, on the same grounds as the previously mentioned concerns and adding the following points:

- **Surface Water Displacement and Flood Risk:** The proposed development's footprint will likely displace surface water, increasing the risk of flooding for properties on Waldron Thorns. This area is already prone to flooding, and residents are deeply concerned about the potential for further damage.
- **Loss of Light and Privacy:** The height of the proposed buildings, along with the inclusion of Juliet balconies, will overlook existing gardens, leading to a significant loss of light and privacy for neighbouring properties.
- **Passageway Concerns:** The creation of a new passageway will increase noise, pose safety risks, and potentially lead to anti-social behaviour in the area.
- **Inadequate Parking:** The area already faces parking challenges, and the proposed development will exacerbate this issue, raising environmental concerns and negatively impacting the community.
- **No Need for Further Development:** The member of the public stressed that there is no need for additional development in this area, as it would only bring about negative consequences.

Another member of the public also objected to planning application WD/2024/1726/F, reiterating the previously mentioned concerns and adding the following points:

- **Pathway Security Issues:** The proposed pathway would pose significant security concerns, and the member does not believe there is an established right of way.
- **Flooding and Parking Concerns:** The member emphasised the risks of flooding and inadequate parking provisions, noting that most households typically own two cars, which the proposed development fails to accommodate.

Members asked the following questions:

Who owns the proposed new footpath? The owner of the property does.

What is the surface material where the soakaways are not working? The member believes it is clay.

A member of the public spoke in objection to planning application WD/2024/1837/FA, highlighting concerns from several local residents:

- **Increased Hours of Operation:** The shop/café's current approved operating hours already exceed the original request. Although the applicant did not contest this approval previously, the shop is currently still not operational and now seeks further extended hours. This proposed increase would exacerbate the negative impact on residents, leading to higher levels of noise pollution, traffic, and light pollution in this quiet rural area, which is part of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). (High Weald National Landscape).

- **Ongoing Expansion Concerns:** The applicants have consistently sought to expand their operations over the years. Residents are worried about the ongoing escalation of demands and its potential adverse effects. They urge the council to oppose the proposed extension of hours and maintain the current approved operating times.

A member asked the following question:

Why were more hours granted than initially requested? The member of the public was unsure but believes it may have been to align with the business park nearest to the site.

A member of the public spoke in objection to planning application WD/2024/1726/F, raising the following concerns:

- **Road Safety:** The safety of the area is a major concern, particularly given that the route has a 7.5-tonne weight limit and is frequented by unaccompanied schoolchildren. The current traffic conditions make it difficult for these children to navigate safely, and any increase in traffic could significantly heighten the risk of accidents, potentially leading to severe injury or death.
- **Flooding and Sewage Issues:** The member supported the concerns raised about inadequate soakaways. The existing drainage system is already insufficient, and the proposed development would exacerbate flooding and sewage problems. The soakaways planned for the development are deemed inadequate and unlikely to address the issue effectively.
- **Biodiversity Impact:** The development is expected to have a negative impact on the local biodiversity. The member highlighted the importance of preserving the area's natural environment.
- **Tree Canopy Preservation:** The tree canopy in the area is visible from across Heathfield and is an important natural feature. The member emphasised the need to protect this canopy from being adversely affected by the proposed development.

Another member of the public also objected to planning application WD/2024/1726/F, reiterating the previously mentioned concerns and adding the following points:

- **Tree Protection:** The tree in question currently provides crucial screening and privacy for their property. There is concern that the tree may be removed or damaged as part of the development, leading to severe overlooking and loss of privacy. The member has sought assistance from Wealden District Council's Planning Department and is interested in potentially placing a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) on this tree.
- **Lack of Notification:** The member was only made aware of the planning application through other residents and was not directly informed by the applicants. They are concerned about the lack of communication and notification regarding the proposed development.

**WDC Cllr Gadd:**

- Reported that he will look into the possibility of placing a Tree Preservation Order (TPO) for the site in question; (Planning application WD/2024/1726/F).
- Noted that, as a member of the planning committee, he will refrain from commenting on specific applications but has taken note of the concerns raised by residents.
- Informed members that the recent WDC Call for Sites has identified three additional sites for Heathfield Parish and will provide details on these areas after the meeting.

**WDC Cllr Collins:**

- Assured Members that he has heard and noted all concerns raised during the meeting.

### **ESCC Cllr Cross:**

- Offered support to residents of Sandy Cross Lane and has already contacted East Sussex Highways to address issues with the traffic report, which she believes does not accurately reflect local concerns.
- Reported her intention to support speeding measures on Mutton Hall Hill and is exploring potential solutions with East Sussex County Council.

### **24/235 Apologies for Absence**

Apologies had been received from Cllrs Dunstall and Whitehouse; these were noted.

### **24/236 Disclosure of Interests in matters on the Agenda**

Cllr Stemp declared a personal interest in WD/2024/1854/F as she knows the applicant.

Cllr Coffey declared a personal interest in WD/2024/1678/O as he knows a resident whose property abuts the property.

### **24/237 To receive and sign the Minutes of the meeting held on Monday 12<sup>th</sup> August 2024 (previously circulated)**

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved and were signed by the Chair.

### **24/238 Action points from previous minutes**

All items are on the agenda

### **24/239 To consider Planning Applications received since the last meeting**

#### **WD/2024/1678/O**

LAND SOUTH OF SANDY CROSS LANE AND EAST OF MONKHURST HOUSE, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8QR. Outline application with all matters reserved bar access for the provision of 9 no. self-build dwellings, access from Sandy Cross Lane, and ancillary works.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members object to this application on the following grounds:

- **Boundary Preservation:** Sandy Cross Lane should remain a distinct boundary to further development, preventing the spread of development into adjacent more sensitive areas, not least on the south side of the Lane.
- **Incursion into Ancient Woodland:** The proposed development encroaches significantly into Ancient Woodland and its concomitant buffer zone, from two sides, potentially causing irreversible harm to this sensitive environment. The submitted scheme lacks any Environmental Impact Statement.
- **Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) or National Landscapes (NL) and Sustainability Concerns:** The site is located within the High Weald National Landscape, formerly

the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, and is deemed unsustainable for development, neither preserving nor enhancing the area. The proposal conflicts with several National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) policies (paragraphs 173, 180, 182, and 191), in that the need for the adverse impacts of the development to be satisfactorily mitigated cannot be satisfactorily demonstrated.

- **Location and Access Issues:** The area in this the application site is located is considered unsafe for pedestrians, particularly vulnerable groups such as young children, those with prams, and wheelchair users, highlighting the unsustainability of the location. The proposed development would exacerbate the strain on already overstretched local amenities, which are located a difficult 30-minute walk away. Additionally, the access routes are narrow with inadequate sight lines, raising significant safety concerns. Finally, it is not considered that it's been demonstrated that satisfactory and safe access can be achieved for the site, given the narrow, undulating and twisting nature of the Lane, and significant loss of frontage screening that would be occasioned to achieve any such improvements at all.
- **Unsustainable Location:** In this context, the site is considered to be in an unsustainable location, only accessible to local services via steep, narrow roads, with no pedestrian footways, nor adequate lighting, and would inevitably necessitate the use of motor vehicles to access any such services.
- **Traffic Impact:** The proposed development would increase traffic congestion, particularly during peak times such as school drop-offs and pick-ups. The submitted Design and Access Statement fails to address these concerns, and according to the NPPF Para 115, planning applications should be refused if such impacts are severe and cumulative, as is the case here, not least when taken with the housing development already approved further along the Lane to the east
- **Inaccurate Transport Report:** The Transport Report included in the application is considered inaccurate and inconsistent. Due to these discrepancies, it should not be considered a valid part of the application. Additionally, the provision of 15 parking spaces through garage parking is inadequate and unsuitable for the proposed development.
- **Surface Water and Drainage Concerns:** The proposed development would worsen existing flooding issues on nearby roads, as the current drainage system is already unable to cope with existing demand. The site's sloping topography and environmentally sensitive location would further exacerbate these issues, causing a greater negative impact, not only on such roads, but also lower lying land, including nearby watercourses and woodland, (where natural flood prevention initiatives have been established), overwhelming such areas, particularly due to the inadequacy of the proposed surface water balancing and retention areas, both in the locality and further downstream, to the detriment of local amenities, but also the wellbeing of biodiversity and ecosystems in all respects. The submitted scheme fails to provide any credible drainage strategy, and there is no clear demonstration that foul sewage can be safely dealt with in any way.
- **Adverse Impacts Outweigh Benefits:** The Planning; (Para 1.4) acknowledges that if adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, planning permission should be refused. This criterion alone justifies the refusal of this application.

- **Inappropriate Appearance:** Development of this site would result in a suburban-style layout that is out of character with the rural surroundings, negatively impacting the visual aesthetics of the area, and contrary to the provisions and principles of the adopted High Weald Design Guide.
- **Unsuitability for Development:** The Landscape Assessment clearly indicates that the site is unsuitable for development, with significant negative environmental impacts. The environmental inadequacies are not adequately addressed in the Design and Access Statement, conflicting with the principles contained within the NPPF.
- **Lack of Housing Need:** There is no current need for additional housing in this area, particularly of this type, particularly as the proposed development does not include onsite affordable housing. The area is already experiencing an influx of development, further negating the necessity of this project.
- **Adverse Impact on Local Amenities:** The proposed development would have a detrimental impact upon adjacent and local residential properties, due to increased noise, activity, light pollution, and other forms of negative environmental impacts.
- **Adverse Impact on Heritage Assets:** The proposed development, in terms of its character, design, layout, materials, roads, parking and street furniture, would have a detrimental impact on the settings of two nearby Grade II listed buildings
- The committee members also noted that a recent appeal was dismissed at Newick Lane, Heathfield, (**Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/W/23/3335556**), which addressed the same issues as those raised in this application, not least regarding the High Weald National Landscape, the precedent established further supporting the grounds for objection in this case.

#### WD/2024/1726/F

LAND TO THE REAR AND BETWEEN THE MANSE & LULLINGTON, TILSMORE ROAD, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0XU. 4 new-build residential houses including associated road, parking provisions, gardens, bike storage units and landscaping.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members object to this application on the following grounds:

- **Backland Development:** The proposed development characterised by a narrow access gap between the frontage houses, with new dwellings and parking immediately to the rear, facing onto the private rear amenity space of the frontage buildings, would constitute classic and unacceptable backland development, exacerbated by the significant variations in height and levels, and would be a wholly unsuitable and unacceptable form of development.
- **Height Variations:** Due to the sloping nature of the site, the proposed rear three-storey development would lead to overlooking and a significant loss of privacy for neighbouring properties, particularly, but not exclusively, in Waldron Thorns to the rear.
- **Design:** The design of the proposed dwellings would be wholly out of character with the style and patterns of development in the local area and street scene. The distinctive "Sylvan" character of the area would be lost due to the removal of mature gardens, trees and hedges.
- **Loss of Trees and Hedging:** The removal of trees and hedges would be harmful, as they currently provide important screening for neighbouring properties, not least in Waldron Thorns.



Their loss would increase noise, light pollution, and have severely detrimental environmental impacts.

- **Flooding and Drainage Concerns:** The Tilsmore area is already and historically at a high risk of flooding, especially from surface water, and further development would exacerbate this issue, negatively affecting neighbouring properties, especially in Waldron Thorns. The existing drainage system is already inadequate to handle the current surface water flows, and the proposed development would increase this strain. Although an evidential report via a surface water drainage strategy was requested by Wealden District Council in pre-application discussions, it was not submitted.
- **Retaining Wall:** The proposed 3-metre retaining wall, with cars parked on top, raises significant concerns regarding its potential adverse visual impact on the area and questions about who would be responsible for its maintenance. There is a high risk of potential damage to land conditions and biodiversity, as well as flooding.
- **Access Concerns:** The area is already busy, and the proposed development would lead to increased traffic and have a negative impact on the local community in terms of pedestrian and highway safety in this narrow, poorly lit road, with no public footways and only occasional 'refuges'. The proposed access arrangements would be inadequate leading to conditions prejudicial to public safety, relying on land not within the applicants' control, and would lead to likely loss of hedgerows and vegetation to facilitate adequate visibility splays.
- **Overlooking:** The development would overlook properties at Waldron Thorns, leading to a loss of privacy for the residents, as well as detrimental impact upon them due to overbearing appearance and relative height of the 3 storey rear elevations.
- **Footpath:** The proposed plans lack sufficient detail regarding the footway link to Waldron Thorns, but its presence would likely impact adjoining neighbours and contribute to a loss of privacy, lack of supervision and likely security implications for users of this path as well as adjoining residents.
- **Overall Impact:** The proposed development would have a negative impact on the area, affecting pedestrians, properties in Waldron Thorns and on either side of the development, wildlife, and the dark skies. The development is excessive in size and bulk, with insufficient attention to biodiversity net gain.
- **Sewage Concerns:** There is insufficient detail on how the development will connect to the existing sewage facility and whether the system can handle the increased load.
- **Traffic and Parking Concerns:** The proposed access road is narrow with limited turning space, making access particularly difficult in this area. There are also concerns about the adequacy of the allocated parking.
- **Lack of Housing Need:** There is no current need for additional housing in this area, particularly of this type and scale.
- **Dark Skies:** The proposed development would negatively impact the dark skies due to the loss of trees and increased light pollution from the proposed development.
- **Lack of Detail:** The application lacks sufficient detail in several areas, raising significant concerns about the overall feasibility and impact of the development, the inadequacy of the detail considered especially poor, considering the 'full' nature of this application.

#### **WD/2024/1837/FA**

BEACON DOWN VINEYARD, BROWNS LANE, CROSS IN HAND, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0QJ.

Variation of condition 14 attached to WD/2023/2860/F (Demolition of the existing agricultural building (With consent for use within class R of the GPDO) and the construction of a farm/café, together with associated parking and landscaping). To vary hours of use.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members object to this application on the following grounds:

- **Validity of Existing Conditions:** The conditions imposed under planning application WD/2023/2860/F, specifically those outlined in section 14(a) of the permission document, were designed to protect residential amenities. These conditions remain valid now, and altering the approved hours would undermine these protections, soon after this decision, with no justification whatsoever.
- **Increased Pollution:** Extending the hours of operation would lead to an increase in light and noise pollution, negatively impacting the surrounding area in terms of the natural environment, and disturbing the dark skies, especially during winter months occasioned by these proposed longer hours into the evenings. The proposed change in hours would also cause significant harm to the amenities of local residents and others enjoying the tranquil beauties of this attractive rural environment.
- **Lack of Justification for Change:** Since the original hours and conditions were granted, no appeal has been made by the applicant. There is insufficient justification provided to support the proposed increase in hours, making it an unwarranted change in the context of all the above considerations.

#### **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 site layout plan, block plan, location plan, suds plan, plot 1-2 plans and elevation, plot 3-4 plans and elevations, Street Scene Elevations, Site Sections

**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 and updated documentation 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
- There is a lack of parking and cycle storage.
- 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, the site is outside any designated development boundary, in an area with scattered residential development north of the A267. Restrictive countryside policies apply, resisting new housing unless there is special justification.
- 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
- The statutory biodiversity net gain requirement has not been satisfactorily addressed, nor have satisfactory ecological and arboricultural assessments been provided, all of which would result in a significant potential adverse impact upon the onsite biodiversity in the context of implementation of the development.

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.

#### **WD/2024/1882/F**

BARS REST, BATTLE ROAD, PUNNETTS TOWN, HEATHFIELD, TN21 9DR. conversion of redundant barn to form attached habitable accommodation extension to adjacent dwelling.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members supported the application and considered the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality, subject to the condition it is only to be used as the purposes stated and ancillary to the main residential dwelling. Also, for the removal of any permitted

developments rights on the east and south elevations, not least fenestration. Furthermore, that the structural changes comply with Wealden District Council's structural conversion policy criteria. Also, a low impact lighting strategy should be implemented in accordance with the applicant's submitted Preliminary Roost Assessment.

**WD/2024/1886/F**

11 WALDRON THORNS, HEATHFIELD, TN21 0AB. Removal of existing defective lean-to roofs, raise brickwork and construct new flat roof.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members supported the application and considered the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality, subject to compliance with the Party Wall Act.

**WD/2024/1546/F**

ALL SAINT'S CHURCH, CHURCH STREET, OLD HEATHFIELD, TN21 9AG

To replace exiting low level metal railings with new higher railings to remove the risk of falling into eternal stairwell leading to boiler plant room.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The members raised no objections to this application.

**WD/2024/1854/F**

41 HIGH STREET, HEATHFIELD, TN21 8HU. Change of use of first floor and conversion of roof space (including proposed rear dormer window) to form self-contained maisonette at first and second floor levels. Retention of existing retail unit and rear courtyard area at ground level.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members supported the application and raised no objections.

**24/240 To consider Planning Applications after the agenda was published**

**WD/2024/1899/F**

KELLS, POSSINGWORTH CLOSE, CROSS-IN-HAND, HEATHFIELD TN21 0TL Replacement open fronted store.

**OBSERVATIONS:** The committee members supported the application and considered the size and appearance to be in keeping with the locality, subject to the condition it is only to be used as the purposes stated and ancillary to the main residential dwelling.

**NO CONSULTEES but comments from personal knowledge are allowed**

**WD/2024/1905/NMA**

BURWELL BURWASH ROAD, BROAD OAK, HEATHFIELD, EAST SUSSEX, TN21 8TE. Application for a non-material amendment to WD/2024/0771/F (Rebuild party wall and align rear elevation to match neighbour). Rebuild party wall and rear elevation to match neighbour. Addition of a small high-level window to return wall of kitchen.

**OBSERVATIONS: This was noted by members**

24/241 **Planning applications approved: Parish Council Comments are in *Italics*. Please note any decisions that vary from the parish council comments are attached.**

**WD/2024/1517/FA-** 2 Gorse Cottages, Cross in Hand Road, Heathfield, TN21 0SL.  
Variation of condition 13 of WD/2023/1396/O (Development of 2 no. low carbon semi-detached dwellings) change to souse design. Approved/*Support*

**This was noted by members**

24/242 **Planning applications refused:**  
*None*

24/243 **Tree Works**

**TM/2024/0127/TPO**

6 PROSPECT TERRACE, STATION ROAD, HEATHFIELD, EAST SUSSEX, TN21 8DD. Fell 3 sycamore trees) T2, T3 and T4) and reduce branches of one sycamore tree (T1) by approx. 3m back to the main trunk within tree preservation order (Heathfield/Waldron) No 92, 1990.

**TM/2024/0160/TPO**

12 STREATFIELD GARDENS, HEATHFIELD, EAST SUSSEX, TN21 8LW.  
Reduce crown of one oak tree by 3-5m in height and reduce lateral limbs to rebalance tree within tree preservation order no.2,1981.

The Committee did not object to either of these applications.

24/244 **Planning Appeals**

**Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/W/23/3335556.** Oaklands Farm, Newick Lane, Heathfield, East Sussex TN21 8PU. Dismissed

**Appeal Ref: APP/C1435/W/24/3347199.** Land at Barley Mow Lane, Punnetts Town, TN21 9DJ.

**These were noted by members**

24/245**Streetlights**

**1. Streetlighting maintenance/energy agreement**

The members discussed the agreement, during which Cllr Leney raised concerns about certain liability issues and the wording of the agreement. Cllr Leney, along with the Assistant Clerk, will address these concerns with the East Sussex County Council Street Lighting Department and report back to the Committee at the next Planning and Highways Committee Meeting.

**2. Update**

This was noted by members

24/246 **Gatwick Airport FASI South Airspace Change Proposal Update**

This was noted by members

24/247 **Mutton Hall Hill speeding concerns raised by resident**

The committee members discussed the previously circulated correspondence.

**Meeting suspended**

Cllr Gadd informed the members that he is aware of the speeding issues on Mutton Hall Hill and has investigated certain areas. He recommended exploring the possibility of installing a red light camera at the traffic lights.

**Meeting resumed**

The members discussed the previous measures taken and the discussions with East Sussex County Council. The item is on the SLR agenda for further discussion to determine if any measures can be implemented to reduce speeding. Signage has already been erected, and it was agreed to place additional signs at the bottom of the hill from west to east. The members also agreed to explore the installation of a speed camera and to review the costs with the Sussex Safer Roads Partnership for the traffic lights on Mutton Hall Hill. They will report their findings at the next Planning and Highways Committee Meeting.

The members clarified that the potential involvement of a residents' association is intended to complement the ongoing work of the committee. This collaboration carries additional weight with East Sussex County Council when advocating for the implementation of measures. It is incorrect to assume that members believe these matters should be left solely to the general public. However, the committee emphasizes that public involvement is crucial in addressing concerns, as a collaborative effort between the committee and residents can lead to the best possible outcomes.

24/248 **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.

24/249 **Crime & Disorder Act 1998 Section 17** – to consider effects (if any) arising from items on the Agenda.

Streetlights and footpaths/twitten, speeding were considered.

24/250 **Risk Management:** -To consider effects (if any) arising from items on the Agenda

Sandy Cross Lane, reputational risk, contractual risks were considered

24/251 **The next Planning and Highways Meeting will be held on **Monday 23<sup>rd</sup> September 2024 at 6.30 pm** in the Main Hall, Heathfield Community Centre, Sheepsetting Lane**

This was noted by members

**Meeting closed at 21.11pm**