

# Minutes of a meeting of Seaford Town Council's Planning & Highways Committee on Tuesday, 4<sup>th</sup> February 2025

Held at The View, Seaford Head Golf Course, Southdown Road, Seaford, BN25 4JS at 7.00pm.

### Present:

Councillors L Wallraven (Chair), L Boorman (Vice-Chair), O Honeyman, R Honeyman, J

Lord, J Meek (Substituted for R Buchanan).

Isabelle Mouland, Assistant Town Clerk

Nikki Blight, Administrative Assistant

There were 28 members of the public in attendance

Councillors S Markwell and M Wearmouth attended in the public gallery

## P69/02/24 Apologies for Absence

Apologies were received from Councillor R Buchanan.

### P70/02/24 Disclosure of Interests

There were no disclosures of interests.

### P71/02/24 Public Participation

There was no public participation at this stage in the meeting.

### P72/02/24 Lewes District Local Plan Consultation – Introduction

Speaker	Statement
Resident A	Highlighted para 31 of the NPPF, urging the Town Council to consider updating the Seaford Neighbourhood Plan as soon as possible.
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident B	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>That the larger proportion of new development is proposed on the coastal strip</li> </ul>

	- That Seaford is classified as a 'district
	centre' and would be required to have
	a minimum density of 50 dwellings per
	hectare
	- Urged the Town Council to lobby LDC
	for the mandatory policy (H1) to be
	reduced or mitigated
	- Highlighted a need for the right
	housing for Seaford and infrastructure
	is strained
	- Urged the Town Council to oppose
	both Chyngton Way and St John's
	School site allocations
	- Expressed concerns about the
	complexity of the consultation itself
	and how other parish councils are
	engaging
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Town Council Response Resident C	Thanked the resident for their contribution. Made the following points:
	Made the following points:
	Made the following points: - Development must be sustainable,
	Made the following points: - Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in keeping with the area</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in keeping with the area</li> <li>The road access and public transport at the St John's School site is not</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in keeping with the area</li> <li>The road access and public transport at the St John's School site is not adequate for housing</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Development must be sustainable, services and transport links already stretched</li> <li>That major roads that service Seaford are poor</li> <li>Most of the St John's School site is playing fields and would be ideal for playing field from Newlands</li> <li>The housing density at the St John's School site is too high and not in keeping with the area</li> <li>The road access and public transport at the St John's School site is not</li> </ul>

	a suburban site surrounded by
	detached dwellings
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident D	Made the following points:
	- Policy H1 must be qualified, if not the
	Seaford Neighbourhood Plan becomes
	irrelevant
	- Only two housing development sites in
	Seaford (Elm Court and Sutton Leas)
	had 50 dwelling densities and are
	packed
	- 50 dwellings mean flats
	- In 2019 a s106 agreement (saying that
	a football pitch could not be at
	Newlands) was signed and £350k paid
	to LDC to accommodate elsewhere,
	had five years to find space and only 23
	weeks left.
	- St John's School site study states that it
	does not identify a surplus or deficiency
	for Seaford in respect of institutional
	grounds, but this is on the basis that
	there is not national
	standard/benchmark
	- Evidence of greenspace deficit was
	identified in Seaford Neighbourhood
	Plan
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident E	Made the following points:
	- Urged the Town Council to be the
	public voice and have courage to
	represent Seaford
	- All properties need to be sustainable
	with green energy sources
	with green energy sources

	- Need the right housing for Seaford and
	all must benefit Seaford
	- Once greenfield is lost, it is lost forever
	- Expressed concerns about sewerage
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident F	Made the following points:
	- There is a noticeable increase in
	visitor numbers, including vehicles
	and public transport
	- Seaford's tourism is not recognised in
	the draft Local Plan
	- Urged the Town Council to put in
	place a tourism strategy, with a
	dedicated councillor and committee
	- Chyngton Way should be withdrawn
	from the Local Plan
	- A better understanding of Seaford
	must be reflected in the Local Plan
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Town Council Response Resident G	Thanked the resident for their contribution.Made the following points:
	Made the following points:
	Made the following points: - Expressed concerns with complexity
	Made the following points:         - Expressed concerns with complexity         of consultation process, including that
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how</li> </ul>
	Made the following points:- Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> <li>Requested that the Town Council give</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> <li>Requested that the Town Council give guidance to answering the questionnaire</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> <li>Requested that the Town Council give guidance to answering the questionnaire</li> <li>- Requested that the Town Council</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> <li>Requested that the Town Council give guidance to answering the questionnaire</li> <li>- Requested that the Town Council employs someone from the Royal</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Made the following points:</li> <li>Expressed concerns with complexity of consultation process, including that it is computer based and how documents are 'live' and are changed during consultation</li> <li>There are 179 questions in LDC questionnaire which is overwhelming and no question specific to sites</li> <li>Requested that the Town Council give guidance to answering the questionnaire</li> <li>- Requested that the Town Council</li> </ul>

Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident H	Circulated maps to the Committee which
	highlighted items such as footpaths and
	woodland missed from the plan,
	expressing concern that the draft Local
	Plan is substandard and must be
	changed.
	Also expressed concern that tourism is not
	recognised in Seaford.
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.
Resident I	Expressed concerns for access to GP
	services as Seaford practices already
	struggling.
	Highlighted that an increase in population
	in this area will intensify need for
	ambulance services (as a result of
	overwhelmed GP) and will put strain on
	ambulance demand and increase in
	response times.
	Urged the Town Council to express this
	concern in response to Draft Local Plan.
Town Council Response	Thanked the resident for their contribution.

The committee considered report 162/24 introducing the Lewes Local Plan consultation.

**P72.1** It was **PROPOSED** to **INSTRUCT** the Assistant Town Clerk to arrange an informal meeting for the Planning and Highways Committee and Public to draft the Town Council's response to the Lewes District Local Plan; this **MOTION** was **CARRIED**.

**P72.2** It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** that it will finalise the Town Council's response at the next Planning & Highways Committee on Thursday 20th February 2025.

(8.06pm – 24 members of the public, and cllrs S Markwell and M Wearmouth exited the meeting)

(Short break - 8.06pm to 8.24pm)

#### P73/02/24 Planning Applications

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 30th December

LW/24/0801 - 11 Park Road - Conversion of existing garage and addition of single storey rear extension to form annexe

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

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 6th January

**LW/24/0776 - Blocks 3 & 4 The Boundary** - Application of a silicone render system to external brickwork on all elevations of flats.

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

LW/24/0780 – Seaford Head Lower School - Stabilisation works to the embankment situated adjacent to the Steyne Road boundary, involving the removal of existing vegetation, benching the existing sloped into 450mm steps, backfilling in 150mm layers with crushed boundary wall and soil to achieve a slope angle of 30-35degrees and installation of an erosion control mat,150mm topsoil and grass seed.

(8.38pm – the Committee moved to suspend Standing Orders to allow for the applicant to answer questions)

(8.39pm – the Committee moved to reinstate Standing Orders)

It was **RESOLVED** to **SUPPORT** the application; adding concerns about a lack of information to evidence mitigation of wildlife disruption, and also suggest that rather than a topsoil and grass seed finish, the School look to rewild the bank and perhaps involve pupils.

(8.45pm – One member of the public exited the meeting)

**LW/25/0002 – Thrift Cottage, Edinburgh Road** - Application for a Single storey rear extension and alterations to side window.

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

(8.48pm – One member of the public exited the meeting)

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 13th January

LW/24/0800 – 53 Kingsmead - Application for a first floor front extension.

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

LW/25/0019 – 25 Beacon Road - Application for a first floor front extension.

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

Planning Applications received in week commencing Monday 20th January

No applications were received.

Tree Works Applications

TW/24/0128/TPO - Amenity Land, Foster Close - W1 - Group consisting of Ash, Elder & Sycamore - Trimming back to site boundary to reduce potential hazards.

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

### P74/02/24 Update Report

The committee considered report 161/24 on the Lewes District Council and South Downs National Park Authority decisions received since the last meeting on applications previously considered by the Committee

It was **RESOLVED** to **NOTE** the report and the decisions set out in the schedule.

The meeting closed at 8.56pm

Councillor L Wallraven Chair of Planning & Highways Committee