



Seaford Town Council

Minutes

Planning & Highways Committee Meeting

Thursday 3 September 2026

Held in the Council Chambers, 37 Church Street, Seaford, BN25 1HG at 7.35pm.

Present:

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

Isabelle Mouland, Community Engagement and Democratic Services Manager

There were 2 members of the public in attendance.

P19/09/26 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor R Stirton.

In accordance with Section 85(1) of the Local Government Act 1972, the reasons for absence were approved as follows: Councillor R Stirton (childcare commitments).

P20/09/26 Disclosure of Interests

Councillor S Markwell declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Agenda Item 4, Planning Application TW/26/0056/TPO, Chyngton House, North Hamsey Lane, as a resident of the estate. Councillor S Markwell confirmed that she would not participate in the discussion or vote on this item.

P21/09/26 Public Participation

There was no public participation.

P22/09/26 Planning Applications – For Comment

The planning and/or tree works applications received since the last Committee meeting on 6 August, for the Committee to consider and comment on as a statutory consultee are as follows:

LW/26/0367 – 54 Hawth Park Road – Erection of single-storey front extension, addition of 3no side rooflights, widening of existing vehicular access/driveway, replacement of existing rear slabbed patio with permeable gravel, thermal upgrades to garage/conservatory and alterations to fenestration.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

LW/26/0373 – 10 Claremont Road – Outline planning application for demolition of existing buildings and development of 10 new houses with all matters reserved except access.

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

- Failure to Deliver the Allocated Housing Capacity of the Site

The site is allocated within the adopted Seaford Neighbourhood Plan for the delivery of 20

dwellings, however the application seeks outline permission for only 10 dwellings. No compelling evidence has been provided to demonstrate why the allocated number of dwellings cannot be achieved on this sustainable brownfield site. The Council considers the proposal to be a significant underdevelopment of the site, contrary to the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, Lewes District Core Strategy Policy CP2, and Chapter 11 of the NPPF, which seek the effective and efficient use of land.

- Failure to Meet Local Housing Need and Provide Affordable Housing

The proposal comprises only three and four-bedroom houses and provides no affordable housing. The Council considers that this fails to address identified local need for smaller homes suitable for first-time buyers, younger people and those wishing to downsize, and represents a missed opportunity to contribute towards affordable housing provision. The proposal is therefore contrary to the objectives of the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP2, and the NPPF.

- Flood Risk and Surface Water Drainage Concerns

Given the area's known flooding and drainage issues, insufficient information has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed SuDS strategy would adequately manage surface water runoff without increasing flood risk elsewhere. In the absence of robust evidence, the proposal fails to demonstrate compliance with local and national flood risk policies.

- Inadequate Parking Provision and Highway Impact

Whilst the site is sustainably located, the Council considers it unrealistic to assume that residents of ten three and four-bedroom family homes will rely principally on public transport. The absence of parking provision is likely to result in overspill parking on surrounding roads, increasing pressure on an already constrained area. The Council notes that alternative parking solutions have been delivered elsewhere in Seaford and have not been adequately explored in this proposal. The proposal is therefore contrary to the transport objectives of the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, relevant policies of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2, and Chapter 9 of the NPPF.

- Unjustified Departure from the Site Allocation

The applicant has not demonstrated why the allocated capacity of 20 dwellings cannot be achieved on the site. In the absence of such evidence, the Council considers the proposal to represent an unjustified departure from the adopted site allocation and the Development Plan-led approach to planning.

- Inappropriate Comparison with Other Developments

The Council does not accept comparisons with the consented development opposite

Morrison's as justification for a car-free scheme. Unlike that proposal, this site represents a substantial redevelopment opportunity capable of delivering the allocated number of dwellings, an appropriate housing mix, affordable housing provision and suitable parking arrangements. Overall, the Council considers that the proposal conflicts with the adopted Development Plan as a whole. It significantly under-delivers the housing allocation identified in the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, fails to provide affordable housing, does not adequately address local housing need, raises unresolved drainage concerns and is likely to create parking pressures. The proposal is therefore contrary to the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, Lewes District Core Strategy Policies CP1 and CP2, relevant policies of the Lewes District Local Plan Part 2, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

LW/26/0380 – 5 Kingsway – Single storey rear extension.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

LW/26/0390 – 6 Rough Brow – Demolition of existing shed and erection of double storey side extension.

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

The Town Council considers that the proposed double-storey side extension fails to comply with the design principles contained within Policy GB03 of the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan, which seeks to ensure that extensions remain subordinate and sympathetic to the original dwelling and the character of the surrounding area. The proposal does not demonstrate the subservient form expected of a two-storey side extension.

In particular:

- The extension is not set back from the principal frontage of the dwelling.
- The extension does not sit at least 1 metre below the main ridge line of the host property.
- The extension is not a minimum of 1 metre from the side boundary.

These are established design requirements within the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan guidance for two-storey side extensions and are intended to ensure that such additions remain visually subordinate to the original dwelling and do not result in a terracing effect or harm the character of the street scene.

LW/26/0350 – Salts Recreation Ground, Marine Parade – Proposed siting of a shipping container for ancillary football club and community.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

LW/26/0363 – 92 Hawth Park Road – Demolition of existing garage and single-storey rear side extension.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

LW/26/0383 – 11 Lullington Close – Demolition of existing conservatory and replacement with single storey side extension, installation of solar panels, external wall insulation/render with replacement fenestration, and associated hard/soft landscaping works.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

Tree Works Applications

TW/26/0056/TPO – Chyngton House, North Hamsey Lane – T1 - Holm Oak - Crown lifting by 2m, Reduction of lowest limb by 3m - To prevent damage to tree T2 - Holm Oak - Crown lifting by 2 m - To prevent damage to tree

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

TW/26/0057/TPO – 2 Willow Drive – T1, T2, T3 - Holm Oak - Reduction of crown by 3-4m - To maintain tree health and prevent possible damage to property

It was **RESOLVED** to **OBJECT** to the application raising the following concerns:

The Town Council considers that insufficient information has been provided to justify the extent of the proposed works. The application seeks a crown reduction of 3-4 metres to three protected Holm Oaks; however, no details have been submitted regarding the current height, spread, condition, structural defects, or any evidence of damage to property that would enable the necessity and proportionality of the works to be properly assessed.

The Town Council acknowledges that routine management and selective thinning of Holm Oaks may be appropriate in certain circumstances. However, a crown reduction of 3-4 metres appears substantial and may amount to a level of intervention that could significantly alter the form and amenity value of the trees. In the absence of supporting arboricultural evidence, it is not possible to determine whether the proposed works represent good arboricultural practice.

Members are also concerned that, following recent periods of drought and environmental stress, such extensive works could have an adverse impact on the health and vitality of the trees if not fully justified and carefully specified.

Accordingly, the Town Council requests that the Local Planning Authority's Arboricultural Officer seek further information from the applicant, including details of the trees' existing dimensions, condition, any evidence of damage or risk, and a clear arboricultural justification for the extent of the proposed crown reduction, before determining the application.

TW/26/0062/TPO – 5 St Marys Close – T1 & T2 - Sycamore - Removal to the ground - To reduce shading and create space for outbuilding

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

The Town Council considers that insufficient information has been provided to enable a proper assessment of the proposed works. The application seeks consent for the removal of two protected

Sycamore trees; however, the submission fails to clearly identify which trees are proposed for removal. The supporting information refers to trees within a group identified as "A, B, C and D", but does not specify which individual trees are intended to be felled. As a result, the extent and impact of the proposal cannot be adequately assessed.

The Town Council further notes that the stated reasons for removal are to reduce shading and create space for an outbuilding. These reasons do not, in themselves, provide sufficient justification for the loss of protected trees. Trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order are afforded protection because of their public amenity value, and proposals for their removal should be supported by clear and compelling arboricultural justification.

No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the trees are dead, diseased, dangerous, causing significant damage, or otherwise warrant removal. In the absence of such evidence, the Town Council considers the proposed felling to be unjustified and contrary to the purpose of the Tree Preservation Order.

The Town Council is therefore concerned that the proposal would result in the unnecessary loss of protected trees and the associated amenity, environmental and landscape benefits they provide. Accordingly, the Town Council requests that the Local Planning Authority's Arboricultural Officer seek further information from the applicant, including the precise identification of the trees proposed for removal and a robust arboricultural justification for the works.

TW/26/0061/TPO – Street Record, Westdown Road – T1 & T2 - Corsica pines - Removal of 2 broken limbs – Safety.

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOT OBJECT** to the application.

P23/09/26 Road Closure Application – Seaford Bonfire

The committee considered report 92/26 on the application to Lewes District Council by Seaford Bonfire Society for temporary road closures for the Seaford Bonfire on Saturday 17 October 2026.

P23.1 It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the contents of the report.

P23.2 It was **AGREED** to submit no comments to Lewes District Council.

P24/09/26 Update Report

The committee considered report 67/26 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 report, decisions on planning applications, and updates on highway matters.

The meeting closed at 8.32pm.

Councillor L Wallraven

Chair of Planning & Highways Committee

DRAFT