



Seaford Town Council

Seaford Town Council Planning & Highways Agenda – 12 February 2026 To the Members of the Planning & Highways Committee

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair), L Boorman (Vice Chair), R Buchanan, O Honeyman, R Honeyman and J Lord

A meeting of the **Planning & Highways Committee** will be held at **Cross Way Church, Clinton Place, Seaford, BN25 1NP** on **Thursday 12 February 2026** at **7.00pm**, which you are summoned to attend.

Steve Quayle
Town Clerk

6 February 2026

PLEASE NOTE:

- **PUBLIC ARRIVAL TIME IS BETWEEN 6.45PM – 6.55PM FOR A 7PM MEETING START**
- The meeting will be recorded and uploaded to the Town Council's YouTube channel shortly after the meeting
- See the end of the agenda for further details of public access and participation
- Councillor queries on non-application agenda items should be reserved for the meeting so the answer and any subsequent points are shared with all councillors. If however a councillor has a question that officers may need to know in advance to prepare a response, please send this through the contact officer of the report so an answer can be prepared to be shared verbally at the meeting, rather than in advance of the meeting via email

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

To consider apologies for absence.

2. Disclosure of Interests

To deal with any disclosure by Members of any disclosable pecuniary interests and interests other than pecuniary interests, as defined under the Seaford Town Council Code of Conduct and the Localism Act 2011, in relation to matters on the agenda.

3. Public Participation

To deal with any questions, or brief representations, from members of the public in accordance with relevant legislation and Seaford Town Council Policy.

In accordance with Town Council policy, members of the public wishing to speak on individual planning applications may do so immediately before each planning application.

4. [Lewes Local Plan – Phase 2 – Final Draft Response](#)

To consider report 164/25 inviting discussions and approval on the Town Council's final draft response to Lewes District Council's Local Plan consultation – phase 2 (pages 6 to 31).

5. [East Sussex County Council's Parking Review for Lewes District– Agreement of the Town Council's Submission](#)

To consider report 165/25 agreeing the requests for changes or additions to parking controls that the Town Council will submit to East Sussex County Council to be fed into the Lewes District on-street parking review (pages 32 to 51).

6. Planning Applications – For Comment

The planning and/or tree works applications for the Committee to consider and comment on as a statutory consultee are as follows:

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 5 January 2026

[LW/25/0690](#) - Environment Agency, Marine Parade - Removal of portacabins and erection of two-storey office and welfare building for Mr C Farthing.

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 12 January 2026

[LW/25/0711](#) - Land At The Hawth, Surrey Road - Planning Permission in Principle - Construction of 7no family dwellings for Messrs J and M Rigden.

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 19 January 2026

[LW/25/0732](#) - 9A Sutton Park Road - Second floor roof conversion from pitched roof to mansard roof to form new bedroom/bathroom for Mr Yasmin Al Wali.

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 26 January 2026

[ESCC/2025/001/CB](#) - **Chyngton Brooks** - The restoration of intertidal habitat at Chyngton Brooks through the managed breaching of the tidal flood embankment and associated minor earthworks to improve hydraulic functioning and biodiversity for The National Trust (*part of a partnership stakeholders project*).

[LW/25/0730](#) – **9 Sutton Park Road** – Single storey rear ground floor parapet walled extension to form a new cafe/bar premises for Mr Y Al Wali.

[LW/26/0018](#) – **3 Meadow Way** – Single storey first floor rear extension, replacement of existing conservatory with two storey rear extension, and alterations to existing fenestration for Prof D Dimitriou.

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 2 February 2026

No applications were received.

Tree Works Applications

[TW/26/0001/TPO](#) - **3 Chyngton Lane** - T1 - Holm Oak - partial crown reduction by 1m - to prevent damage to garage/fence and clearance from ground by 2.5m - to facilitate access between trunk and garage/fence; T2 - Holm Oak - lift crown by 2.5m above ground level - to reduce obstructions in access and partial crown reduction by 1m to improve balance ;T3 - Holm Oak - lift crown by 2m above ground level - to improve balance of the crown for Mr P Mabey.

[TW/26/0004/TPO](#) - **12 Steyning Road** - T8 and T9 - Holm Oak - reduce and reshape crown by 4m - to prevent branches from overhanging to private garden for Mrs A Francis.

[TW/26/0005/TCA](#) - **Sussex Cottage, Upper Belgrave Road** - G1 - 8 Nos. - Acer Trees - Re-pollard to previous points - To prevent overhanging on driveway and neighbour's private garden for Mr L Russ.

[SDNP/25/04976/TCA](#) - **Land At Site Of Bishopstone Place** - T1 and T2 - Poplar - Reduction in height/reshaping of trees by approximately 5 metres - Removal of epicormic growth for Mr A Bray.

7. [Update Report](#)

To consider report 160/25 reporting on decisions taken by Lewes District Council since the last meeting on applications previously considered by the Committee (pages 52 to 54).

AGENDA NOTES

For further information about items on this Agenda please contact:

Steve Quayle, Town Clerk, 37 Church Street, Seaford, East Sussex, BN25 1HG

Email: meetings@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk

Telephone: 01323 894 870

Circulation:

All Town Councillors and registered email recipients.

Public Access:

Members of the public looking to access this meeting will be able to do so by:

1. Attending the meeting in person.

The Town Council asks that you contact meetings@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk or 01323 894 870 to register your interest in attending at least 24 hours before the meeting.

Spaces will be assigned on a first come, first served basis.

Please note that if you don't register and just attempt to turn up at the meeting, this could result in you not being able to attend if there is no space.

OR

2. Watching the recording of the meeting on the [Town Council's YouTube channel](#) , which will be uploaded after the meeting has taken place.

Public Access to the Venue:

If you are attending the meeting in person, please arrive from 6.45pm ready for a 7pm meeting start.

Public Participation:

Members of the public looking to participate in the public participation section of the meeting must do so in person, by making a verbal statement during the public participation section of the meeting.

Below are some key points for public participation in the meeting:

1. Your statement should be regarding business on the agenda for that meeting.
2. You will only be able to speak at a certain point of the meeting; the Chair of the meeting will indicate when this is.
3. You do not have to state your name if you don't want to.
4. If you are unsure of when best to speak, either query this with an officer/councillor ahead of the meeting or raise your hand during the public participation item of the meeting and ask the Chair – they will always be happy to advise.

5. When the Chair has indicated that it is the part of the meeting that allows public participation, raise your hand and the Chair will invite you to speak in order.
6. Statements by members of the public are limited to four minutes and you don't automatically have the right to reply. The Chair may have to cut you short if you overrun on time or try to speak out of turn – this is just to ensure the meeting stays on track.
7. Where required, the Town Council will try to provide a response to your statement but if it is unable to do so at the meeting, may respond in writing following the meeting.
8. Members of the public should not speak at other points of the meeting.
9. A summarised version of your statement, but no personal details, will be recorded in the minutes of the meeting.

Public Comments

Members of the public looking to submit comments on any item of business on the agenda can do so in writing ahead of the meeting and this will be circulated to all committee members. Comments can be submitted by email to planning@seafordtowncouncil.gov.uk or by post to the Town Council offices.



Seaford Town Council

Report No:	164/25
Agenda Item No:	4
Committee:	Planning & Highways
Date:	12 February 2026
Title:	Lewes Local Plan Consultation - Phase 2 - Final Draft Response
By:	Isabelle Mouland, Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager
Purpose of Report:	To invite discussion and approval on the Town Council's final draft response to Lewes District Council's Local Plan consultation – phase 2

Actions

The Committee is advised:

1. To consider the contents of the report.
2. To consider the Town Council's final draft response to the Lewes Local Plan consultation phase 2 questionnaire, suggesting amendments where appropriate.
3. To consider the final draft response to site allocations and supporting images.
4. To consider the information regarding Local Green Spaces and requests for the Town Council to submit supporting evidence for sites.
5. To move to a vote on the motions below.

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended:

1. To note the contents of the report.
2. To record a note of thanks to the many residents who have contributed invaluable evidence, comments and concerns which have aided the Town

Council in its final draft response to the phase 2 consultation on behalf of the town.

3. To agree to finalise Seaford Town Council's response to the Lewes Local Plan phase 2 consultation questionnaire.
4. To agree to finalise Seaford Town Council's response to site allocations in Seaford.
5. To agree to share the evidence collated to inform the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan Local Green Spaces designations and submit them as part of this consultation to confirm the Town Council's support.
6. To delegate authority to the Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager to submit evidence and support from the Town Council in relation to the Local Green Spaces identified in the methodology and requested by residents.

1. Information

- 1.1** Lewes District Council (LDC) launched the second phase of consultation on the Lewes Local Plan (LLP) on 18 December 2025; this ends on 28 February 2026.
- 1.2** Phase 2 of the consultation sets out a spatial strategy and identifies sites for 8,568 net new homes across the District over the plan period, while also re-evaluating areas considered during Phase 1.
- 1.3** Since the launch of the consultation, Seaford Town Council has been gathering evidence from residents, town councillors and officers to feed into the Town Council's response.
- 1.4** The Town Council has held a series of public engagement sessions focusing on the different topics and site allocations proposed in the LLP. These sessions were attended by over 60 residents and town councillors. Those in attendance were all given the opportunity to discuss key topics, policies and the Seaford site allocations.
- 1.5** The Town Council is immensely grateful for the invaluable contributions made by residents.
- 1.6** All of the evidence received and discussed at the public engagement sessions have been collated and, where appropriate, included in the Town Council's final draft response to the LLP phase 2 consultation.

- 1.7 This report presents three documents for consideration:
- **Appendix A** - the final draft response to the LLP phase 2 consultation questionnaire
 - **Appendix B** - the final draft response to site allocations
 - **Appendix C** – Supporting images to support the SF1 (Chyngton Field) site allocation response
- 1.8 Additionally, and as a separate point within the report for consideration, is the Town Council's response to LDC's Local Green Spaces (LGS) Methodology with a Call for Sites – which is also being consulted on within this Phase 2 LLP consultation.

2. Lewes Local Plan – Town Council's Response to the Phase 2 Questionnaire

- 2.1 Appendix A presents the final draft of the Town Council's response to the LLP phase 2 consultation questionnaire.
- 2.2 For reference, the full draft LLP Spatial Strategy, and a summary of the LLP Spatial Strategy can be found within the consultation documents here - https://planningpolicyconsult.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LP_SpatialStrategyandSites/consultationHome
- 2.3 The Committee is invited to consider the final draft response, suggesting amendments where appropriate.

3. Lewes Local Plan – Town Council's Response to Phase 2 Site Allocations

- 3.1 Appendix B presents the final draft of the Town Council's response to the four site allocations within Seaford:
- SF1 – Chyngton Field,
 - SF2 – St. John's School,
 - SF3 – Talland Parade, and
 - SF4 – Sutton Place.
- 3.2 Appendix C presents images to support the response to the SF1 site.
- 3.3 For reference, the site allocation proposals can be found in the LLP Spatial Strategy or by using the interactive map here - https://planningpolicyconsult.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LP_SpatialStrategyandSites/consultationHome

3.4 The Committee is invited to consider the final draft response to the site allocations, suggesting amendments where appropriate.

4. Lewes Local Plan – Local Green Spaces Policy and Call for Sites

4.1 It has been recommended, within Appendix A of this report, in the response to Question 10, that the Town Council urges LDC to amend the Local Green Spaces Designation Methodology and re-issue the Call for Sites.

4.2 However, recognising that LDC may not accept this response, it is recommended that the Town Council considers LGS in Seaford and what it should submit/support for LGS designation.

4.3 The proposed methodology states that, “In the first instance, sites which fall into the below categories will be considered for LGS designation. These are;

- All open space sites identified in the Open Space Strategy 2020 (or as updated), and/or within the Lewes Green and Blue Infrastructure Study 3 under the following typologies
 - Amenity Greenspaces
 - Natural/Semi Natural Greenspaces
 - Parks and Gardens
 - Outdoor Sports Facilities
- Sites designated as Local Wildlife Sites
- Existing Local Green Spaces designated in Neighbourhood Plans
- Any sites submitted for assessment”.

4.4 Furthermore, the methodology goes on to list 90 identified sites in Seaford.

4.5 Nine of which are designated as LGS within the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, and although these sites have been identified, it is recommended that the Town Council share the evidence collated to inform the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan and submit them as part of this consultation to re-confirm the Town Council’s support.

4.6 Due to the way that the methodology is currently written (which the Town Council is potentially disputing in the questionnaire at Appendix A), 32 of the Seaford identified sites will not make it through the desk top review due to being under the 0.2ha minimum requirement.

- 4.7** The Town Council has also been approached by residents to submit the Seaford Allotments, both golf courses and Seaford Head School sites – which are all currently not acceptable withing the proposed methodology.
- 4.8** Additionally, the Town Council has been approached by residents to submit Chyngton Field as a LGS and submit evidence of support for Blatchington Green (identified in the methodology as ‘North Way Open Space’ as a 0.11ha site).
- 4.9** For reference, the LGS methodology with an interactive LGS assessment site map is here - https://planningpolicyconsult.lewes-eastbourne.gov.uk/LDC_LGS/consultationHome
- 4.10** The Committee is invited to consider the above information relating to LGS, and delegate authority to the Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager to submit sites for LGS designation with evidence and support from the Town Council.

5. Financial Appraisal

- 5.1** There are no direct financial implications of this report.

6. Contact Officer

- 6.1** The contact officer for this report is Isabelle Mouland, Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager.

1) Do you think the proposed spatial strategy will support the aim of creating a “network of low-carbon climate resilient connected settlements”?

1.1. Answer: No

1.2. Summary Position

The Town Council does not consider the proposed spatial strategy to be capable of delivering a network of low carbon, climate resilient, connected settlements. This is because Seaford’s designation as a Tier 1 District Centre is based on theoretical access to infrastructure rather than operational capacity, while significant geographical, transport, health, and utilities constraints—many of which are not reasonably capable of mitigation—undermine the strategy’s deliverability and its consistency with the Plan’s stated aims of low-carbon, climate-resilient, connected settlements.

1.3. Settlement Hierarchy: Misalignment with Operational Reality

The designation of Seaford as a Tier 1 District Centre assumes sufficient, reliable access by road and public transport and a broad range of services. In practice, Seaford’s transport network and essential services are at or beyond capacity. The assessment methodology appears to privilege the *existence* of infrastructure over its *functioning* and adequacy. Consequently, the settlement hierarchy overstates Seaford’s ability to operate as a Tier 1 hub and cannot credibly underpin a low-carbon, well-connected spatial pattern.

1.4. Geographical Constraints: Limited Capacity for Strategic Growth

Seaford is tightly constrained between the English Channel and the South Downs National Park. These fixed physical constraints severely limit scope for new transport corridors, road widening, or meaningful infrastructure enhancement. Within this context, growth is likely to increase car dependency and is unlikely to improve resilience and connectivity to the extent envisaged by the strategy.

1.5. Transport: Network Stress and Resilience Risks

All access routes to Seaford experience significant stress:

- (a) A259 (east via Exceat Bridge):** causeway section with daily congestion and queueing, not future-proof. Confirmed as ‘not’ part of the strategic road network, even after the Exceat Bridge widening scheme.

(b) A259 (west via Newhaven): proposed bus lane changes will likely exacerbate delays for general traffic. The dangerous section of road past Bishopstone has been the subject of long-running campaigns by MPs, councillors and councils.

(c) A27 via Alfriston: frequent flooding and constrained geometry unsuitable for modern volumes. Signs erected by the Highways Authority within the last year warn motorists it is a “medieval town: very narrow roads”.

Any incident on the A259 leads to network-wide gridlock in and out of Seaford, with direct implications for emergency response, including HM Coastguard and RNLI. This undermines the policy intention to “shape growth by accessibility” and to reduce reliance on the private car.

1.6. Health and Social Infrastructure: Existing Deficits

- Both GP practices in Seaford are closed to new patients; in addition there is no minor injuries unit.
- Forecast practice population growth (to c. 28,252 by 2032) indicates rising pressure that current provision cannot absorb.
- Ambulance response is already impacted by demand and congestion.
- Access to NHS dentistry for new patients is severely limited.
- Parts of Seaford (Seaford town centre and Seaford North) are among the most deprived areas in the District, and further growth without commensurate infrastructure would exacerbate inequality and access issues.

1.7. Utilities Capacity

The Newhaven Water Treatment Plant is reported to be at capacity. Reliance on statutory duties to provide future infrastructure does not resolve immediate constraints, nor demonstrate deliverability within the Plan period.

1.8. Policy Inconsistencies in Site Allocations

Two proposed allocations are inconsistent with the Policy’s stated aims around accessibility, low-carbon travel, and conservation of landscape character:

(a) SF1 – Chyngton Field

- Adjacent to the SDNP boundary and visually/landscape sensitive.
- Would negatively impact on the SDNP’s ‘Dark Skies’ Reserve given its proximity.

- Access is limited via a residential, part-privately owned, cul de sac; local roads and visitor parking pressures already overwhelm the network on a regular basis.
- Minimal public transport (twice weekly bus); the 2.5 km distance to the train station is not practical for most journeys, particularly given topography.
- Development would neither promote low carbon travel nor conserve rural character.

(b) SF2 – St John’s School

- Remote from main bus routes (nearest stop approx. 1.1 km) and rail services (approx. 1.6 km).
- Access road is substandard, narrow, and unsafe for pedestrians.
- Firle Road largely lacks pavements; formal upgrades would erode the Area of Established Character, conflicting with the objective to conserve landscape and heritage while “providing new infrastructure”.

1.9. Evidence Base: Tourism Data Out of Date

Tourism assumptions rely on 2018/19 data; now 8 years out of date. Post pandemic visitation has increased substantially due to the ‘staycation’ phenomenon, placing additional pressure on the coastal transport network, parking, and the SDNP gateway. Without up-to-date tourism data, the Plan’s claims to support tourism and healthy lifestyles are not robust.

1.10. Conclusion and Requested Modifications

Given fixed geographical constraints, overstretched transport and health infrastructure, utilities capacity issues, and the location-specific failings of allocations SF1 and SF2, the proposed spatial strategy is not deliverable in Seaford and cannot reasonably achieve a network of low carbon, climate resilient, connected settlements.

Requested modifications:

- (a) Revisit the settlement hierarchy** for Seaford to reflect operational capacity and resilience, not merely baseline provision.
- (b) Redirect a greater proportion of growth** to more accessible locations within the Plan area where infrastructure can be viably expanded and where low carbon travel can realistically be enabled.

- (c) **Reassess allocations SF1 and SF2** against the Policy's accessibility and landscape criteria and remove them if they cannot meet those tests.
- (d) **Update and publish the evidence base** for transport capacity, emergency response, health and dental provision, utilities capacity, and tourism (post 2020/21), and ensure the spatial strategy is retested against that current evidence.
- (e) **Include clear phasing and infrastructure dependencies**, ensuring no major growth is occupied ahead of demonstrable, funded delivery of critical infrastructure (transport, health, and utilities).

2) Does the strategic policy on Achieving Sustainable Development provide a good framework to ensure that new development is well-connected by sustainable transport?

2.1. Answer: Somewhat Agree

2.2. Summary Position

The Town Council agrees that the Policy provides an appropriate framework for supporting sustainable transport in principle. However, its effectiveness in Seaford is severely constrained by the town's geography, limited infrastructure capacity, and the location of proposed site allocations.

2.3. Seaford's Tier 1 designation is not realistic in practice

The Policy states that growth will be focused in Tier 1 and Tier 2 settlements "where public transport and active travel can provide realistic alternatives to the car." The Town Council disputes Seaford's Tier 1 status. Although Seaford appears to meet the definition of a District Centre, the actual performance of its transport network, public transport provision, and supporting infrastructure is inadequate.

Seaford's geographical constraints—being "tightly sandwiched" between the English Channel and the South Downs National Park—severely limit opportunities for transport improvements. This makes the Policy's expectation of delivering realistic non-car alternatives highly unlikely to be achieved in this location.

2.4. Infrastructure limitations undermine sustainable transport objectives

Seaford's transport network is already over capacity:

- All access roads experience regular congestion.

- Public transport options are limited and unreliable for many parts of the town.
- Topography and distances to the station further discourage walking and cycling, particularly from outlying areas.

These constraints mean Seaford cannot meet the Policy's expectation that growth should be well-connected by sustainable transport.

2.5. Proposed site allocations conflict with the Policy's aims

(a) Site SF1 – Chyngton Field

- Very limited access via a residential, part-privately owned, cul de sac, and existing congestion already overwhelms the area.
- Only one bus service twice weekly and no planned improvements.
- 2.5 km from the train station and town centre, making active travel impractical for daily trips.
- Located in the countryside, directly adjoining the SDNP, where the Policy requires protection from inappropriate development.

SF1 cannot deliver realistic alternatives to private car use and conflicts with the Policy's landscape and ecological protection requirements.

(b) Site SF2 – St John's School

- Significant distance from bus routes (approx. 1.1 km) and rail services (approx. 1.6 km).
- Access road is substandard, narrow, and unsafe for pedestrians.
- Firle Road lacks pavements for most of its length; the grass verge is uneven and unusable for mobility-impaired users or pushchairs.
- Upgrading the road to provide safe pedestrian routes would fundamentally alter the Area of Established Character.

As a result, SF2 cannot provide safe or realistic sustainable travel options and undermines the Policy's objectives.

2.6. Conclusion

While the strategic framework for sustainable transport is sound in principle, Seaford's location-specific constraints, existing overcapacity, and the characteristics of sites SF1 and SF2 mean the Policy is unlikely to deliver well connected, low car development in the town. Sustainable transport objectives would be better achieved by directing growth to settlements where infrastructure can realistically support modal shift away from the private car.

3) Do you agree with the approach to phase the occupation of development in accordance with the delivery of critical infrastructure related to transport, utilities, education and health?

3.1. Answer: Strongly Disagree

3.2. Summary Position

The Town Council strongly disagrees with the proposed approach to phase the occupation of development in line with the future delivery of critical infrastructure. If essential transport, utilities, education, recreation, and health infrastructure cannot be delivered before development begins, then the site is not an appropriate location for growth.

3.3. Phased occupation is not an adequate safeguard

Phasing occupation does not resolve the fundamental issue: Seaford lacks the physical capacity, available land, and locational flexibility to accommodate the required upgrades to its critical infrastructure. Securing funding or promises of future delivery does not guarantee deliverability, particularly where expansion is geographically constrained or operationally unfeasible. In such cases, sites should be ruled out at the plan-making stage, not permitted on the assumption of uncertain future infrastructure.

3.4. Seaford already faces severe deficits that cannot be remedied through phasing

Seaford's critical infrastructure—including roads, public transport, health services, and utilities—is already at or beyond capacity. The town also has a significant deficit of recreation space relative to its population, and there is very limited opportunities to create new provision due to land constraints. Given these entrenched limitations, phasing does not provide a realistic route to delivering the infrastructure needed to support further development.

3.5. Evidence shows that funding alone does not secure deliverability

In 2020, Lewes District Council received a commuted sum of £350,000 from Bellway to replace public sports facilities lost through the former Newlands School development. Despite sustained efforts by the Town Council and the District Council over 5 years, not a single suitable site has been found to deliver the required replacement. This demonstrates that even when funding

is available, physical and locational constraints in Seaford prevent delivery of essential community infrastructure.

This precedent shows that linking occupation to future infrastructure delivery is not a credible or effective mechanism in Seaford, and may result in stalled or unoccupied development.

3.6. Conclusion

The approach to phased occupation does not adequately safeguard Seaford's community, given the town's structural and geographic limitations. If critical infrastructure cannot be delivered in advance, (and in Seaford it often cannot), sites should not be allocated for development. Phasing merely postpones the problem rather than ensuring sustainable, infrastructure-led growth.

4) Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Newhaven

4.1. Answer: No

5) Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Seaford?

5.1. Answer: No

6) Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Peacehaven?

6.1. Answer: No

7) Do you have any comments on the specific small sites identified in Ringmer?

7.1. Answer: No

8) Do you support the designation of these Strategic Green Gaps?

8.1. Answer: Not Sure (to all, as none in Seaford)

9) Are there any other areas you believe should be designated as a Strategic Green Gap that are not currently included?

9.1. Answer: No

10) Do you support the Local Green Spaces policy?

10.1. Answer: No

10.2. Summary Position

The Town Council strongly supports the principle of protecting Local Green Spaces (LGS), but has significant concerns about the LGS Designation Methodology proposed by Lewes District Council (LDC). As drafted, it is inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), unduly restrictive, and risks leaving valued green spaces vulnerable to development.

10.3. Conflict with the NPPF

The NPPF requires that LGS must be:

- close to the community they serve;
- demonstrably special for their beauty, historic significance, recreational value, tranquillity, or wildlife; and
- not an extensive tract of land.

The NPPF does not:

- exclude allotments, golf courses, or educational sites;
- specify a minimum site size.

LDC's methodology imposes additional restrictions that go beyond national policy, narrowing the range of spaces that communities can protect.

10.4. Unjustified exclusions leave important spaces unprotected

LDC's refusal to consider:

- allotments,
- golf courses, and
- educational sites

disregards their demonstrable community and environmental value.

In Seaford:

- Educational sites (e.g., Seaford Head School) are used extensively by community groups during weekday evenings and weekends.

- Golf courses provide significant public access via Rights of Way and Permissive Paths and include important landscape and wildlife areas. Excluding such sites contradicts both the NPPF's intent and local community needs.

10.5. The minimum size threshold (0.2 ha) is unjustified and harmful

LDC's minimum threshold of 0.2 ha:

- has no basis in the NPPF;
- would exclude many smaller green spaces that are locally valued;
- is roughly the size required for a 10 dwelling development, increasing development vulnerability;
- is particularly inappropriate in Seaford, which already has an evidenced green-space deficit.

All sizes of green space can be "demonstrably special". Imposing a minimum size restricts communities' ability to protect the places most important to them.

10.6. Lack of clarity around assessment and decision making

The methodology does not explain:

- who will assess LGS nominations,
- how assessments will be carried out,
- how decisions will be reported, or
- how communities can challenge or seek reconsideration of rejections.

This lack of transparency undermines confidence in the process and risks inconsistent or opaque outcomes.

10.6. Inadequate communication regarding consultation status

The methodology document does not clearly communicate that it is itself out for consultation. As written, it appears to state definitively that sub-0.2 ha sites and sites such as allotments, educational land, and golf courses will not be accepted, which could deter communities from submitting legitimate and national policy compliant proposals.

10.7. Conclusion and request

The Town Council cannot support the Local Green Spaces Policy while the accompanying methodology contradicts national policy and imposes arbitrary restrictions not supported by evidence.

The Town Council urges LDC to:

- (a) Amend the methodology so that it aligns fully with the NPPF.

- (b) Remove unjustified exclusions (allotments, golf courses, educational sites).
- (c) Remove the minimum size threshold.
- (d) Provide a clear, transparent assessment and feedback process.
- (e) Re-issue the Call for Sites and Evidence once the methodology has been corrected.

11) Do you have any comments on any Spatial Strategy Policies from the Phase 1 consultation?

11.1. Answer: Yes

The Town Council wishes to comment on several Spatial Strategy policies from the Phase 1 consultation, specifically in relation to the Settlement Hierarchy, Policy H1, and Policy HW2.

11.2. Seaford's Classification as a District Centre is Unsound

LDC's response to the Town Council's earlier consultation comments does not address the fundamental issue: Seaford is physically unable to accommodate the level of infrastructure required of a District Centre.

While LDC notes that GP capacity issues are "a common issue nationally," this does not reflect Seaford's *unique and permanent geographical constraints*. Unlike other settlements, Seaford cannot expand health, education, transport, or social infrastructure due to being, as LDC itself states, "*tightly sandwiched between the English Channel and the South Downs National Park.*"

Other settlements in the district can expand outwards; Seaford cannot. This is supported by LDC's rejection of a Strategic Green Gap between Seaford, Newhaven and Bishopstone (Appendix 03 of the consultation documents), within which it is stated that "*It is considered that the designation of the SDNP provides sufficient protection against the coalescence of these towns and therefore it is not necessary to designate a strategic green gap in this location*" and furthermore that "*the area to the east of the SDNP boundary and west of Seaford is defined as Flood Zone 3b and therefore development in this area would be contrary to National Policy*", further complicating and preventing geographical and outwards growth of the town. Therefore,

classifying Seaford as a District Centre results in unrealistic assumptions about its ability to lead infrastructure supported growth.

If retained as a District Centre, Seaford will not be able to deliver many of the Local Plan's strategic policy ambitions for sustainable development and infrastructure-led growth.

11.3. Policy H1 – The Minimum Density Requirement is Not Appropriate

The Town Council continues to oppose the wording of Policy H1 section 4a, which states:

“Within District Centres ... a minimum density of 50 dwellings per hectare is required.”

The word “required” must be removed.

Evidence from the sites put forward in Seaford demonstrates that:

- 50 dwellings per hectare is not achievable on the town's available sites; and
- such densities would be inconsistent with Seaford's established character, topography, and settlement pattern.

A rigid minimum density requirement is therefore neither achievable nor appropriate and should be replaced with “expected unless site specific constraints indicate otherwise.”

11.4. Policy HW2 – Exclusion of Seaford from Dark Skies Protections

The Town Council is very concerned that Seaford's designation as a District Centre excludes it from Policy HW2, which states that development “*outside of District Centres and Service Centres*” must minimise light impacts on the South Downs International Dark Skies Reserve.

Seaford is directly surrounded by the SDNP and is one of the closest urban areas to the Reserve boundary. Excluding Seaford from HW2:

- increases the risk of light pollution affecting the nationally recognised Dark Skies Reserve;
- undermines the environmental protection aims of the Plan; and
- creates inconsistency, given Seaford's more sensitive landscape setting compared with other settlements that are covered.

The Town Council therefore urges that the policy be amended so that all development within the setting of the SDNP, including in Seaford, must comply with the lighting restrictions set out in HW2.

11.5. Summary

The Town Council requests the following changes:

- (a) Reassess Seaford's District Centre designation**, acknowledging its immovable physical and infrastructural constraints.
- (b) Amend Policy H1** to remove the inflexible density requirement and replace it with context responsive wording.
- (c) Amend Policy HW2** so that Seaford is included within Dark Skies protections given its proximity to—and landscape relationship with—the SDNP.

These changes are necessary to ensure that the Local Plan's Spatial Strategy is deliverable, evidence based, and aligned with Seaford's real-world constraints..

12) Taking everything into account, do you generally agree or disagree with the proposals in the consultation document?

12.1. Answer: Strongly Disagree

SF1 – Chyngton Field

Response: Seaford Town Council strongly objects to the allocation of Site SF1 (Chyngton Field) and requests its complete removal from the Lewes Local Plan on the grounds that the allocation is demonstrably unsound, undeliverable, and in direct conflict with national policy, the South Downs National Park Local Plan, the emerging Lewes District Plan, and the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan.

Evidence:

1. Fundamental and Irreversible Landscape Harm

SF1 sits immediately adjacent to the South Downs National Park (SDNP) and forms an essential open buffer between Seaford's built development and the nationally protected landscape. Development here would:

- destroy the gateway to one of the most internationally recognised coastal landscapes in England (Seaford Head, Seven Sisters, Beachy Head);
- cause major harm to tranquillity, openness, landscape character, and long distance views;
- erode the setting of the SDNP in a location where its sensitivity is at its highest;
- damage the SDNP's Dark Skies Reserve.

Under NPPF paragraphs 187, 189, 190(c), and 191, great weight must be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, and development must not harm their character, setting, or special qualities. SF1 fails every one of these requirements.

2. Conflict With the South Downs International Dark Skies Reserve

The site lies within the Transition Zone of the SDNP's International Dark Skies Reserve, where reducing light pollution is essential in order to safeguard the potential for these areas to revert to "dark zones." Introducing housing here would:

- increase upward light spill and skyglow;
- undermine tranquillity and dark sky quality;

- conflict directly with SDNP Policy SD8 (Dark Skies).

This area is one of the few coastal-accessible dark skies viewing areas in the south-east. The Local Plan incorrectly asserts that Seaford is “not in a dark skies area”—this is factually incorrect and must be rectified.

3. A Critical Visitor Hub Whose Function Would Be Permanently Damaged

The area which Chyngton Field is sited is the primary visitor access point to:

- South Hill Barn
- Sussex Heritage Coast / King Charles III England Coast Path
- South Downs Way / Vanguard Way / Avenue Verte
- National Cycle Network
- internationally famous viewpoints used in global media and film

The location now attracts daily coach parties, especially since other local beauty spots (Birling Gap, Seven Sisters Country Park) have banned coach access.

For many people with limited mobility, this is the only accessible entry point into the SDNP.

Development of SF1 would *fatally compromise* this unique visitor role—there is no reasonable alternative location for these functions. No landscaping scheme could mitigate the harm.

This directly contradicts LLP Policies SDS1 (tourism support), SDS2 (sustainable access), NE1 (natural environment protection), NE2 (green/blue infrastructure), and IC9 (Public Right of Way protection).

4. Severe Transport, Access, and Safety Constraints (Undeliverable Site)

The site is:

- served only by narrow roads already overwhelmed by visitor parking and turning movements; the site can only be accessed by a residential, part-privately-owned cul de sac;
- 2.5 km from the nearest rail station, and only served by one bus per week, making it impossible to deliver “realistic alternatives to the car”;

- directly accessed from routes that regularly gridlock when visitor numbers peak.

Adding new housing here would intensify congestion, obstruct South Hill Barn access, and jeopardise public safety. The allocation therefore fails:

- LLP SDS2 (6a) – cannot enable low carbon travel-carbon travel
- IC6 – not within a sustainable transport area
- IC9 – adverse impact on public rights of way

It also undermines NPPF objectives to reduce car dependency and promote sustainable access.

5. Direct Conflict with SDNP Local Plan Policies

LDC is reminded of the duty to protect landscapes which requires relevant authorities in England to "seek to further" the conservation and enhancement of National Parks and National Landscapes.

- SF1 clearly breaches multiple policies in the South Downs Local Plan, including:
 - SD4 – Landscape Character
 - SD6 – Safeguarding Views (notably the iconic viewing platform at West Dean, where SF1 lies directly on the skyline)
 - SD7 – Relative Tranquillity
 - SD8 – Dark Skies

This level of conflict with the statutory local plan for the National Park is fatal to the allocation's soundness.

6. Conflict With the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan

The site contravenes:

- SEA1 – Landscape and SDNP Protection, including harm to the Heritage Coast, tranquillity, and dark skies
- Key views and the setting of the Chyngton Lane Conservation Area

A Local Plan cannot simply override a made Neighbourhood Plan without clear, robust justification - which is absent.

7. South Hill Barn: Loss of Setting and Public Value

South Hill Barn is a major public asset owned by Seaford Town Council, with long-term plans for sensitive cultural/community uses aligned with the National Park's statutory purposes.

Housing at SF1 would:

- severely undermine the Barn's setting;
- degrade visitor experience;
- restrict the Town Council's ability to bring the Barn into beneficial public use.

This directly conflicts with NPPF Chapter 15, requiring the enhancement of valued landscapes and cultural assets.

8. The Allocation Fails All Four Tests of Soundness

Not Justified:

The Plan provides no evidence that SF1 is the *least harmful* or *most appropriate* site. Many less sensitive, more accessible locations exist elsewhere in the district.

Not Effective:

Transport, access, landscape, and visitor pressures mean the site cannot be delivered without severe adverse impacts.

Not Consistent With National Policy:

The allocation breaches NPPF paragraphs 187–191 on landscape protection, 199–202 on heritage, and all SDNP statutory duties.

Not Deliverable:

Infrastructure constraints, dark skies conflict, and landscape harm render the site fundamentally undeliverable.

9. Conclusion – Request for Removal

SF1 (Chyngton Field) is an inappropriate, harmful, and unsound allocation.

Its development would cause permanent and irreversible damage to one of the

country's most iconic landscapes, undermine the statutory purposes of the SDNP, destroy an internationally important visitor hub, and conflict with multiple national, district, and neighbourhood planning policies.

The Town Council therefore formally requests that site SF1 be removed entirely from the Lewes Local Plan.

SF2 – St John's School

Response: Seaford Town Council recognises the potential for redevelopment of part of the St John's School site. However, the current proposal for 40 dwellings is excessive, inconsistent with the Area of Established Character (AEC), harmful to local infrastructure, and unsupported by transport, design, or environmental evidence. The Town Council therefore strongly objects to the SF2 allocation as drafted and requests its amendment to a significantly reduced and policy-compliant scale.

1. The Allocation Fails Multiple Tests of Soundness

Not Justified:

The proposed density does not reflect the AEC, the established pattern of development, or the physical capacity of the site. No evidence is provided by LDC to justify housing at over three times the density of surrounding development.

Not Effective:

The site cannot be safely or sustainably accessed at the proposed scale, nor is there evidence the infrastructure burden (transport, drainage, healthcare) can be accommodated.

Not Consistent with National Policy:

The proposal fails to conserve local character, ensure safe access, promote sustainable transport, protect biodiversity, or secure healthy living conditions—all requirements of NPPF Chapters 8, 9, 12, and 15.

2. Density and Area of Established Character (AEC)

2.1 Proposal Conflicts with AEC Principles

- The proposed 40 dwellings produces a net density of 24.24 dwellings per hectare (dph), more than double the adjacent Firle Grange (11.2 dph) and the nearby Bowden Rise development (11.6 dph).
- The AEC designation requires continuity of character, not intensification.
- The Town Council's own evidence shows that only 18–19 homes would fall within the acceptable density envelope for the 1.65 ha developable area.

2.2 Incorrect Density Calculation

LDC's density calculation inaccurately includes the 1.15 ha of recreational space, which is non-developable and intended for wider public use. Only the brownfield portion of the site should be used for density calculations.

3. Community Recreational Use – Insufficient Assurance and Ambiguity

3.1 Recreational Space Must Be Protected via Policy and s106

The 1.15 ha of open space:

- must be excluded from density calculations,
- should be treated as Local Green Space due to long-standing community use, and
- must be secured through a legally binding s106 agreement to ensure ownership, access, and long-term management.

3.2 Seaford's Severe Recreational Deficit

Seaford has an established shortage of playing pitch provision, evidenced by LDC's inability—over 5 years—to find a site for the £350,000 Newlands s106 contribution. This site offers one of the only viable opportunities to provide a full-sized sports pitch.

3.3 Use Must Be Specified

The open space must be designated for field sports, not left vague, to ensure capacity for formal recreation that the surrounding area lacks.

4. Transport, Access and Pedestrian Safety

4.1 Dangerous and Constrained Road Network

- Firle Road lacks pavements for most of its length; pedestrians are forced to walk on verges or in the road.
- The area already suffers congestion due to two nearby primary schools.

4.2 Public Transport Accessibility is Poor

- Nearest bus stop: 1.1 km
- Nearest train station: 1.6 km

This does not meet NPPF requirements for sustainable transport connectivity.

4.3 Increased Traffic Would Exacerbate Safety Risks

40 homes would introduce 40–80 additional vehicles, worsening congestion and pedestrian danger in an area already unsuitable for larger modern vehicles.

4.4 Northern Access Must Be Pedestrian/Cycle Only

Residents strongly oppose vehicular access via the northern route to Bowden Rise due to its proximity to rear gardens and constrained width. The policy should state: “Northern access is restricted to pedestrian and cycle access only.”

5. Light Pollution Mitigation Required

As the site is close to areas of elevated landscape sensitivity, and given Seaford’s proximity to the SDNP Dark Skies Transition Zone, policy wording must require:

- downward-facing luminaires,
- zero upward light spill,
- limits on security lighting, and
- ecological-friendly lighting controls.

6. Existing Buildings Are Not Suitable for Reuse

Experience with the Newland’s School redevelopment demonstrates that retaining large institutional buildings:

- is not viable for developers,
- increases costs, reducing affordability, and

- leads to poor-quality flat conversions rather than needed family homes.

Therefore, policy must state that new-build family homes are required, not conversions.

7. Biodiversity and Protected Species

The site contains:

- trees contributing to local character and biodiversity, which “must be retained”, not merely “should be retained”; and
- an established badger sett requiring strict protection and mitigation.

The allocation as written does not contain sufficient biodiversity safeguards to satisfy NPPF para 179.

8. Infrastructure Capacity – Seaford Cannot Absorb Further Pressure

8.1 Healthcare

- Only two GP practices, both closed to new patients.
- No minor injuries unit.
- Residents already travel long distances for routine and emergency care, often to the Conquest Hospital in Hastings (50-mile round trip).
- Ambulance services are severely overstretched due to systemwide strain.

8.2 Drainage

The area suffers from regular drainage blockages and flooding, often addressed by residents due to inadequate response capacity.

8.3 Utilities

The sewage network and treatment facilities are already at or beyond capacity.

The Local Plan does not show deliverable, funded infrastructure capacity to support the development.

9. Conclusion and Requested Changes

The Town Council requests that LDC:

- (a) Reduce the allocation from 40 dwellings to no more than 18–19 dwellings, consistent with the AEC and surrounding densities.
- (b) Exclude the 1.15 ha recreational land from density calculations and formally designate and secure it as community recreational land suitable for field sports.
- (c) Prohibit vehicular use of the northern access.
- (d) Add mandatory wording for pavements, lighting, and safe access.
- (e) Require dark-sky-compatible lighting.
- (f) Require new-build family homes, not reuse of the existing building.
- (g) Strengthen biodiversity protection measures, including mandatory tree retention and mitigation for protected species.
- (h) Provides evidence of infrastructure capacity, particularly healthcare and drainage, before allocating the site.

As written, SF2 is not sound, not justified, not deliverable, and not consistent with national policy. The Town Council therefore strongly objects to the allocation unless it is amended in line with the above recommendations.

SF3 – Talland Parade

Response: Seaford Town Council welcomes this site allocation.

SF4 – Sutton Place

Response: Seaford Town Council welcomes this site allocation.

SF1 – Chyngton Field Response – Supporting Images



Image 1: This image shows the iconic, highly popular landscape and where the site is situated in relation to this (outline in blue).



Image 2: This image displays the open character of the landscape from the site as the gateway to the SDNP.

Report 164/25 Appendix C -
Final Draft Response to Lewes Local Plan Phase 2 – Site Allocation
– Chyngton Field Response – Supporting Images



Image 3: This image highlights the popularity of this tourist area and the traffic issues that brings.



Image 4: This image presents the landscape looking inland, which shows the site area on the left and why it forms part of the cherished countryside landscape and is described as the gateway to the SDNP.

**Report 164/25 Appendix C -
Final Draft Response to Lewes Local Plan Phase 2 – Site Allocation
– Chyngton Field Response – Supporting Images**



Image 5: This image presents the landscape from Seaford Head, which shows the site area to the left down the hill, highlighting that this will change this iconic view point from the SDNP.



Image 6: From the site itself, showing just one of the many night's sky images taken by Dark Skies enthusiasts living in and visiting this iconic area.



Seaford Town Council

Report No:	165/25
Agenda Item No:	5
Committee:	Planning & Highways
Date:	12 February 2026
Title:	East Sussex County Council's Parking Review for Lewes District – Agreement of the Town Council's Submission
By:	Peter Cousin, Head of Place
Purpose of Report:	To agree the requests for changes or additions to parking controls that the Town Council will submit to East Sussex County Council to be fed into their Review of Lewes District on-street parking

Actions

The Committee is advised:

1. To consider the comments and suggestions that have been submitted by residents, visitors, and councillors, and use these to inform the Town Council's submission.
2. To move to a vote on the motions below.

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended:

1. To note the contents of the report and appendices
2. To agree the Town Council's submission to East Sussex County Council to be fed into the upcoming Review of Lewes District on-street parking..

1. Introduction

- 1.1 From 1 March 2026, East Sussex County Council (ESCC) will begin its review of on-street parking within the Lewes District. Ahead of this date, the

Town Council is asked to consider any requests for changes or additions to parking controls within the town that it would wish to submit.

- 1.2 To ensure that any submissions by the Town Council are representing the town, a survey was run by the Town Council for a month between December 2025 and January 2026, gathering suggestions and comments from residents and visitors.
- 1.3 This report is presenting the proposed submissions for consideration and agreement by this Committee.

2. Information

- 2.1 ESCC continually reviews its on-street parking schemes to ensure they meet the changing needs of local communities. The reviews are carried out every 14 to 16 months and are done individually for each district/borough, with Seaford being included within the Lewes District review. The review process must follow a formal and legal process, including two rounds of consultation and usually taking around 14 to 16 months to complete.
- 2.2 ESCC invites requests for new or changed parking controls at any stage, with those received being fed into the next available review. The deadline for requests to be included in the 2026 review is 28 February 2026.

3. Survey Outcome

- 3.1 The Town Council requested feedback from Seaford residents and visitors on parking in the town and received 222 responses; 211 from Seaford residents (12 of whom were also Seaford business owners) and 11 from visitors to Seaford.
- 3.2 The responses received can broadly be categorised as follows:
 - (a) Seafront
 - (b) Town centre
 - (c) Schools
 - (d) Other individual roads
 - (e) General comments
- 3.3 Officers have analysed the responses, and an informal session was held with councillors to discuss these on 5 February 2026, helping to inform this report.
- 3.4 What was quickly apparent was that many responses contradicted others i.e. both supporting and opposing the introduction of paid parking, changes

to parking on Broad Street, changes to the free parking time limit, and so on.

- 3.5** There was, however, clearer consensus in some areas, such as:
- (a) the need for restrictions on campervans parking on the seafront,
 - (b) greater parking restrictions needed on Steyne Road near to Seaford Head School, and
 - (c) requests for specific streets, quite often for double yellow lines around junctions or on bus routes to ensure safe passageway.
- 3.6** It should be highlighted that this review is for on-street parking only and does not include public car parks within Seaford that are managed by the Town Council (e.g. South Hill Barn, Esplanade, and High and Over) or Lewes District Council (e.g. Richmond Road, Sutton Croft Lane, Sutton Road, Saxon Lane, and West Street). It also does not include the gravel strip on the seafront near the Martello, as this is private land owned by the Town Council.
- 3.7** Attached at **Appendix A** is the proposed submission to ESCC. This incorporates:
- (a) the suggestions from the councillor session held on 5 February,
 - (b) other one-off resident's requests that have not been discussed, and upon which the Town Council does not hold a position, but are being passed to ESCC for consideration,
 - (c) a number of general comments, and
 - (d) a request for ESCC to look at how to mitigate the impact of the recently approved trial of pay & display at South Hill Barn Car Park which is anticipated to potentially lead to displaced car parking along Chyngton Way and surrounding residential roads.
- 3.8** For completeness, a copy of the extracted survey responses is included at **Appendix B**.
- 3.9** The proposal is that officers will submit Appendix A – as amended by this Committee – to ESCC to be considered during the upcoming Lewes District Parking Review.

4. Next Steps

- 4.1** From 1 March 2026, ESCC will prioritise the requests received, scoring these against a number of factors, including:

- (a) safety
- (b) access
- (c) congestion and traffic flow
- (d) crash history
- (e) the class of road
- (f) local conditions such as nearby shops, schools, or hospitals
- (g) demand from local residents and businesses
- (h) the nature of the issue and when it occurs

4.2 ESCC anticipate having this stage completed by May 2026.

4.3 Following this are two stages of public consultation – initially an informal consultation, including detailed maps of the proposed controls, followed by a formal consultation with proposed Traffic Regulation Orders available for comment. This Committee will be given the opportunity to comment on both stages of the consultation.

4.4 Where any objections are submitted to ESCC about the proposals, ESCC's Planning Committee will meet to consider these before the Traffic Regulation Order is finalised.

4.5 The above review process should be completed, and any on-street lining works carried out, by summer 2027.

5. Ongoing Process

5.1 Recognising that ESCC will be undertaking further reviews of on-street parking at regular 14 to 16 month intervals, the Town Council will update its website to signpost residents and visitors to ESCC's website where they can submit any requests for consideration in the next parking review.

5.2 In addition, and being aware that many of the resident and visitor responses to the survey related more to enforcement than parking restrictions themselves, officers will review guidance or signposting that can be shared with residents and visitors to help report any enforcement issues (or lack thereof).

6. Financial Appraisal

6.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

7. Contact Officer

7.1 The Contact Officer for this report is Peter Cousin, Head of Place.

Seaford Town Council – Requests to East Sussex County Council for the Lewes District On-Street Parking Review

No.	Site	Road/s	Request	Reasoning	Supporting Image
1	Seafront	Esplanade – top of Cliff Gardens and east to Splash Point	Double yellow lines from the southern end of Cliff Gardens east to Splash Point, on both sides of the road, including the turning circle but excluding the designated parking bays on the seaside and the disabled bays in the turning circle	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow proper use of the turning circle • To allow safe access for emergency services (fire and ambulance, larger vehicles) to splash point and the rear of the houses at Cliff Close 	

2	Seafront	Martello Road	Extension of the current double yellow lines on the eastern side from the junction with the Esplanade to the unmade stretch of road	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• To avoid unpassable roads during peak months when the seafront is overwhelmed with visitors by vehicles• To protect the entry into and out of Martello Mews• To maintain parking on the western side where there is exit onto a pavement	
---	----------	---------------	---	--	---

3	Seafront	Cricketfield Road – section between Martello Fields	Double yellow lines to be put on both sides of the road (currently only being on one)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This road is vital for access to the seafront, part of the local bus route and used very heavily in the peak months • Parking on one side of this road causes congestion in the Esplanade, College Road and Cricketfield Road, where there are frequently lots of pedestrians and beach users • There is no pavement on the unmarked side of the road, restricting safe access to and from parked vehicles 		
4	Town Centre	High Street – ‘upper’ / eastern stretch, left from bottom of Broad Street	Parking restriction during daytime hours (8am to 6pm, Monday to Saturday) on its southern side	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow safer passage along a narrow road during peak hours, including larger delivery vehicles for the businesses within the town centre 		

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow easier exit from the business park (blue circle) on to High Street, which is currently restricted by vehicles parked opposite the entrance 	
5	Town Centre	Broad Street (entire length of)	Change current parking restriction from 8am to 8pm, to 8am to 6pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Majority of businesses within the town centre close at 5/5.30pm, so a restriction until 8pm is not needed. Also supports restaurants and convenience shops who are open later and benefit from ease of customer parking 	-

6	Schools	Steyne Road – between Crooked Lane and Ashurst Road	Double yellow lines on school side of Steyne Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ease current pinch point of traffic, causing congestion and erratic driving so near to a school entrance 	
7	Schools	Lexden Road	Double yellow lines on Lexden Road opposite the junction with Upper Belgrave Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This area is frequently used for parking for the nearby school making this well used junction dangerous and causing congestion This is part of a local bus route (buses coming down Upper Belgrave Road and turning left on to Lexden Road) and cars parked opposite the junction can cause 	

				issues for the bus to swing round the corner	
8	Other	North Way & Upper Belgrave Road	Double yellow lines around corner of junction of North Way and Upper Belgrave Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicles frequently park close to the corner in North Way, causing restricted vision for vehicles turning into North Way and subsequent congestion on Upper Belgrave Road which is used as a cut through to avoid main roads and particularly busy around school times 	
9	Other	Alfriston Road	The Town Council understand that this is a complex area given the limited parking, residential homes and new convenience store. The Town Council requests that ESCC assesses the parking arrangements on Alfriston Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are frequently vehicles parked with two wheels on the kerb on Alfriston Road (the stretch including 3 – 71 Alfriston Road) creating pinch points on this busy road (being one of the three main entry roads into the town) 	-

			(from the junction with Hindover Road to Blue Haze Avenue)		
10	Other	Brooklyn Road & Chichester Road	The Town Council acknowledges that these are narrow roads and navigating these can be very challenging – the request is for ESCC to assess the parking arrangements for suitability and any potential improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents have expressed concerns regarding the parking in these roads, exacerbated by vehicles from local car dealerships and users of the train and bus stations 	-
11	Other	Hawth Park Road, Bishopstone – entire length of	Double yellow lines on one side of the entire road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a bus route providing vital access to public transport to this estate – the current road is at times barely passable for the bus, with vehicles parked everywhere, frequently on kerbs and grass verges restricting the path through for any large vehicles 	-

				<p>(including large emergency service vehicles and deliveries)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been incidences of the local bus having to turn around at Hawth Grove because it cannot carry on around Hawth Park Road 	
12	Other	Vale Road	<p>The Town Council acknowledges that Vale Road is a complex road, with a high demand for on street parking for residents, being on a regularly used bus route and often being used locally as the 'rat run' to avoid the A259. The request is for ESCC to assess the parking arrangements for suitability and any potential improvements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents have expressed concerns regarding the parking in this road and the lack of vision at junctions e.g. with Sutton Drove and Lexden Road junctions, and as vehicles enter Vale Road from Alfriston Road and road bends 	-
13	Other	Walmer Road	<p>Double yellow lines on the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To allow greater vision and safer 	-

			junctions of Walmer Road with side roads coming off it: Hythe Crescent, Bodiam Close, Saltwood Road, and Romney Close	passageway on to a main road used as a bus route, to service the local primary school, for the local post office, well used churches / community halls, in a densely populated residential area	
14	Other	Station Road, Bishopstone	Request for a disabled parking bay at the train station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The train station does not have a disabled parking bay • As well as access to the train service, the station also houses a thriving community hub (Friends of Bishopstone Station) that is well used throughout the week by local residents for a variety of purposes 	
15	Other	Chyngton Way and surrounding roads	The Town Council requests that ESCC makes appropriate mitigation along	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a high likelihood risk that the pay & display trial will lead to displaced cars 	-

			Chyngton Way and surrounding roads in recognition of the trial pay and display scheme at South Hill Barn commencing April 2026	looking for elsewhere to park in the nearby residential streets	
--	--	--	--	---	--

General Comments

- Better enforcement is needed in general across the town day and night
- Better enforcement is needed near junctions on double yellow lines, particularly at night when they seem to be routinely ignored.
- More double yellow lines at junctions needed to ensure the safety of road users (vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians)
- More enforcement is needed during peak times, especially along seafront and northern side of the road/pavement during the summer months

Requests from Members of the Public

There were a number of individual requests from members of the public that the Town Council has not been able to consider in detail. The Town Council is therefore forwarding these requests to ESCC for consideration and does not have an adopted position on them:

Seafront

- A dedicated area for coaches and for them to be charged for parking
- Introducing EV charging points
- Increasing the size of parking bays
- Slanting the parking for improved safety
- Improving safety for pedestrians crossing between the promenade and Dane Road by addressing the issue with cars parked right up against the wall (opposite the junction with Dane Road)

Other

- Edinburgh Road and Claremont Road, request for double yellow lines around the junction

- Heathfield Road and Bainbridge Road, request for double yellow lines around the junction and white lines round driveways, due to restricted visibility
- Rye Close, restrictions needed on narrow section from Saltwood Road
- Buckle Drive and Buckle Close, request for double yellows on both sides of the road
- Fitzgerald Avenue and Fitzgerald Park, request for double yellow lines on one side of
- Kingsmead, request for double yellow lines at the ends of the road
- Richmond Road, request for double yellow lines to prevent parking on pavement, causing issues for pedestrians
- Ringmer Road, request for no parking area opposite the car park exit, between Cunningham Road and number 12.
- Vale Close, introduction of parking bays
- Double yellow lines on Southdown Road at junction with Sutton Road for 50 metres
- Blatchington Road, review of need for double yellow lines at junctions with side roads
- Queen Park Gardens, request for double yellow lines on corners.

On-street Parking Review Public Responses

Total Entries	222
Seaford Residents	211
	12
Seaford Visitors	11

residents of which are also Seaford Business Owners

Different comments on specific areas

Seafront	18
Town Centre	18
Specific Roads or Residential Areas	36
Near schools	7

General Comments:

Different general comments made	9
People making general comments	145
Comments made	No.
Against any changes / keep the same / happy with current on-street parking	58
Against any parking charges	55
Wants to see charging introduced with residential permits	9
Against residential permits	10
Want to see an increase in proper enforcement of current restrictions, including those parking on yellow lines	5
Want to see monitoring around junctions	3
Want to see parking on pavements/curbs stopped or monitored	2
Want to see enforcement of safer and more considerate parking around schools	2
Please consider a discount for Seaford residents if payment is going to be implemented.	1

On-street Parking Review Public Responses: SEAFORD SEAFRONT

18 Different comments about Seafront on-street parking

114 Comments made on Seafront on-street parking

No.	Comments/suggestions
19	Against seafront parking charges
18	Want visitors to be charged and for residents to have free permits for the seafront
14	Want campervans/motorhomes to be charged to park on the seafront
12	Thinks there is too much/wants to stop overnight campervan/motorhome parking on seafront
8	Want to charge/restrict parking on seafront
8	Want to tarmac the gravel area and make car-only bays
7	Want special/dedicated campervan/motorhome parking on the seafront
7	Generally unhappy with campervans/motorhomes on the seafront
5	Wants to see charging in summer months
5	Want to ban campervans/motorhomes
3	Want coaches to have a dedicated area on seafront and be charged
2	Want to welcome campervans/motorhomes on the seafront
1	Want to see current campervan/motorhome restrictions on seafront enforced
1	Wants to see EV points on the seafront
1	Wants to increase size of parking bays on the seafront
1	Wants parking bays to be slanted in both directions as currently dangerous to reverse
1	Wants to make seafront on-street residential only and use Martello Fields visitor parking that charities can manage
1	Martello Tower to Dane Road - very dangerous with cars parked against sea wall so children have to exit into road. Need gaps in seafront parking for pedestrian safety. Larger gap to improve visibility for zebra crossing and start parking further west at Dane Road corner.

On-street Parking Review Public Responses: TOWN CENTRE**18 Different comments about Town Centre on-street parking****72 Comments made on Town Centre on-street parking**

No.	Comments/suggestions
13	Think 2hrs free parking in town works well
9	Find parking in town difficult/limited and wants spaces increased
9	Want to keep the town parking the same / no changes made
7	Against charging for town parking
6	Wants residential areas within the town centre to be residential parking only
4	Want Broad Street to have both sides for parking short-term and free
4	Want the parking on yellow lines in town to be stopped/enforced
4	Want to remove all on-street parking in Broad Street/High Street apart from disabled and loading bays
3	Wants to have the town parking time limit reduced
2	Want to increase the town's free parking time limit
2	Want the taxi bays removed from Broad Street
2	Think that High Street is too narrow for parking on both sides
2	Wants Broad Street to be one-sided parking only / parking difficult with it being both sides
2	Wants to see a ban of parking on the right hand side of Broad Street
1	In Broad Street wants single yellow line to be made double yellow
1	Wants to see parking restrictions being enforced on Dane Road by Philip Mann
1	Wants to see restrictions in place around the station to stop commuters parking all day
1	High Street - parking on yellow lines is blocking cars coming out of business car park - needs to be made no parking

On-street Parking Review Public Responses: SPECIFIC ROADS/RESIDENTIAL AREAS

36 Different comments about specific roads/residential areas on-street parking

67 Comments made about specific roads/residential areas on-street parking

No.	Road/Area	Comments/suggestions
5	Alfriston Road	Want double yellow lines near Tesco and to stop parking on the bend and on curbs
5	Brooklyn Road	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
5	Brooklyn, Claremont, Salsbury, Grosvenor & Wilmington Roads	Want to stop car dealers clogging up area with commercial vehicles as residential only
5	Martello Road	Want double yellow lines to stop parking on both sides
4	Walmer Road	Wants the junction of Hythe Crescent and Walmer Rd to have double yellows
3	Hawth Park Road	Want parking only on one side and double yellows on both sides of bend
3	Vale Road	Want to enforce safer parking, stop cars parking in bus stops, and increase double yellow lines
2	Bramber Road	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
2	Edinburgh Road and junction with Claremont Road	Wants double yellow lines on the tight corners at the top of Edinburgh Road, opposite and on junctions and outside driveways to allow safe driving. Cars park on both sides of the road on the corner and you cannot see vehicles driving until you come face to face
2	Fitzgerald Avenue & park	Wants double yellow lines on park side and to enforce no pavement parking
2	Heathfield Road junction with Bainbridge Close	Want double yellow lines to be installed around the bend, opposite Bainbridge Close, and in areas where visibility is compromised. Plus introduction of white access protection lines near driveways close to the bend would help prevent parking in critical sightline areas and improve safety when vehicles are exiting.
2	Rye Close	Wants restrictions on narrow section from Saltwood Road junction to stop pavement parking
2	Steyne Road	Wants parking only on one side
2	Walmer Road	Wants the junction of Saltwood Road and Walmer Road to have double yellows
1	Avondale Road	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
1	Blatchington Road	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
1	Buckle Close	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
1	Buckle Close	Wants double yellow lines both sides from Marine Parade to Buckle Drive & Close
1	Corners of Queens Park Gardens	There needs to be double yellow lines for at least 10 metres on both corners of Queens Park Gardens
1	Corsica Road	Wants double yellow lines at entrance/junction
1	Crickfield Road	Wants double yellow lines on both sides and metal posts/bollards to separate the pavement from parking
1	Crouch Lane	Want residents only parking / resident's permit parking
1	Crouch Lane	Wants to see enforcement of restrictions i.e. no pavement parking and no parking on both sides
1	Kingsmead	Wants yellow lines at both ends
1	Mardons	Wants parking only on one side
1	Maurice Road	Wants double yellow lines at entrance/junction
1	North Way of Blatchington Road	Wants double yellow lines at entrance/junction
1	Richmond Road outside VR Flowers to the roundabout	Wants double yellow lines - there has been numerous complaints about vehicles blocking the pavement pushing pedestrians to use the road. If such recommendations are/is taken it will have solve the issue.
1	Ringmer Road, left side of the road, between Cunningham Court and number 12, opposite the parking exit.	Wants safety to be increased by putting in place a no parking zone of the length of two/three cars in front of the parking exit.
1	Southdown Road	Wants double yellow lines at entrance/junction at top of road joining a259
1	Southfield Road, East side at junction with Sutton Road	Wants double yellow line for 50 metres or so would make a huge difference to allowing the junction to function safely.
1	Station Road, Bishopstone	Wants disabled bays
1	Station Road, Bishopstone	Wants 12h restrictions in place to stop people parking and going on holiday/away
1	Station Road, Bishopstone	Wants resident permit parking near to Bishopstone Station
1	Vale Close	Wants parking bays to be marked out
1	Walmer Road	Wants double yellow lines installed right through from the Churchill House pedestrians entrance by the playground to the carpark entrance on Hillside Avenue Chyngton Methodist Church and including no parking on the grass verge thus protecting the trees recently planted there, also has photographs of the junction issues if required to back up request
1	Walmer Road	Wants traffic wardens. double yellows on the corner of Hythe Crescent (Millberg Road end) this needs to be extended to a safer distance to allow residents to be able to safely pull in and out of the road. Cars park so close to the end of the road. The other entrance down by the park has no double yellows...it would make sense to include them down that end too. Along Walmer Road on the park side of the road would be good if there was double yellows on that side only, allowing residents to still park outside their house on the opposite side where the houses are. We desperately need a zebra crossing along that stretch of the road. During school run times it is very dangerous and difficult to safely cross. I had seen many near misses of children trying to cross the road on their way to school. Cars speed down the road without any consideration

On-street Parking Review Public Responses: Near Schools

7 Different comments about school areas on-street parking

8 Comments made about school areas on-street parking

No.	Road/Area/School	Comments/suggestions
2	Cradle Hill School	Want more restrictions to encourage safer parking such as double yellow lines on corners and to be monitored during school drop off/pick up times
1	Chichester Road/Kedale Road junction	Need double yellow lines to stop dangerous parking near junction at school drop/pick up
1	Lexden Road and Barn Rise	Wants to convert the grass verges on one side of the road to lay-bys
1	Steyne Road between Crooked Lane and Ashurst Road	Wants to make the southern side of the road adjacent to the school field a no parking zone allowing parking to the northern side only.
1	Steyne Road by Seaford Head 6th form college	Wants at least one side to have double yellow lines. Also, parking of business transit vans is causing congestion
1	Steyne Road outside Seaford Head school, between - between Ashurst Road and Cricketfield Rd	Wants a single yellow line to the side by the playing field
1	Steyne Road, south side opposite Seaford Head Lower School entrance	Wants double yellow lines to be in place opposite both the in entrance and exit gates. Then for this to be enforced.



Seaford Town Council

Report No:	160/25
Agenda Item No:	7
Committee:	Planning & Highways
Date:	12 February 2026
Title:	Update Report
By:	Isabelle Mouland, Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager
Purpose of Report:	To notify the Committee of decisions taken by the Planning Authority on planning applications previously considered by this Committee, and any 'for information' updates on Highway matters

Actions
The Committee is advised:
1. To consider the contents of the report. 2. To move to a vote on the motions below.

Recommendations
The Committee is recommended:
1. To note the report, decisions on planning applications, and updates on highway matters.

1. Information

- 1.1 The attached schedule at Appendix A lists the decisions taken by Lewes District Council (LDC) and South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA) since the last Committee meeting on applications previously considered by this Committee.

2. Financial Appraisal

2.1 There are no direct financial implications as a result of this report.

3. Contact Officer

3.1 The contact officer for this report is Isabelle Mouland, Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager

Report 160-25 Appendix A

SCHEDULE OF DECISIONS TAKEN BY THE PLANNING AUTHORITY SINCE THIS COMMITTEE'S LAST MEETING ON 15 JANUARY 2026

Approvals – No Objections from Seaford Town Council

LW/25/0672 – 10 Cornfield Road – Raising of existing side boundary brick wall with wooden fencing to 2m, and erection of 1m sleeper wall to front/side boundaries.

LW/25/0719 – 28 Rookery Way – Replacement of existing rear sun lounge with a single storey rear extension.

Approvals – Objection from Seaford Town Council

None at the time of writing.

Refusals – Objection from Seaford Town Council

LW/25/0651 – 12 Clementine Avenue – Erection of a self-build detached single dwelling.

Refusals – No Objection from Seaford Town Council

None at the time of writing.

Tree Works Applications

TW/25/0101/TPO - 1 Chapel Close – T5 - Beech - Reduce secondary growth by 25% at the front; lift smaller growth on North side to approx. 6m; and reduce branch length by up to 4m (13ft) - to reduce overshadowing and provide better balance for the tree – Approved

TW/25/0114/TPO – 7 Roedean Close – G5 - 8 No. Sycamores - Crown reduction by 2 metres - General maintenance to reduce growth towards highway – Approved

TW/25/0116/TCA – 10 Blatchington Hill – T2 - Italian Plum - Crown reduction and reshape by up to 2.0-2.5 m T3 - Red Horse Chestnut - Crown reduction and reshape by up to 2.5-3.0 m to growth points - Remove deadwood and stubs in crown – Approved

TW/25/0121/TPO – 19 Normansal Park Avenue – T1- Elm - Removal to ground level and bark stripping of remaining stump due to Dutch Elm Disease – Approved

Withdrawn Applications

None at the time of writing.

Appeals

None at the time of writing.