

Delegated Officer Recommendation

Case Officer: CJT

Consults Expiry: 30 May 2007

View Consults tab for individual consultation expiry dates

Advert Expiry: 25 May 2007

Expiry Date: 12 July 2007

BVPI Category: Major

WD/2006/3564/MAO

OUTLINE APPLICATION FOR THE ERECTION OF 197 DWELLINGS, INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING, WITH ASSOCIATED ACCESS, STRUCTURAL LANDSCAPING AND RECREATIONAL SPACE (INCLUDING FOUR LAP'S AND ONE LEAP)

LAND AT BIRD IN EYE FARM SOUTH, UCKFIELD

Parish: Framfield

LB ref:

Received Complete: 12 April 2007

Cons Area:

Recommendation - Refusal

Case Officer

Initials

Date

Team Leader/Senior

Initials

Date

Authority to Delegate Required?

YES	NO
-----	----

Date

Fields filled in on Custom screen on Datawright?

(tick)

Refusals only – HDBC

Initials

Date

Decision notice checked

Initials

Date

1. The proposed development represents an unacceptable and unjustified form of development of a site which lies outside the limits of the defined development boundary for Uckfield and Framfield, contrary to the provisions of Planning Policy Statements 1 and 7; Policies S1, S4, S10 and EN1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011; Policies GD2, EN1 and DC17 of the Adopted Wealden Local Plan 1998 and Policies GD2 and DC15 of the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan.
2. The development proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in existing safety hazards and unacceptable traffic conditions in the immediate area, specifically rural lanes around the village of Framfield and Uckfield Town Centre, an area that is already heavily congested at peak times and the proposal is therefore contrary to

Policy TR3 and Policy S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011, TR3 of the Wealden Local Plan (adopted 1998) and TR2 of the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan (2005).

3. 4. Notwithstanding the provision of an Environmental Statement and taking account of enhancement proposed as part of the application , insufficient information has been submitted to address the impact of the development proposals on landscape management, habitat enhancements, effect of pedestrian and cycle links on habitats, layout of development, space allocation for buffer zones between the built form and retained natural features (including adjacent ancient woodland - Wealden Ancient Woodland Survey 2005) and impact on connectivity with other sites for protected species. Based on the submitted information, the proposed development package is contrary to the provisions of PPS9, Policies S1, EN17, EN18, EN20 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011; Policies EN1, EN5, EN12, EN16 of the Adopted Wealden Local Plan; Policies NE1, NE14, NE15 of the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan.
4. 3.The proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that adequate provision will be made to encourage sustainable modes of transport, contrary to Policies S1(c) and TR3 of the approved East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan and Policies TR1 and TR2 of the Non-Statutory Wealden Local Plan.
5. 5. No mechanism exists to secure affordable housing on site and as a result the proposed development is contrary to policies H4 and S7(d) of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011, HG3 of the Adopted Wealden Local Plan and HG4 of the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan.
6. NOTE: This planning decision relates solely to the following submitted plan(s):

Ref.	Date Stamped.	STN5R
Design Design and Access Statement .		12 April 2007
Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Statement.		12 April 2007.
Statement of Community Involvement.		12 April 2007.
Transport Assessment.		12 April 2007.
Environmental Statement.		12 April 2007.
Stage 1 Road Safety Audit.		12 April 2007.
2007.954.060. Topographical Survey		12 April 2007.
JJG.U2.SK04. illustrative masterplan		12 April 2007.
Ecological Assessment		12 April 2007.
Landscape Assessment		12 April 2007.

RESULT OF CONSULTATIONS

Consultations

1. Highway Authority – It is recommended that consent be **refused** for the following reasons: -

The development proposal would lead to an unacceptable increase in existing safety hazards and unacceptable traffic conditions in Uckfield Town Centre, an area that is already heavily congested at peak times and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy TR3 and Policy S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Structure Plan 1991 – 2011.

The proposal will introduce a traffic hazard on the B2102 (Bird-In-Eye Hill) by reason of the additional slowing, stopping and turning traffic which would be created at the junction of the new access road and Bird-In-Eye Hill and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991 - 2011.

The submitted details do not demonstrate that adequate provision will be made to facilitate two-way traffic flow on the B2102 and the material change in the volume of traffic using Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill would increase the existing hazard by interfering further with the free flow and safety of traffic on the B2102 which is contrary to Policy TR3 of the East Sussex and Brighton & Hove Structure Plan 1991 - 2011.

The submitted details do not adequately demonstrate that adequate provision will be made to encourage sustainable modes of transport between the site and Uckfield Town Centre and the proposal is therefore contrary to Policy TR3 and Policy S1 of the East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Structure Plan 1991 – 2011.

Notes

Town Centre

Recently published Department of Transport 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' recommends that assessment years should consider person trips from all committed developments that would impact significantly on the transport network, especially where they substantially overlap, such as at the same junctions and/or on roads as the proposed development. The traffic analysis included in the Transport Assessment indicates that the development proposal would increase traffic at the signalised junction of Framfield Road/High Street/Bell Lane Junction by approximately 7 percent in both am & pm peak times. However, the traffic analysis does not take account of the traffic impact from committed development in the non-statutory Wealden Local Plan.

The County Council has recently taken action to help relieve traffic congestion in Uckfield Town Centre. The measures included the reallocation of road space (i.e. a two lane approach to traffic signals by removing parking and widening pavements at bus stops to improve access), improving the Framfield Road junction and linking the traffic signals in the town centre to optimise performance. This has allowed the

junctions to operate more effectively, although with little spare capacity.

The Highway Authority has consistently raised concerns throughout the local plan process that traffic generating development in Uckfield should not materially worsen congestion in the town centre. It has also been made clear that in order to accommodate the traffic that will be generated by the housing allocations proposed in the current non-statutory Wealden Local Plan a town centre highway improvement scheme is required to ensure acceptable highway safety and traffic flows. Currently Uckfield Town Centre experiences congestion at Bell Lane/High Street and Framfield Road/High Street junctions particularly in the am and pm peak times, and this has a detrimental impact on road safety highlighted by the fact that there has been 16 injury accidents in the last 3 years in Uckfield Town Centre.

The Transport Assessment submitted in support of this application does not satisfactorily address traffic generation and capacity issues in the Town Centre at peak times, and therefore the proposals are not acceptable to this Authority.

The submitted assessment indicates that the provision of SCOOT would to some extent mitigate the additional traffic generated as a result of the development proposal. However, SCOOT has already been installed by the County Council and the junctions remain at capacity.

The development proposal would have a material impact on the town centre, significantly greater than the 2 percent deemed material in the local plan. To allow such a development to proceed in the absence of an appropriate highway solution would result in unacceptable traffic conditions in the town centre for existing residents and businesses particularly at peak times with unacceptable queuing and delays potentially worsening the safety position. For these reasons I recommend consent be refused.

To help resolve the town centre issue the County Council has commissioned consultants to look at scheme options. Contributions are being sought from the developer's of the allocated sites in Uckfield.

If the applicant is prepared to design and implement a town centre highway improvement scheme to address the concerns raised above funds from the allocated sites would be made available and this would overcome my principle objection raised above.

Some concern is also expressed with regard to the traffic impact on the surrounding highway network. Without a satisfactory town centre solution it is likely that traffic will use the surrounding country lanes to avoid delays encountered from town centre congestion.

New Access Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102) Junction

If the development proposal is granted planning consent I would wish for the simple priority junction with Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102) to be upgraded to a right turn lane with appropriate ghost islands in accordance with the recommendations in Part 6 TD 42/95 of the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).

In addition, I would wish for an extended 30mph speed limit on the B2102 (Bird-In-

Eye Hill) to be implemented as a result of the proposal, with appropriate measures to reinforce a reduced speed limit of 30mph and these measures will need to be implemented as a result of the proposal.

Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102)

Although it is acknowledged that the details submitted in support of this application indicate a commitment to contributing towards or providing a car parking and improvement scheme to improve the free flow of traffic on Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102) no details of the scheme have been submitted in support of this application.

The existing pedestrian/cycle routes along the B2102 (Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill) between the site and Uckfield Town Centre are very poor and in the absence of a Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill scheme the proposal does not satisfactorily demonstrate that it encourages sustainable modes of transport.

In the event of this application being granted planning permission, I would wish for the car parking improvement scheme and pedestrian improvement on Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102) to be implemented as a result of the proposal.

New Estate Road Layout

I would wish new estate roads within the site to be adopted as publicly maintained highway and wish for them to be laid out and constructed in accordance with the national guidance in the 'Manual for Streets' and the County Council's Construction Specification.

It would therefore be necessary for the applicant to enter into a Section 38 Legal Agreement with the County Council as Highway Authority.

The new estate road will need to be subject to the formal 4 stage road safety audit procedure.

In light of the ground contours on the site the applicant's attention is drawn to the recommended maximum gradient of 1:10 (10%) for the new estate roads.

Although it is acknowledged that the Proposed Access Arrangement – Option 1 (Drawing No. 2006.954.032 Rev. B) indicates 2 new bus stops on the new access road serving the site, I do not consider it likely that bus operators will wish to enter the site, especially when considering that the estate road layout indicated on Drawing No. JJG.U2. SK04 is formed of a series of cul-de-sacs and does not include a safe and convenient bus loop.

Pedestrian/Cycle/Emergency Link

Due to the ground contours of the site the applicant's attention is drawn to Paragraph 6.3.27 and Paragraph 6.4.11 of the Manual for Streets which recommends pedestrian/cycle routes should not generally exceed a 1:20 (5%) gradient. Some concern is expressed as the Topographical Survey (Drawing No. 2007.954.060) would indicate that the gradient of the pedestrian/cycle/emergency link will significantly exceed the recommended 1:20 (5%) gradient.

Travel Plan

The applicant's commitment to provide a Residential Travel Plan for the site is welcomed by this Authority. However, for a Travel Plan to be successful it is considered important that good long-term secure and covered cycle parking be provided on the site.

It will also be necessary for good quality bus services with sheltered waiting facilities and raised kerbs suitable for low floor buses to be provided on the B2102 (Bird-In-Eye Hill) and for good quality pedestrian routes to be provided between the site and the bus stops on the B2102.

The Travel Plan will need to be secured by a Section 106 Legal Agreement between the applicant and the County Council as Highway Authority.

Bus Services

The site is presently served by the 318 bus service, which only provides a rural hourly service. To ensure the site is adequately served by public transport it will be necessary to improve the existing bus service and a financial contribution will therefore be sought. Full details of the improvements to the bus service and the extent of the financial contribution will need to be determined through consultation with our Passenger Transport Group.

Car Parking

It will be necessary for a maximum of 2 car parking spaces to be provided per large residential dwelling house characterised as having 3 bedrooms or more, plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors. And 1 space per small residential dwelling house or flat characterised as having 2 bedrooms or less, plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors.

The site is located outside of Zone 4 of the County Council's adopted parking standards, and therefore does not qualify for a 75-100 percent reduction from the maximum standard, and any reduction in car parking will therefore need to be agreed with the Planning Authority in consultation with the County Council as Highway Authority.

In addition, I would wish for 1 long-term secure and covered cycle parking space to be provided for each residential dwelling house, or flat without the use of a garage or shed.

Local Sustainability Accessibility Improvement Contribution (LSAIC)

The development proposal will require a contribution of finance towards the cost of implementing Local Area Transport Strategies (LAT's) to reduce traffic congestion and widen the choice of transport available.

In the event of this outline application being granted permission the financial contribution in relation to the proposed development calculated by reference to the Local Sustainability Accessibility Improvement Contribution (LSAIC) methodology

within the County Council's supplementary planning guidance 'A New Approach to Developer Contributions' would be determined by reference to the reserved matters approvals granted pursuant to the outline planning permission currently sought.

Legal Agreement

In the event of the application being granted planning permission it will be necessary for the Framfield Road/Bird-In-Eye Hill (B2102) car parking and pedestrian improvement scheme, new right turn lane from Bird-In-Eye Hill into the site and 30mph speed reduction and appropriate measures to reinforce the 30mph speed limit on the B2102 (Bird-In-Eye Hill) to be secured by a Section 106/278 Legal Agreement between the applicant and the County Council as Highway Authority.

The off-site highway works will also need to be subject to the formal 4 stage road safety audit procedure.

In addition, the LSAIC contribution, bus service contribution and Travel Plan will need to be secured by Section 106 Legal Agreement between the applicant and the County Council as Highway Authority.

I wish to be reconsulted on this application following the applicant's response to the above comments.

2. Southern Water Services

Foul Sewerage.

- Inadequate local capacity in network.
- Development would increase flows to the public sewerage system increasing flooding risk to existing properties and land.
- Additional off-site sewers or improvement to existing sewers will be required to increase capacity.
- Legal agreement required to achieve this appropriate condition and informative recommended if permission to be granted.

Surface Water Disposal.

- Surface water drainage to a water course.
- Drainage using Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems. (SUDS).
- Arrangements for long term maintenance to ensure system is maintained in perpetuity.
- Good management will avoid flooding from the proposed surface water system which may result in inundation of the foul sewerage system.

3. Conservation and Design Officer - As this is an outline application, the following advice is intended for general guidance. I will provide further comments on any full application.

My principal thoughts are:

Access

- the affect of all this development on the rural character of the road around

the access to the site, affect of additional parking restrictions further down the hill, and pedestrian safety

Layout

- I feel that the Bird in Eye South site could usefully look towards the nearby 'New Town' of Uckfield in terms of layout and building type/design.

At New Town there is a progression of street layout from the distinct grid of the inner core out towards the looser more 'gardened' streets of the early 20th century areas.

Most houses in New Town incorporate small front gardens. Small garden areas or communal garden areas to the fronts of terraces and apartments soften the streetscape and provide additional privacy and security to residents.

- Linear terraces could be laid out so as to form blocks to wrap around inner courtyards. Inner courtyards can be accessed by cars via a main access way, with additional pedestrian access from the street through enclosed arched openings cut at regular intervals through the terraces. Inner courtyards provide a more secure and overlooked area. Such courtyards can act as parking areas, landscaped amenity space, and easy access to and storage of bins and utility housings. The 'block' concept would also allow for terraces to 'turn' corners rather than terminating at corners.
- Courtyard car parking and/or communal garage blocks at points easily accessible to residents can fit into the streetscape in a far more acceptable way than individual garages tacked onto the side or in the front areas of individual housing.
- Focus buildings should be at visually logical locations

Design

- The application details and photographs appear to refer to a menu of elements from a very diverse range of buildings – and intends to use this menu for the design of the new properties. Considerable reference is also being made to the existing character of buildings within the older, northern part of Uckfield – in and around the Conservation Area.
- The nearest and indeed virtually adjacent part of Uckfield is the 'New Town'. This was the area to the south of the river which was mainly developed within a comparatively short period of time from the mid Victorian to the Edwardian periods. The character of New Town to a large extent defines the character of the southern part of Uckfield (i.e. south of the river). The houses in the New Town, whilst for the main part of modest scale, show some fundamental principles of building design.
- Design elements found on houses in New Town could usefully be used as a point of reference.
- Vary ridge heights
- Incorporate chimneys
- 'Articulate' terraces
- Avoid unrelated design elements on individual houses
- Design for contemporary visual character whilst incorporating particular local design elements from older parts of Uckfield – but avoid pastiche

Materials

- The emphasis on the use of local materials is welcomed.
- Whilst the application details rightly suggests a limited palette of materials, much depends on how these materials are to be used and combined. Inappropriate use of even a limited number of different materials can spoil the appearance of houses by making them look 'fussy'.

4. Head of Policy and Environment

The land which is the subject of this application is located outside of the development boundary of Uckfield in both the Adopted Wealden Local Plan 1998 and the Non-Statutory Wealden Local Plan, approved by the Council in December 2005. As such, this proposal would be contrary to the Council's policies.

The Non-Statutory Local Plan identified sites to meet the East Sussex Structure Plan housing requirements for the period up to 2011. The Structure Plan required 880 dwellings per annum to be built in Wealden for the period 2006-11. There was also a small additional shortfall to be met, from the period 1991 to 2006 (total of 512).

However, due to potential difficulties in bringing forward some of the sites identified in the Non-Statutory Local Plan, the Council is currently unable to prove a 5 year land supply in accordance with the requirements of PPS3. This is the case in relation to the need to meet Structure Plan housing requirements. It is, however, anticipated that the South East Plan will be adopted in spring / summer 2008 and from this date the housing requirement for Wealden will be set by this document. The draft South East Plan stipulates an annual housing requirement for Wealden of 400 dwellings per annum (significantly below the Structure Plan figure of 880 dwellings per annum). In this respect, once the South East Plan is adopted (assuming that the final figure in the plan is significantly below the Structure Plan figure of 880 dwellings per annum) then a substantially lower level of housing site supply will be required in order to meet the 5 year requirement.

As the Council is currently unable to prove a 5-year land supply (which is at present based on the requirement to provide sites to meet Structure Plan requirements) then in considering planning applications for housing, regard should be had to the policies in PPS3, including the considerations in paragraph 69. It is also a material consideration that, once the south East Plan is adopted, it may well be the case that the Council can prove 5-year land supply.

You will be aware that this site was included in the First Deposit Draft of the review of the Wealden Local Plan, January 2003. In this respect, detailed consideration of the merits of this site (although you will note that the site proposal also included land to the north of Framfield Road) were considered by the Wealden Local Plan Review Special Review Committee at its meeting on 15th December 2003 (paragraphs 18.2 – 18.69). Following detailed consideration, the Council determined not to include this site in the Revised Draft Plan.

5. East Sussex Health Authority – views awaited.

6. South East Water Ltd – views awaited.

7. Natural England (formerly English Nature) – Recommend Refusal – Ecological Survey of 2003 is not up to date and hence does not comply with Planning Policy Statement (PPS7).

8. Arboriculture, Landscape and Biodiversity Section – Cannot support the current proposals for the following reasons:

- 1) The site is not allocated for development.
- 2) I have not seen any Arboriculture Impact Assessment as required under BS 5837. (2005), however, I have concerns that the proposed works will impact negatively on trees to be retained but which appear to be affected by the proposals.
- 3) The proposals do not appear meet criteria for approval under PPS3 nor under PPS9.
- 4) The layout and design do not meet criteria for approval under current guidance and policy.
- 5) Some of the proposed ecological and landscape mitigation and enhancement are welcome, however, the overall scheme does not maximise opportunities for this and I do not, therefore, consider it meets the criteria for approval.

9. Fire & Rescue Service – need for the provision of suitable and sufficient fire hydrants to be fixed to the water supply.

10. Sussex Wildlife Trust – views awaited.

11. Environment Agency (Sussex Area Office) – have no objections, in principle, to the proposal as submitted provided the following Planning Conditions are imposed on any planning permission granted:

Planning Condition(s)

The Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) accompanying this application states that the risk of flooding to this development can be adequately managed. We therefore have no objection to this development.

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until details of proposed flood risk mitigation works have been submitted and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure that the development is subject to minimum risk of flooding.

NB: This is required to demonstrate that adequate flood routing will be incorporated within the development to accommodate overland flows (sheet run-off) arising from both within the site and externally as a result of extreme rainfall conditions. This is to comply with the recommendation made in the applicants FRA, paragraph 9.24 (page 20). A detailed plan indicating the over surface flood routing and proposed finished floor levels should be submitted as a minimum.

Prior to the commencement of any development, a scheme for the provision and implementation of surface water drainage works shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Authority. The works/scheme shall be constructed and completed in accordance with the plans and timetable approved by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To reduce the risk of flooding by ensuring a satisfactory drainage

system.

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision and implementation of foul drainage works has been approved by and implemented to the reasonable satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority. Any works required to upgrade the infrastructure sufficiently to provide capacity for the new development such as outlined in the Flood Risk Assessment and Drainage Statement dated December 2006 should be undertaken prior to acceptance of the development's foul sewage.

Reason: To prevent pollution of controlled waters.

It is known that there are foul sewer capacity issues in Uckfield and therefore it is recommended that the sewerage undertaker (Southern Water Services) should be consulted regarding the availability of capacity in the foul water sewer.

The Framfield Road Pumping Station appears to be impacting on the Framfield Stream and ecological quality is fairly poor. The main River Uck currently remains unaffected by the poor quality on the Framfield Stream, but any increase in frequency of storm discharges from the proposed development will further impact on the Framfield Stream and risks impacting on the River Uck. We would wish to see improvements at the Pumping Station to ensure no increase in discharges were this development to progress.

No development approved by this permission shall be commenced until a scheme for the provision of surface water drainage works has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage works shall be completed in accordance with the details and timetable agreed.

Reason: To prevent pollution of controlled waters by ensuring the provision of a satisfactory means of surface water disposal.

Prior to being discharged into any watercourse, surface water sewer or soakaway system, all surface water drainage from parking areas and hard standings shall be passed through trapped gullies to BS 5911:1982 with an overall capacity compatible with the site being drained.

Reason: To prevent pollution of the water environment.

We are in agreement with the conclusions of the desk study that there is unlikely to be any significant contamination from the previous site uses, however we would still recommend the following planning condition:

If during development, any visibly contaminated or odorous material not previously identified is found to be present at the site, must be investigated. The Planning Authority must be informed immediately of the nature and degree of contamination present. The developer shall submit a Method Statement which must detail how this unsuspected contamination shall be dealt with.

Reason: To ensure that the development complies with approved details in the interests of protection of Controlled Waters.

No development shall commence until details of site landscaping and ecological enhancements have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These landscaping details shall include:

- 1) appropriate ecological enhancements (including those incorporated into the SuDs scheme, Section 8.8 FRA and Drainage Strategy);**
- 2) compensatory habitat creation and landscape planting;**
- 3) measures specifically to address retention and enhancement of the site's ecological connectivity through ecological corridors and networks;**
- 4) a scheme for human access restrictions to the retained and created habitats (including access control measures, as mentioned in Design and Access Statement section 8.1);**
- 5) a scheme for future habitat/landscape management of the site. Thereafter, the scheme shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans.**

Reason:

This is a large scale development and ecological enhancements should be an intrinsic part of the plans. This is in keeping with PPS1 'Delivering sustainable development', PPS9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation' and the draft South East Plan. Policy NRM4 of the draft South East Plan seeks to avoid a net loss of biodiversity and to actively pursue opportunities to achieve a net gain of biodiversity across the region. PPS9 states how planning decisions should maintain, enhance, restore, and add to biodiversity interests, and recognises that development proposals provide opportunities for including beneficial biodiversity features as part of good design. Furthermore, PPS9 recognises the need to maintain, strengthen and integrate networks of natural habitats within development. Fragmentation and isolation of habitats should be avoided. This is in line with Wealden Local Plan Policies EN14. EN15 and EN16.

No development shall commence until a scheme of lighting, designed to minimise impacts on wildlife, the habitats and particularly watercourses on site, is submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. Thereafter the scheme shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason: To prevent the detrimental effects of development scheme lighting on habitats and associated wildlife. Lighting will need to be designed to minimise light spillage into the areas of ancient woodland and towards the watercourses.

No development shall commence until a Construction Environmental Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority. This CEMP shall include:

- Method statements detailing how environmental impacts will be prevented during construction (e.g. erection of temporary fences around retained habitats);**
- Full details of construction site drainage and treatment and attenuation of runoff, designed to prevent pollution/sedimentation of any watercourse or wetland area during construction.**

Thereafter the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.

Reason:

The production and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan is essential in ensuring that all potential environmental impacts of construction will be prevented or minimised. The presence of ancient woodland and associated watercourses and wetland areas is a particular concern at this site, and these Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitats must be protected during the works. This is also in line with the Wealden Local Plan Policies EN14 and EN16.

NB: according to the Comprehensive Ecological Assessment, no BAP habitats are present on site, but wet woodland is present and this is a UK priority BAP habitat.

No development shall commence until the results of an up-to-date ecological surveys including protected species survey of the site, along with any necessary resulting mitigation measures, are submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Authority.

Reason:

To prevent damage to protected species, a material planning consideration. Without up-to-date surveys it is impossible to ensure that no such harm is done. The currently submitted ecological survey information was collected between 2000 and 2005, and thus may not represent the current ecological issues on the site.

Planning Advice

All drainage systems must be adopted or demonstrate their maintenance will be formally established in perpetuity of the development. This is particularly important with attenuation systems, which may not meet the criteria for adoption by the sewerage/water undertaker.

Information on Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) can be found in annex F of PPS 25 , the PPS25 Practice Guide, the CIRIA C522 document 'Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems-design manual for England and Wales' and the 'Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems'. The Interim Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SuDS. The Interim Code of Practice is available electronically on both the Environment Agency's web site at: www.environment-agency.gov.uk and CIRIA's web site at: www.ciria.org.uk.

The site incorporates/is bounded by the Framfield Stream, a main river under the jurisdiction of the Environment Agency. Any works whatsoever in, over, or under the channel of this watercourse on its banks within 8 metres from the top of the channel, would require the prior consent of the Agency under Section 109 of the Water Resources Act 1991 and/or Byelaws.

Although the Agency has a right to enter onto the land to carry out maintenance and repairs, it is not under any obligation to do such work. In the absence of any express agreement to the contrary, maintenance or repair of the river bank and any structure affecting the channel is the responsibility of the riparian owners.

Any other watercourse(s) within or adjoining the site would be classified as an "ordinary watercourse" and is not maintained by the Agency. In the absence of any

express agreement to the contrary, maintenance or repair of the watercourse banks and any structures affecting the channels is the responsibility of the riparian owners.

The retention or reinstatement of watercourse corridors is considered an essential element of sustainable development as it provides for safe floodwater conveyance and storage, continuity of the watercourse habitat, scope for natural processes of erosion and depositing, recreational opportunities and access for future watercourse maintenance or improvement.

Ecological enhancements may include enhancing existing wet interests and also creation of new wetland features. Particularly, provision of ecological enhancements through use of Sustainable Drainage Systems would be encouraged. Such drainage methods may include surface water fed features such as swales (wide grassed ditches), wet balancing ponds incorporating reed beds, and wetland areas which will help to store and clean surface water. These techniques can also be designed as beneficial wildlife, amenity and landscape features as part of an open space or a landscaping scheme for a development.

We would encourage the creation of wetland areas for the benefit of biodiversity, as part of a wider mosaic of habitat creation for compensation and biodiversity enhancement at this site. Enhancements to existing watercourses should also be considered, along with control of invasive species.

We do not feel that the current mitigation and enhancement measures fulfil the requirements for delivering a net gain in biodiversity in respect of wetland habitats. Through the use of sustainable drainage systems it is possible to deliver wetland enhancements alongside drainage systems, in a sustainable manner. Surface water should be controlled and treated prior to discharge to the Framfield Stream through SUDS and open channels, rather than a fully piped system. The submitted information describes how an underground drain shall lead from the northernmost balancing pond to the Framfield Stream. The use of an open channel should be investigated. Furthermore, discharge could be treated through, for example, discharge to a reed bed which would provide water quality improvements as well as a better controlled discharge and wetland enhancements, or through a linear series of ponds with successive improvements in water quality prior to discharge to the stream. The detention basins could also be better designed to enhance wildlife, through incorporation of more permanent ponds and wetland areas, in addition to the dry attenuation basins currently proposed.

The Framfield Stream and associated floodplain habitats in this area do not appear to be reaching their full potential. Enhancements to or management of the watercourse and its associated habitats would be regarded favourably, though these should be undertaken in consultation with, and with the appropriate consents from, the Environment Agency. This development would provide an excellent opportunity to seek large enhancements to the habitats within and adjacent to the site, and we would be pleased to work with the developer to devise an appropriate plan. We would suggest that the Council should formulate a Section 106 agreement to ensure the future retention and management of these enhancement works.

We promote the efficient use of water in all development. The Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) provides a framework for house building practice including standards for water.

In the south-east, with growing pressure from planned development, population growth, risks of more frequent dry summers and a valuable environment to protect we recommend that a minimum of level 3 of the CSH is achieved for water consumption.

This level equates to 105 litres per person per day, which is readily achievable at minimal cost by using fittings such as, 6/4 litre dual flush WCs, low flow taps and showers and efficient washing machines, which are all currently available.

12. Economic Development Officer – views awaited.

13. Police (Crime Prevention) – Pleased to note that crime prevention is discussed in the design and access statement. Wish to discuss details of development with applicants if outline permission is granted.

14. Housing Department - As per Policy HG4 of the Non-Statutory Plan the Council should be seeking 30% affordable housing on this site equating 59 units. The design of the housing should be such that the quality and appearance of the homes are not distinguishable by their tenure type.

I have detailed below the preferred mix for affordable housing based on a 197 unit scheme that would see 49 affordable homes to rent and 10 for purchase on a shared ownership basis. This mix will help to meet local housing need:

2 x 2 bedroom wheelchair units to rent

10 x 2 bedroom flats for rent

11 x 2 bedroom houses for rent

21 x 3 bedroom houses for rent

5 x 4 bedroom houses to rent

4 x 2 bedroom flats for shared ownership

6 x 2 bedroom houses for shared ownership

Policy HG4 (5) requires the affordable housing is to be well integrated with the market housing and distributed in small groups of no more than 10 dwellings throughout the development.

I have the following comments concerning the current design of the scheme:

- Lifts that accommodate wheelchair users should service all floors in each block of flats
- The flats require good quality useable outdoor space
- LEAP close to boundary of Farm is not well overlooked
- How does the applicant see LAP working in the south of the site (as it appears to have a road circling it)?
- What is the applicant's vision for the Square?

- There are unattractive areas of parking, some with little overlooking. This could make areas unusable. How will they be managed and maintained?
- Policy HG7 requires the applicant to provide 20% smaller market units; this is in addition to the 30% affordable housing contribution.
- Has the applicant considered the use of renewable energy sources such as

District Heating Systems, Biomass and enhanced recycling facilities to reduce CO² footprint.

We welcome the applicant's statement concerning a community participation process as it is important to ensure the new homes integrate with the existing community.

The affordable housing units should be owned and managed by a Housing Association approved by and has entered into a nomination agreement with the District Council. The developer/landowner should dispose of the affordable units to the Housing Association either on a freehold basis or on a long lease of at least 125 years at a peppercorn rent.

The District Council approves the following Housing Associations:

- Downland Housing Association
- Town & Country Housing Group
- Raglan Housing Association
- Home Housing Group

In the event of the RSL being unable to obtain public subsidy for the affordable rented units, the affordable element will convert to 50% affordable rent and 50% affordable home ownership (shared ownership). The RSL would need to demonstrate to the Council that public subsidy is not available for this scheme.

The affordable units should meet the following internal minimum sizes:

- 2 Bedroom Flats 66²m
- 2 Bedroom wheelchair Flat 71²m
- 2 Bedroom Houses 76²m
- 3 Bedroom Houses 86²m
- 4 Bedroom Houses 111²m
- 2 bed bungalow wheelchair 91²m

The affordable housing should also:

- Meet Housing Corporation Design & Quality Standards (this has replaced Scheme Development Standards)
- Meet level 3 of The Code for Sustainable Homes (Communities & Local Government publication)
- Incorporate Joseph Rowntree 'Lifetime Homes standards'
- Meet Secure by Design principles as agreed by the Police Architectural Liaison Officer.

The delivery of affordable housing is a key strategic objective of the Council and I can confirm that there is proven need for affordable housing in the area as follows:

- The 2005 Housing Needs Survey identified over 410 households who live in the District require a move to Uckfield.
- And 230 new forming households that will be looking to access the housing market in Uckfield.

15. Framfield Parish Council

1.0. Background.

1.1 The current proposal is part of an original 2002 scheme, considered by Councils in 2003 and subsequently removed from the WDC local plan. A proposal to develop the northern site was put forward late last year and rejected by WDC following strong objections from Framfield Parish parishioners and the Parish Council together with supporting concerns from Uckfield. The southern part of that scheme is what is now being proposed. This was previously aired as a separate development in 2006 at presentations by the developers at Framfield Memorial hall and Uckfield civic centre when considerable objections were raised by the public.

1.2 On every occasion Framfield P.C. has made it very clear to developers and agents that the proposal is part of Framfield parish, there are considerable issues involved and inevitably there would be strong objections. The land does not form part of the potential development area considered in the WDC non statutory plan and whilst the latter may not be legally enforceable it was a very public and considered approach to urban development in the area.

2.0 Summary

2.1. Framfield Parish Council objects to this proposal on the grounds of unsuitability in terms of area development and the detrimental effects of increased traffic, potential flooding danger, environmental impact and erosion of rural identity. Detailed points of concern follow.

3.0. Traffic

3.1 The Framfield Road is already a very congested area with significant bus, car and lorry traffic. If built, this development could produce 300 extra vehicles with approx. 1,000 vehicle movements per day. Buses already have some difficulty negotiating the congested Framfield Road and delays to time tables are not uncommon as a result. The emergency services equally have difficulty at times because of volume of traffic and parked vehicles. The area ambulance station will be close to the access to the proposed development and some impact on response times must surely be a possibility?

3.2 The extra traffic generated by this proposal will add to the already difficult situation in Uckfield which is widely recognized particularly by ESCC Highways who are well aware of the difficulties concerning Framfield Rd.

3.3 These vehicles can be expected to disperse in all directions each morning and converge each evening. The B2102 through Bird in Eye will carry this traffic and many drivers wishing to avoid the already notoriously congested Framfield Road and Uckfield Town Centre, would use Sandy lane to give them access to Buxted/Maresfield and the A272 east/west and the A22 north. People traveling south would use Brookhouse Lane at the, almost blind, corner by the Hare & Hounds in Framfield to give access to the Uckfield by-pass and A22 south and A26 to Lewes. Those going east to Heathfield will have to go through Framfield. People endeavouring to reach Uckfield commercial and industrial locations will have no alternative except Framfield Road and Uckfield High Street. This added congestion could only be resolved if car parking was virtually banned from Framfield Road and policing of this measure enforced to a level regarded as unacceptable by residents.

3.4 It is our understanding that educational services, particularly primary level, in the area may not be adequate for the likely number of children from this proposed development. The likely answer is for even more school run type traffic spreading over an even wider area than present. This would be particularly so if the admirable Framfield school attracted pupils from the new development as the only safe means of access would be by vehicle in the total absence of footways/pavements in that area. This would then, of course, add significantly to traffic congestion within Framfield village especially in the direct vicinity of the school where there is already difficulty for through traffic and the inherent danger for children.

4. Infrastructure

The current medical services, i.e. GP surgeries, serving the Uckfield area are currently oversubscribed. There is no provision to extend these facilities to cope with the potential needs of new residents on the scale proposed. In the same light, such a development would require a water supply and sewage disposal, again there is no provision to cope with these issues and current facilities are overstretched.

5. Flooding

5.1 The ongoing controversy about Uckfield's flood alleviation schemes or lack of will only be aggravated by this development.

5.2 Development on Bird-in-Eye cannot possibly alleviate flood problems, due to its location with no areas able to withhold large volumes of water between Bird-in-Eye and Uckfield. The possibility of flash flooding will increase due to this proposed development's size.

6. Greenbelt

The position of this development within Framfield Parish is blatant Town creep into the countryside and represents a significant visible loss of environment for residents. The need to maintain gaps between the town and country is clearly recognised nationally.

7. Rural Identity

7.1 The proposed development would impose around 150 dwellings, maybe 300 adults and perhaps up to 100 children on a rural Parish. This one large housing estate might well, therefore, comprise about one tenth of the Framfield Parish electorate but in perhaps one thousandth of the land space. This imbalance is likely to be further exacerbated when new residents discover they are technically part of a rural Parish rather than Uckfield Town.

7.2 It is realistic to assume that virtually none of the new residents will work within Framfield and probably not that many in Uckfield either. The prospect of the development being a dormitory which emits significant volumes of commuting traffic is to be avoided.

16. GOSE (MEA)- Views awaited.

17. Pollution Control – Drainage Proposals satisfactory; no contaminated land condition required.

18. ESCC - Development Contributions – details awaited.

19. ESCC - Strategic Planning - views awaited.

20. Technical Services- Recommends Conditions..

21. County Archaeologist – No consideration of archaeology contained in application. Records indicate Mesolithic Flint work and a Romano British iron-working site nearby that indicates past human activity in the area and this may be the case at this site. Recommends condition requiring programme of archaeological works to be submitted for approval.

22. South East England Regional Assembly – views awaited.

Relevant Planning History.

1.0. *An application (WD/2006/2713/MEA) for the development of land to the north of Bird in Eye Farm for 300 dwellings, 930m² of employment development, open space, access roads and highway improvements was **refused** in January 2007 for six reasons : concerning:*

- 1) *Site outside Development Boundary.*
- 2) *Highway Safety.*
- 3) *Inadequate provision for sustainable modes of transport.*
- 4) *Environmental Impact.*
- 5) *No mechanism to secure provision of affordable housing.*
- 6) *Parts of the site noise sensitive.*

Response to Parish/Town Council:

2.0. As with WD/2006/2713/MEA, this site is outside the Development Boundary and there are also highway problems that (see comments of the Highway Authority).

1. Local Residents.

19 letters and emails have been received in objection to the application, five of which are from the same property and have the same wording. The objections fall within the following categories:

- Land not allocated for residential development.
- Additional (commuting) traffic would make Framfield Road impossible to negotiate particularly for emergency vehicles, especially ambulances using the station on Bird in Eye Hill.
- Lack of footpaths and pavements in the area which would force people to sue their cars even for short journeys.
- Increase in noise and disturbance from traffic.
- Concern about flooding – any proposed development would lead to a greater and faster run-off would exacerbate the flooding of the Framfield Stream.
- Impact on landscape and distant views towards the site.
- An additional 197 dwellings would add additional pressure on the already fully stretched local medical services.
- The site is in the parish of Framfield, not in Uckfield.
- Encroachment in green belt areas and loss of agricultural land.
- Future housing development for Uckfield should be located to the west of the town where there is ready access to the A22/by pass.

CASE OFFICER'S ASSESSMENT

- The Proposal:

The application concerns 9.6 hectares of land on the east side of Uckfield. The site is defined to the north by the rear boundaries of existing properties in Bird in Eye Hill, to the west by the Framfield Stream and its floodplain, to the south by existing established woodland and to the east by farm buildings and dwellings forming Bird in Eye Farm and agricultural land.

The application is made in outline and comprises the development of 197 dwellings with access, landscaping and recreational open space. The residential development is proposed on 6.1 hectares with the balance of the site on its west side, lying within the Framfield stream floodplain.

Access to the site would be from Bird in Eye Hill to the east of the residential properties on the south side of the road; on the illustrative layout drawing, two areas of residential estate development are shown divided by an area of informal open space.

- Planning Policy:

The application site lies outside the Uckfield Development Boundary in both the adopted Wealden Local Plan 1998 and the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan 2005. Policy GD2 of the adopted plan presumes against development outside of the development boundary whilst Policy DC17 of that plan states that: 'Housing development will not be allowed outside development boundariesunless it conforms with other policies in the Plan.'

The proposal is therefore contrary to these policies. However, the lack of a five year supply of housing land to 2011 is material to the determination of the application. Indeed, Planning Policy Statement 3 – 'Housing' states in paragraph 71:

'Where Local Planning Authorities cannot demonstrate an up-to-date five year supply of deliverable sites, for example, where Local Development Documents have not been reviewed to take into account policies in this PPS or there is less than five years supply of deliverable sites, they should consider favourably planning applications for housing, having regard to the policies in this PPS including the considerations in paragraph 69.'

Policy H1 of the approved East Sussex and Brighton and Hove Structure Plan 1991-2011 contains a requirement for the provision of 4400 new dwellings within Wealden over the period 2006-2011 including 3300 dwellings on new allocations of housing land. The adopted Wealden Local Plan 1998 does not provide any allocations of housing land to cover this period.

To address this issue allocations of housing land were made in the non statutory local plan which was adopted for development control purposes in 2005. The non statutory plan does not however, form part of the approved development plan for the area and as a result the weight to be attached to it in decisions is limited. In a recent appeal decision relating to Oakleigh in Five Ash Down, the inspector concluded that for the purposes of determining that application, the

non statutory plan policy allocating that site for residential *development* ‘..should be attributed only limited weight.’ and that the proposed development should be assessed in relation to the development plan, national policy and other material considerations.

Various sites to accommodate the housing allocated in the Structure Plan were considered by the council as part of the Wealden Local Plan Review Special Review Committee . The application site, together with neighbouring land to the north side of Bird in Eye Hill was allocated for housing under Policy UC1 which allocated both of the Bird in Eye Farm sites, north and south, for 500 dwellings. Some 237 objections were received to this allocation relating inter-alia to increased traffic, landscape impact, flood risk etc. At the Wealden Local Plan Review Special Review Committee on 15 December 2003, members resolved to delete the entire allocation from the draft Local Plan. The remaining part of the allocation – land to the west of Framfield Stream, accessed from Mallard Drive, should be retained as a housing allocation.

The allocation for housing of the Bird in Eye Hill was further considered following consideration of representations received to the Revised Draft Wealden Local Plan Review; 24 objections were received to the *deletion* of the application site and the land to the north; these objections argued that the Bird in Eye sites were more sustainable and better contained within the landscape than other sites allocated in the Draft Plan.

These objections were considered by the Wealden Local Plan Review Special Review Committee at its meeting on 10 May 2005 when members agreed with the officers’ conclusion that no change be made to the draft plan in response to representations received. At the meeting of the cabinet on 27 June 2005, it was resolved that the Revised (Non Statutory) Wealden Local Plan be approved for use as an Interim Guide for Development Control. This resolution was made subject to the judgement on an appeal to the Court of Appeal on the legality of the Council’s decision to abandon the statutory plan. Following a favourable judgement from the Court of Appeal, the Revised Wealden Local Plan was considered by full council at its meetings on 9 November and 14 December 2005. No further amendments to the sites agreed to be allocated in the Plan and hence the application site is not allocated for housing in that Plan.

The proposed development of 197 dwellings is therefore in conflict with the policies of the adopted 1998 local plan and the non statutory plan adopted as an interim guide for Development Control in December 2005.

Layout and Design.

The application is in outline but informed by an ‘illustrative master plan.’ General comments on layout and design issues are provided by the Conservation and Design Section which may be referred to in full in the consultations section above. The comments are prefaced by reference to the outline nature of the application.

The points made set out various points to be addressed in a detailed design and layout and do not represent an objection per se. It is considered that these are matters for consideration at the reserved matters stage were outline permission

to be granted.

Landscape Impact

The site is to some extent contained by the flood plain of the stream, existing woodland and the development at Bird in Eye Farm and existing housing fronting Bird in Eye Hill. The landscape and visual impact assessment submitted with the application shows that the site will be screened from view from the east north and south by the topography of the surroundings and established landscaping and woods/tree belts.

It is inevitable that an urban extension on this scale will have landscape impacts both in the rural surroundings and in views from the existing developed areas of the town. The landscape assessment submitted with the application, indicates that there will be views of the site from the existing built up area of Uckfield – which lies primarily to the west and north west of the application site. Given the outline/illustrative nature of the proposals and having regard to the analysis presented by the Landscape and Visual Assessment , it appears that subject to the new development being designed to integrate with its surroundings, the landscape impact may be acceptable.

Trees, Ecology and Biodiversity.

The comments of the landscape and biodiversity officer are set out above. The report submitted to inform the application in this regard does not it is considered meet the minimum requirements of PPS7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas or PPS9 – Biodiversity and Geological Conservation. It is recommended that a reason for refusal is included to deal with this issue.

Access and Traffic Impact

The Highway Authority recommend refusal of the application for 4 reasons relating to:

- Unacceptable increase in existing safety hazards and unacceptable traffic conditions in Uckfield Town Centre
- Traffic hazard on Bird in Eye Hill (B2102) due to additional stopping, slowing and turning traffic which would be created at the junction of the new access road with Bird in Eye Hill.
- Details do not demonstrate adequate provision will be made to facilitate two-way traffic flow on the B2102 and increased volume of traffic using Framfield Road/Bird in Eye Hill would increase existing traffic hazard by interfering with free flow and safety of traffic on B2102.
- Inadequate details to demonstrate that adequate provision will be made to encourage sustainable modes of transport between the site and Uckfield Town Centre.

There are evidently highway problems with the proposed development of this site as explained in the recommended reasons for refusal; the highway authority comment that; ‘ To allow such development to proceed in the absence of an appropriate highway solution would result in unacceptable conditions in the town centre for

existing residents and businesses, there are also problems with the new junction of the proposed estate and Bird in Eye Hill and provision to allow for two way traffic in Bird in Eye Hill.

Whilst these matters may be capable of being resolved as it stands the application is recommended for refusal for the reasons recommended by the Highway Authority.

Drainage and Flood Risk:

The Environment Agency have raised no objection to the proposed development subject to a flood risk mitigation has been submitted for approval and thereafter implemented. Conditions are also recommended relating to surface and foul water drainage as set out above.

Developer's Contributions:

ESCC has confirmed that the development would give rise to contributions totalling £626900 and would need to be secured by S106 Agreement were permission to be granted . The total amount is the product of the following amounts arising from the provision of County Council service infrastructure other than highways and transport:

- Nursery School - £5500.
- Secondary School: £572,700.
- Household waste and recycling: £14000.
- Rights of Way: £4700.

Further contributions would be required towards the implementation of Local Area Transport Strategies (LSAIC's) These would be calculated by reference to reserved matters approvals granted pursuant to the outline permission if granted.

Affordable Housing.

The comments of the Housing Department confirm the quantum and type of affordable units that should be provided in accordance with Policies HG4 and HG7 of the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan 2005. Whilst the outline proposals include affordable housing in accordance with these policies no agreement or mechanism is in place to deliver the affordable housing were planning permission to be granted and in these circumstances the proposal is contrary to Policies HG4 and HG7.

Conclusions.

- The site is shown to lie beyond the Development Boundary of Uckfield and is not allocated for residential or other development in either the Non Statutory Wealden Local Plan 2005 or the Adopted Wealden Local Plan 1998.
- There is no reasonable case to release this land to meet defined housing requirements up to 2011.
- Although considered for allocation for housing purposes in the Draft Wealden Local Plan Review; the Council resolved not to include this site as an allocation in the Non Statutory Local Plan adopted as an interim guide for development control in December 2005. The decision not to allocate this site for housing development in that plan followed 3 rounds of public consultation and made by the elected members of the Planning Authority.

- PPS3 – Housing requires the Planning Authority to consider favourably applications for housing having regard to other policies in PPS3. The site has been rejected as an allocation in the Non Statutory Local Plan following extensive public consultation. There are unresolved problems including highway issues that militate against the grant of planning permission at the present time.
- Whilst the Council is currently unable to demonstrate a 5 year land supply to meet Structure Plan requirements, the emerging South East Plan that will replace the Structure Plan, if approved in spring/summer 2008 the annual requirement for Wealden would be 400 dwellings per annum compared to 800 dwellings per annum under the current Structure Plan figure. Once adopted it may be that the Council will be able to prove a 5 year land supply.
- Further, the approval of the application would be premature pending the production of the Core Strategy and related Site Allocations as part of the emerging Local Development Framework. Notwithstanding the compulsion in PPS3 to grant planning permission for housing development when there is no demonstrable 5 year supply the material planning objections to the development of this site lead to a recommendation of refusal in this case.

There is no mechanism to secure the necessary infrastructure required to sustain the development and off-site highway works in Framfield Road and Bird in Eye Hill have not been resolved to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority. Although on a bus route, the site is not in a very sustainable location and future residents would be likely to be dependant upon travel by private car to gain access to key community services.

It is recommended that planning permission is refused.