



## Seaford Town Council

### Minutes of a meeting of Seaford Town Council's Planning & Highways on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> February 2024

Held at the Clinton Centre, Seaford, BN25 1NP on Thursday 1<sup>st</sup> February at 7.00pm.

#### Present:

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair), L Boorman (Vice Chair), R Buchanan, R Clay, R Honeyman, S Markwell and M Wearmouth.

Geoff Johnson, Planning Officer

Adam Chugg, Town Clerk

Isabelle Moulard, Assistant Town Clerk

Georgia Raeburn, Governance Manager

There were 48 members of the public in attendance.

#### P85/02/24 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor O Honeyman (Councillor M Wearmouth substituted).

#### P86/02/24 Disclosure of Interests

Councillor L Boorman declared a non-pecuniary interest in LW/24/0017 as a member, they would therefore not take part in the discussion or vote on this application.

#### P87/02/24 Public Participation

| Speaker    | Statement  |
|------------|--|
| Resident A | <i>The residents want to opposed intensification of development in the coastal strip. We acknowledge there is a target to meet but recommend that allocations are looked at carefully. The group had to delay dealing with the consultation until the new year but since then have spent 100 0plus hours in studying and publicising the consultation documents. The public were not aware of the consultation The Newhaven Drop-In session was not well managed and Plan not clear. The website is not user</i> |

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
|                   | <i>friendly. The questionnaires should be available at the drop in session in Seaford for those residents who cannot respond online.</i>  |
| <i>Resident B</i> | <i>The Land Availability Assessment helps developers to identify prime sites with information from local estate agents. Sites for redevelopment are referred with over-optimistic comments. There is no reference to highways access for the Chyngton Way development and that it adjoins the National Park. The LAA's identification of sites simply encourages speculation and encourages redevelopment on sites of larger houses.</i>  |
| <i>Resident C</i> | <i>Suggested intensification of development in the Coastal Strip in the Issues and Options document puts Seaford under undue pressure. Redevelopments are likely to adversely affect the existing character of the town and are likely to contravene the Design Guidelines in the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan. How will the SNP be reviewed? What is the timescale and who will do it? There are a lot of worries for the residents.</i>   |
| <i>Resident D</i> | <i>Any new development is likely to cause serious transport problems. The A259 is approaching its maximum capacity and suffers regular serious congestion as does the only viable route north, the A26. The emergency services are extremely concerned. 'Green' proposals will not bring about any improvement. The coastal strip should not be required to take a disproportionate share of the District's development requirement.</i>  |
| <i>Resident E</i> | <i>There are wildlife and landscape concerns over the pressure for development of sites such as Chyngton field. The car park attracts many tourists to the area. The parking spills over into Chyngton Way. The use of South Hill Barn is likely to increase. The access road is already extremely busy. The use of the land for filming and events such as Walk the Chalk adds to the pressure. Given this situation further residential development is not acceptable or appropriate.</i> |
| <i>Resident F</i> | <i>The Chyngton Way site is not sustainable in terms of climate change policies. New residents would have to rely on private transport to access the town centre and local services some 20</i>   |

|                   |  |
|-------------------|--|
|                   | <i>minutes walk away. LDC also promotes rewilding. The site is already 'rewilded'. The NPPF recognises that some land can be put to useful environmental purposes. Its habitats and eco systems should be left alone.</i>  |
| <i>Resident G</i> | <i>There are many omissions in the Chyngton field Landscape Assessment. It is sited by a road to South Hill Barn and close to the iconic view of the Seven Sisters. It is a popular area for star gazing so should be protected under the 'Dark Skies' policy. Chyngton Way is a designated Area of Special Character in the Neighbourhood Plan. It is also an important archaeological investigation area being the site of South Camp in WW1.</i>  |
| <i>Resident H</i> | <i>Local infrastructure is already under great pressure including the water supply and sewage system. Medical services cannot cope with the current demand e.g there is a 6 week wait for blood tests. There is a lack of community facilities. Any new development in Chyngton Way will impact on important and well-used footpaths and running routes linking the town to the Downland including the National Cycleway no 2.</i>   |
| <i>Resident I</i> | <i>The designation of the coastline in this area as Heritage Coast carries a heavy responsibility. It brings multiple benefits and should be keenly protected. In May 2016 the area was designated a Dark Skies reserve This encourages bats and other nocturnal animals.</i>  |
| <i>Resident J</i> | <i>The sites at Chyngton Way and South Way form a gateway to the National Park and Heritage Coast. It is an international Nature Reserve. It attracts many visitors and film crews. Development of the site is not acceptable. Replacing green areas with housing will hinder wayfaring. Development is also contrary to accessibility principles and will prejudice those with limited accessibility. It will also impact on the special character of the area as recognised in the Neighbourhood Plan.</i> |
| <i>Resident K</i> | <i>There are concerns about the impact of development on the ground water and aquifers. Development will increase flood risk. Sewage processing in Seaford is already a major concern. How will it cope with dozens of extra houses?</i>   |

|                       |  |
|-----------------------|--|
|                       | <i>SE England is a water-stressed area. Leaving this site open supports the aquifers and encourages wildlife. The local water supply depends on ground water. The site is also close to an area of contaminated land.</i>  |
| <i>Resident L</i>     | <i>In summary the strength of local objections is obvious. The site borders the National Park its development will be detrimental to tourism. It will block views to and from the Park. It will impact the 'dark skies' and increase the ground water flood risk. The highway authority cannot guarantee adequate access. Wastewater services are at capacity. Health services are overstretched. There will be adverse impact on wildlife. There is contaminated land to the south It is an important transitional area from the east of the town to the downland. The town must retain its cultural heritage. Please help us retain this unique environment.</i> |
| <i>Resident M</i>     | <i>Thanked the residents for their contributions. He wanted to correct some earlier comments of the Planning Officer. Firstly, the correct description of the Chyngton Way site in the Land Availability Assessment was potentially developable and deliverable. Secondly it was wrong to describe the Development Capacity Study as having a 'broadbrush' approach.</i>   |
| Town Council Response | Thanked the residents for their contributions, which would be carefully considered by Committee.   |

## **P88/02/24 Planning Applications - For Comment**

Lewes District Council Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 8<sup>th</sup> January 2024

[LW/24/0002 - 27 Bishopstone Road, Bishopstone](#) - Single storey rear extension for B Donaldson.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

Lewes District Council Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> January 2024

[LW/24/0017 – Catholic Church of St Thomas More, Sutton Road](#) - Installation of 2 no. emergency sleeping pods for temporary use by rough sleepers for Deacon S Sharpe.

| Speaker                                      | Statement   |
|--|---|
| Resident N                                   | <p><i>Expressed concern at the lack of formal consultant by the applicant in the local area. Confirmed that there has never been an issue with rough sleepers in Seaford, in his professional experience within the Police force. If they are approved, expressed concerns that the pods will attract rough sleepers to the area and the issues that can be linked to this. Explained the difference between rough sleepers and homeless people.</i></p> <p><i>Set out that the applicant is a businessman with many different interests.</i></p> <p><i>Raised concerns that the pods could become a 24-hour drop-in hostel, which would change the character of a quiet residential area. Suggested an alternative site could be identified in the town centre, if the Town Council felt the pods should be supported.</i></p> <p><i>Confirmed that they have expressed concerns to the Bishop and the applicant is giving the scheme further thought.</i></p> <p><i>Implored the Town Council to object to the application.</i></p> |
| Town Council Response                        | Thanked the resident for their contribution.  |
| Councillor C Bristow from the public gallery | <p>Explained that they have spoken to people in the ward the pods are suggested for to gather their thoughts. Has also confirmed that most people seen on the streets during the day in Seaford do in fact have overnight accommodation. Urged the Committee to be realistic about need within the town.</p> <p>Confirmed that they had spoken with a professional that has worked with rough sleepers. Their feedback included the likelihood of the pods attracting more rough sleepers, who are very vulnerable members of the society, often with untreated mental health or medical conditions and substance misuse issues, which can bring anti-social behaviour.</p>   |

|                              |   |
|------------------------------|---|
|                              | <p>Expressed concerns around the lack of operational procedures in place to support 24/7 scheme, the close siting of the pods to a busy main road and the small sleeping floor area allocated within the pods compared to guidelines.</p> <p>Shared that successful schemes elsewhere in the UK are run on a multi-agency basis i.e. with the Police, health care providers etc.</p> <p>Urged that if a need in the community is identified, that this be addressed as a community with multi-agency support.</p> |
| <p>Town Council Response</p> | <p>Thanked the resident for Councillor Bristow for their contribution.</p>  |

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

- The lack of consultation with residents,
- The lack of coordinated support likely to be available for occupants of pods and no indication., in the supporting documents, that sufficient support will be available,
- Given the doubts about the level of support, the concern that pods will bring problems such as anti-social behaviour to the area and that will be generally detrimental to residential amenity and unneighbourly,
- Concerns around lack of facilities in the pods, in particular the restricted floor area and lack of sanitation facilities,
- The need for multi-agency support with a proposal of this nature to ensure safeguarding of occupants and the area.

Lewes District Council Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 8<sup>th</sup> January 2024

[LW/23/0768 – 2 Freeland Close, Bishopstone](#) - Single storey side extension, relocation of rear access steps and alterations to existing side and rear fenestration for Mr M Smith.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

[LW/24/0001 – 5 Chyngton Lane](#) - Replacement single storey side extension, two storey side extension, installation of solar panels to rear roof slope, alterations to fenestration and associated landscaping for Mr I Hosman and Mrs C Mummery.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The proposed replacement single storey side extension is supported

However, the two-storey side extension proposed is at the same ridge height as the host property and not set back from the existing frontage. As such it would be over dominant

and not subservient to the host property. It would therefore be contrary to policy DM 25 of the Lewes Local Plan Part 2 and to Para GB03 (Page 31) of the Design Guidelines incorporated in the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan

[LW/23/0760 - Old School House, Upper Belgrave Road](#) - Demolition of existing side porch, replacement with single storey side infill extension to connect existing outbuilding to main dwelling, removal of existing dormers, with installation of replacement dormers at rear and side elevations and 2no. additional side dormers, removal of existing roof light with installation of 2no. rooflights at side elevation and 1no at front elevation, alterations to fenestration at side elevation and internal layout, recladding of roof at ground floor level and extension of driveway at front elevation for Ms S Gardhouse.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

[LW/23/0533 - 61 Marine Drive, Bishopstone](#) - Raising of roof height to provide first floor extension for Mr D Hutchings.

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application on the following grounds:-

The significant increase in the roof height would be completely out of scale with the neighbouring attached property and would be detrimental to the generally low profile character of the locality. The proposal would also disrupt the pattern of development in the area which was aimed at retaining views towards Newhaven Harbour and the sea.

Lewes District Council Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 15<sup>th</sup> January 2024

[LW/24/0014 - The Seven Sisters, Alfriston Road](#) – Advertisement Consent Application - Installation of 4no. non-illuminated box facias, 3no. externally illuminated box facias, 1no. dibond graphic and 1no. store directory signs for Tesco.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

[LW/24/0015 – The Seven Sisters, Alfriston Road](#) – Installation of 1 no. Steel MOE Door, 1 no. protection handrail with low height access gate, 2 no. ramraid bollards and 1no. brick infill area.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

[LW/24/0022 - 2 Stirling Avenue](#) - Erection of single storey rear/side extension for Mr P Creed.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

[LW/24/0037 – 133 North Way](#) - Section 73A retrospective application for 5no. sun tube skylights for Mr N Starks.

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application.

Tree Works Applications

[TW/24/0002/TPO – 1 Sandore Road](#) - T1- Sycamore - crown reduce by up to 1.5m T2- Maple - crown reduce by up to 2m T3- Ash - Removal of large lower limbs for Mr G Durnford.

It was reported that this application had been **APPROVED** on 29<sup>th</sup> January – this was **NOTED**.

[TW/24/0009/TCA – 9 Croft Lane](#) - T1 – Fell Sycamore for Ms R McKenzie.

It was **RESOLVED** to **MAKE NO COMMENT** on the application.

The Committee requested that there must be sufficient information posted on the District Council's Planning Portal to accompany applications and enable a comment to be made.

### **P89/02/24 Lewes Local Plan – Spatial Strategy and Policies Directions**

The Committee considered report 153/23 on the latest Local Plan Consultation document issued by Lewes District Council with information and comments to facilitate a formal response from the Town Council.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the Planning Officer's comments.

### **P90/02/24 Update Report**

The Committee considered report 140/23 reporting on decisions taken by Lewes District Council since the last meeting on applications previously considered by the Committee.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the contents of the report.

The meeting closed at 9.41pm.

*Councillor L Wallraven*

Councillor L Wallraven

Chair of Planning & Highways