

Committee: **Regulatory  
Planning Committee**

Date: **18 May 2016**

Report by: **Director of Communities Economy and Transport**

Proposal: **Continued use of site as a waste transfer station and materials recovery facility, including erection of new building to accommodate recycling plant and equipment, together with ancillary development**

Site Address: **19 Brambleside, Bellbrook Industrial Estate, Uckfield, TN22 1QQ.**

Applicant: **Mr D Baldwin, Kier Services Ltd**

Application No. **WD/768/CM**

Key Issues: (i) **Purpose of development**  
(ii) **Siting, design and effect on amenity**  
(iii) **Traffic and access**  
(iv) **Effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA**  
(v) **Effect on the reinstatement of the Lewes to Uckfield Railway Line**

Contact Officer: **Katie Rayner – Tel: 01273 481833**

Local Member: **Councillor Claire Dowling**

---

## **SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS**

**1. The Committee is recommended to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out at paragraph 8.1 of this report.**

---

## **CONSIDERATION BY DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITIES ECONOMY AND TRANSPORT**

### **1. The Site and Surroundings**

1.1 The application site is located within the south-western boundary of the Bellbrook Industrial Estate, an established industrial and commercial area within the development boundary of Uckfield to the west of the main town centre. The application site itself currently operates as a Waste Transfer Station (WTS) and Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) with buildings to the west of the site and associated storage bays to the east. These two areas are separated by an operational yard area with a weighbridge on its northern side.

1.2 The Bellbrook Industrial Estate contains 145 units of differing sizes and the application site occupies a single unit of 0.39 hectares on the south-western boundary. The site benefits from tree screening on its eastern, western and southern boundaries. The site is also bounded to the south by a Waste Water Treatment Works with agricultural fields beyond, and the south-eastern corner of the site overlaps the safeguarded route of the former Uckfield to Lewes Railway Line.

1.3 The site is accessed off Brambleside, which is a public highway and which itself is accessed via Brookside, which joins Bell Farm Road (B2102) that runs east towards Uckfield and west towards the A22 along the northern boundary of the Bellbrook Industrial Estate. The site is set back from Brambleside via a short driveway to a vehicle security gate providing access directly into the operational yard area. There is also a pedestrian side gate, which allows access to a footpath that runs alongside the existing WTS building. The site is approximately 370 metres from the nearest residential area, which is located to the north of Bell Farm Road.

1.4 The site is owned by Wealden District Council and is leased to Kier Services Ltd as part of a ten-year joint waste management contract. As part of the contract, Kier Services Ltd are responsible for the management of waste through recycling collections, street cleansing and beach-cleaning for Wealden and Rother District Councils and Hastings and Eastbourne Borough Councils.

## **2. The Proposal**

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the continued use of the site as a WTS and MRF to regularise the planning position of the site, which is proposed to be operated on a more intensive basis than the use approved under the extant Planning Permission WD/1992/0898/DC/F.

2.2 The proposal comprises two parts. First, the continued use of the existing WTS, including the retention of the two existing buildings on site, comprises the WTS and Paper Card Reception Building alongside the existing hardstanding yard area for the sorting and transfer of waste, the weighbridge and two storage bays in the north-eastern corner of the operational yard area of the site. Second, the construction of a new building to accommodate a MRF in place of the external storage bays on the eastern boundary of the site, alongside the construction of 22 staff parking spaces located outside of the operational yard to the east and west of the site access and an increase in the operational hours of the site on Saturdays.

2.3 The proposed MRF building would occupy the eastern half of the site measuring 42 metres in length with a width of 17 metres and a height of 12 metres at its pitch. The building would have single skin cladding and high opening doors which would remain open during working hours. The internal height requirement of the building is 9 metres to accommodate the additional machinery that is proposed to be operated at the site, which includes a

trommel, magnet, edi-current separator, bailer and multiple conveyors. An additional conveyor would run along the southern boundary of the site and connect to the proposed MRF. This would be covered by a canopy measuring 23 metres in length, 5 metres wide and 9 metres in height.

2.4 The current use of the site is to receive household recyclable waste collected on behalf of Rother, Wealden, Hastings and Eastbourne Councils. The materials collected include glass, paper, plastic bottles, metals, foil and beverage cartons. The materials are sorted and then stored in internal bays (with glass in external bays), except for paper, which is stored in the paper reception building. Thereafter, the materials are then transferred for onward treatment. Collected kerbside recyclates would continue to be brought to the site by refuse collection vehicles and bulk articulated vehicles. The material will then enter the site over the weighbridge and be stored in the existing buildings, depending on the type of waste, from where it will be loaded into the proposed MRF by the use of a mobile shovel.

2.5 The proposed throughput of material at the site would not increase and therefore would not exceed 40,000 tonnes per annum, which is the current level. The existing vehicle trips associated with the management of waste will therefore also be maintained. However, according to the applicant, the proposed MRF building is expected to allow waste to be sorted more efficiently, thereby maximising the recovery of recyclates. This will require an additional 12 HGV export trips a day. The applicant has proposed that all of the traffic leaving the site would do so from the junction of Brookside with Bell Farm Road heading west towards the A22. From there, the applicant assumes a 50:50 split of vehicles heading north or south along the A22.

2.6 The site currently employs 18 members of staff and the proposal would generate 14 additional jobs, thereby increasing to 32. This would in turn generate additional light vehicle movements to and from the site each day. New parking facilities have been proposed in order to accommodate the increase in staff. The construction of these parking areas will require some re-profiling of the northern boundary of the site outside of the operational yard area. The proposed operational hours from Monday to Friday are to remain the same as that already permitted at 06.00 to 20.00 and this application proposes to increase the operational hours at the site for Saturdays from 06.00-12.00 to 06.00 to 20.00.

### **3. Site History**

3.1 The site has benefited from a waste management use for a number of years. There is no County Planning history for the site, however, a number of planning permissions have been granted for the waste management use of the site by Wealden District Council.

3.2 Planning permission was first granted (ref: WD/1992/0898/DC/F) in 1992 for the erection of a Materials Transfer Station on the western boundary of the site. Later in the same year, permission was granted (ref:

WD/1992/2330/DC/F) for the construction of a building to accommodate a recycling plant and offices at the site.

3.3 In 1993, permission was granted (ref: WD/1992/3101/DC/F) for a building to house a recyclable materials processing plant. In addition to this, a temporary permission was also granted (ref: WD/1993/2133/DC/F) for the formation of three material storage bays and yardage which was subsequently renewed in 1995 (ref: WD/1995/2271/DC/F).

3.4 In 1998, permission was granted (ref: WD/1997/2713/F) for the concreting of the undeveloped area of the site to construct six bays to store recycled material on the eastern boundary of the site for a temporary period until 2004, which was renewed in 2004 (ref: WD/2004/0703/DC) and more recently 2013 (ref: WD/2013/0218) for a temporary period until 2018. During this time permission was also granted (ref: WD/2001/2659/DC) for the covering of existing material storage bays and an extension to the MRF building which was granted in 2003 (ref: WD/2003/2488/DC).

3.5 In 2005, permission was granted (ref: WD/2004/2887/F) for the erection of a new waste paper bay enclosure for a temporary period until 30 April 2007. This permission was subsequently renewed in 2010 (ref: WD/2010/0218/F) and in 2015 (ref: WD/2015/1004/F) for a temporary period until 2020.

3.6 In summary, the relevant permissions at the site refer to the use as a WTS with associated building granted in May 1992 (ref: WD/1992/0898/DC/F), the use of the storage bays in the yard area for recycled materials granted in March 2013 for a temporary period until 2018 (ref: WD/2013/0218/F) and the use of the covered waste paper enclosure granted in August 2015 for a temporary period until 2020 (ref: WD/2015/1004/F). The current proposal seeks to continue to use the site as a WTS including the retention of the existing WTS building and waste paper enclosure and extend its operations with the addition of a new MRF building and ancillary development.

#### **4. Consultations and Representations**

4.1 Wealden District Council raise no objection, subject to the County Council being satisfied that the proposal alone or in combination with all other plans and projects does not have a Likely Significant Effect upon the Ashdown Forest SPA, SAC and SSSI as safeguarded by The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. The District's Environmental Health Officer has not submitted any observations.

4.2 Uckfield Town Council support the application, as it is felt that the new building would keep the site tidier.

4.3 Highway Authority raises no objections, as it does not consider that the highway impact would be detrimental to the operation of the highway. The parking and swept path analysis is considered to be acceptable. However,

vehicles may still have to wait on the highway as is currently the case but there would be an improvement due to fewer on-street cars associated with the site. Conditions are recommended regarding access arrangements, the implementation of proper parking arrangements and internal site layout markings.

4.4 Environment Agency raise no objection to the proposal, but advises the applicant that a new or variation to their current Environmental Permit may be required.

4.5 Flood Risk Management ESCC, raises no objection to the proposal, however it is noted that the proposed development would be expected to achieve a 'like for like' surface water discharge rate between the existing and proposed scenarios during the 1 in 1, 1 in 30 and 1 in 100 rainfall events. It is considered that a surface water management proposal supported by a surface water drainage drawing showing how the development can achieve a 'like for like' discharge rate between the existing and proposed scenarios could be secured by condition if the Council is minded to approve the application.

4.6 Representations: The occupier of a business in the adjacent Horsted Square objects on the grounds that the proposal will place more pressure on the roads and access arrangements within the Estate and increase the levels of dirt. It is also considered that planning for the facility to remain and grow would appear to be unwise.

## **5. The Development Plan and other policies of relevance to this decision are:**

5.1 East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan 2013: Policies: WMP3b (Turning Waste into a Resource); WMP3d (Minimising & Managing Waste During Construction, Demolition & Excavation); WMP6 (Safeguarded Sites); WMP7a (Areas of Focus); WMP22 (Increased Operational Capacity within the Site Boundary of Existing Waste Facilities); WMP23a (Design Principles); WMP23b (Operation of Sites); WMP25 (General Amenity); WMP26 (Traffic Considerations); & WMP27a (Environment & Environmental Enhancement).

5.2 Wealden Local Plan 1998: Saved Policies: BS3 (Concentration of business development); EN27 (General amenity); TR17 (Reinstatement of the former Uckfield to Lewes railway line).

Wealden District Council has not formally determined whether its saved policies in the Wealden Local Plan are in general conformity with the NPPF. However, the saved policies are considered by the County Planning Authority to be in general conformity with the overarching principles of the NPPF.

5.3 Wealden District (incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Local Development Framework, Core Strategy – February 2013: Policy WCS12 (Biodiversity).

The Wealden District (incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Core Strategy Local Plan was adopted on the 19 February 2013. The Core Strategy Local Plan is the key policy document setting out a strategic vision, objectives and spatial strategy for the area up to 2027. In this case/planning application there are no relevant planning policies from the core strategy local plan. Currently saved development management policies contained in the Wealden Local Plan 1998 remain part of the Development Plan for the area.

5.4 East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan Submission Draft 2015: Map 49 – SP-WCA/AC, Unit 19, Bellbrook Industrial Estate, Uckfield.

5.5 East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan Schedule of Suitable Industrial Estates, October 2015: I/D Bellbrook Industrial Estate, Uckfield.

5.6 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) March 2012

The NPPF does not change the status of the Development Plan as the starting point for decision making and constitutes guidance as a material consideration in determining planning applications. It does not contain specific waste policies but regard should be had to NPPF policies so far as relevant. Parts 7 (Requiring good design) and 11 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) are relevant in this case.

5.7 National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) 2014

The NPPW sets out detailed waste planning policies and regard should be had to them when planning authorities seek to discharge their responsibilities to the extent that they are appropriate to waste management.

## **6. Considerations**

### **Purpose of development**

6.1 The Waste and Minerals Plan supports, in principle, proposals for the development of waste management facilities where they contribute to the implementation of the Waste Hierarchy (Policy WMP3b), are located in Areas of Focus (Policy WMP7a) and are located on sites within which the operational capacity can be increased (Policy WMP22). Proposals also need to demonstrate that waste is minimised during any construction and demolition works (Policy WMP3d) and that a working programme accompanies the proposed operation (Policy WMP23b). The Waste and Minerals Plan also supports the retention of existing waste sites (Policy WMP6) and the Draft Sites Plan identifies the application site and the Industrial Estate as suitable for waste management facilities.

6.2 The application site is safeguarded for existing waste management uses under Policy WMP6 and is within an Area of Search, in accordance with Policy WMP7a. The Bellbrook Industrial Estate has been identified within the Schedule of Suitable Industrial Estates for waste management purposes within the Draft Waste and Minerals Sites Plan. It is also identified within Saved Policy BS3 of Wealden Local Plan (1998), which supports the focus of business development and any extension or addition to such development, within existing Industrial Estates where appropriate.

6.3 The proposal is for the continued use of the site as a WTS and MRF, including the retention of the existing buildings alongside the construction of a new MRF building to accommodate additional equipment. The driver for this is to facilitate the ten year joint waste management contract with the East Sussex Joint Waste Partnership, which is secured until 2023. Waste would therefore continue to be brought on to the site and sorted into different waste streams before being bulked up and transferred to other facilities.

6.4 According to the applicant, the purpose of the development is to allow the management of the same throughput of waste more efficiently through the provision of new equipment that would maximise the recovery of recyclates and allow waste that would usually be transported off site for sorting elsewhere to be dealt with on the site. This would increase the operational capacity of the site, which accords in principle with Policy WMP22. However, proposals also need to take into account the potential impact on the environment, transport and amenity of the surrounding area.

6.5 The applicant has provided a brief outline of how the site is expected to operate, however, as specified within Policy WMP23b, development proposals should be accompanied by a detailed working programme. However, there is an element of doubt over the how the scale of the proposed operations will be appropriately managed given the reduction in external circulation space resulting from the installation of the new building. It has also not been demonstrated how waste resulting from the construction of the new building would be managed and minimised in accordance with Policy WMP3d. However, these aspects could be addressed by appropriate conditions, if planning permission is granted.

6.6 Taking all the above matters into account, the proposed development accords, in principle, with waste management policies in the Waste and Minerals Plan, the emerging Sites Plan and Saved Policy BS3 of the Wealden Local Plan.

### **Siting, design and effect on amenity**

6.7 Policy WMP25 of the Waste and Minerals Plan requires proposals to have no unacceptable effects on the standard of amenity appropriate to the established, permitted or allocated land uses of the local and host communities likely to be affected by the development. Furthermore, there should be no significant adverse impact on air quality or the acoustic

environment, and adequate controls should be secured regarding dust, litter, noise and odour resulting from the development. Saved Policy EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan requires that, inter alia, the scale, form and site coverage of development should respect the character of adjoining development. Moreover, the proposed development should not create an unacceptable adverse impact on the amenities of adjoining developments and the neighbourhood by reason of scale, height, form, noise and traffic movements. Policy WMP23a of the Waste and Minerals Plan requires buildings associated with waste development to be of a scale, form and character appropriate to its location. Part 7 of the NPPF requires development to be of good design.

6.8 The proposed MRF building would be located along the eastern boundary of the site. Although piling is not envisaged for its construction, some local strengthening of the existing concrete floor would be required immediately below heavy items of equipment, involving about 50 cubic metres. In addition, some removal of existing concrete may also be required. The eastern boundary of the site benefits from a line of ever-green Leyland Cypress trees, which serve as an effective screen to the office premises, which adjoins to the east. It is likely that these trees were required to be planted to lessen the visual effect of the activities within the application site from adjoining land, particularly as the premises to the east has windows facing west. Although the trees provide a distinct screen to the site in relation to the adjoining offices, the applicant had not sufficiently taken their presence into account in locating the proposed MRF building. Indeed, it appeared from the submitted details that the building would involve the loss of the trees and so the applicant was required to undertake an accurate Arboricultural Impact assessment to ascertain the true extent of the effect of the development on the boundary trees. The Assessment concluded that, in terms of the boundary trees, the line of Leyland Cypress along the eastern boundary and five trees along the southern boundary (comprising one Leyland Cypress and four broad-leaf specimens) would require possible removal. Although pruning of the trees could take place to accommodate the building, given the extent of the pruning that would need to take place to accommodate the building (and the effect on the tree protection area), it is highly likely that removal of the trees would result. This would then expose the site from the east and the separation between office/light industrial use and a waste management use would be lost.

6.9 The adverse effects to the boundary trees would result from the proposed building being located too close to them. Ordinarily, new buildings should be placed within sites so as to exploit the benefits of existing resources, such as boundary planting or screening. However, in this case, it is clear from the siting of the proposed building that the site is unable to accommodate the building without damage being undertaken to the boundary trees. Moreover, there is no space for any replacement planting to take place to mitigate the loss. Therefore, it appears that the site is not large enough to effectively contain the building without adversely impacting on its beneficial screening. Moreover, this situation casts doubt over whether the inclusion of the building would impinge further on the operational activities within what is already a constrained site.



6.10 One representation has been received from an adjoining business located in Horsted Square to the west of the application site, which includes objections relating to loss of amenity. The main concern raised refers to significant problems which traffic and dirt generated from the existing operation is having on the surrounding area, with particular concern that these will be exacerbated by the proposed intensification of operations at the site. The proposal has potential to increase the impact on the locality, as the overall capacity of the operations at the site will increase in terms of the processes taking place. Furthermore, there will be a reduction in the operational yard area due to the footprint of the new building, thereby limiting the amount of vehicle manoeuvrability that can currently take place on the site, potentially resulting in an increase in vehicles queuing on Brambleside waiting to access the site. Although the Highway Authority is satisfied in highway terms that the proposals would be acceptable (see Traffic and access section below), the increase in operational activity at the site may still result in an adverse effect on amenity.

6.11 Overall, it is considered that the proposed location of the new MRF building is inappropriate and would result in an adverse effect on the eastern boundary tree screening which provides separation between the waste facility and the adjoining office/commercial premises to the east. Consequently, the proposal conflicts with Policy WMP25a of the Waste and Minerals Plan and saved Policy EN27(1) of the Wealden Local Plan.

### **Traffic and access**

6.12 Policy WMP26 of the Waste and Minerals Plan requires that development should provide for appropriate access arrangements for the volume and nature of traffic generated by the proposal, that no unacceptable safety hazards would be generated for other road users, that the level of traffic generated would not exceed the capacity of the local road network and that there are suitable arrangements for on site vehicle manoeuvring, parking and loading/unloading areas.

6.13 The number of vehicle movements would increase resulting from the need for additional vehicles to export materials from the MRF, resulting in 12 additional loads. An increase in 14 staff would also require an increase in on-site parking and the applicant proposes a total of 22 spaces. Although the Highway Authority had raised concerns, particularly with regard to parking provision off the highway, the applicant has amended the application so that it now meets the requirements of the Highway Authority. The proposed staff parking now allows the highway to be clear of cars to the extent that HGVs would not cause an obstruction while waiting on the road to enter the site. The internal layout of the site and how vehicles would manoeuvre is also considered acceptable to the Highway Authority. Subject to recommended conditions on the implementation of the access, parking and internal layout arrangements, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in highway terms.

### **Effect on the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA**

6.14 The site lies within 7 kilometres (km) of the Ashdown Forest, parts of which are designated as a Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), thereby affording it the highest protection in nature conservation terms. The 7km buffer zone is an established zone of influence and forms part of Policy WCS12 of Wealden District Council's Core Strategy Local Plan 2013. Policy WCS12 states that a development proposal located within 7km of the Ashdown Forest which would, either individually or in combination with other development, increase recreation and traffic pressures upon the internationally designated areas, must mitigate its own impact. Regulation 61 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulation 2010, requires an appropriate assessment of the proposal which is likely to have a significant effect upon a European Site.

6.15 Policy WMP27 of the Waste and Minerals Plan requires proposals to have no significant adverse impact on sites of national and local importance for nature conservation. In order to assess whether a proposal will have a likely significant effect on a designated site, Policy WMP27 requires that if any waste or minerals development that is likely to result in an increase of more than two hundred heavy duty vehicles per day on any road that lies within 200m of a European site will be subject to a project level Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) screening to evaluate air quality impacts.

6.16 The proposed development seeks to increase the existing vehicle movements on the site by 12 HGV trips, or 24 two-way HGV movements daily, therefore significantly under the stated threshold for a HRA. Wealden District Council have raised no objection to the proposal as it is considered that due to the nature of proposed development, it would not result in an increase in disturbance to protected bird species and there are no elements of the proposal which would have an impact upon the recreational activity on the Forest area. However, the main consideration for the current proposal with regard to the impact on the Ashdown Forest, is whether it would be adversely affected by the increase in nitrogen emissions resulting the increase in vehicle movements to and from the site. Clearly, most vehicles will emit nitrogen compounds and the lorries associated with this proposal will contribute to overall emissions. However, the increase in numbers of vehicle movements is relatively minor and would not materially affect nitrogen levels on Ashdown Forest.

6.17 This is a complicated issue, the implications of which are not straightforward. Despite this although the proposal will attract vehicle movements these are not significant enough in number to have a significant adverse impact on the nitrogen deposition levels and are therefore considered inconsequential where regard is had to the conservation objectives of the Ashdown Forest.

#### **Effect on the reinstatement of the Lewes to Uckfield Railway Line**

6.18 Saved Policy TR17 of the Wealden Local Plan seeks to resist any development that would prejudice the reinstatement of the Lewes to Uckfield Railway Line. It was on this basis that a number of temporary planning permissions have been granted by the District Council on the site to date. In the case of this application, the southern end of the proposed building would be located on the route of the former Uckfield to Lewes Railway Line.

6.19 As there is no material change in the status of Saved Policy TR17 since the previous approvals on the site, it is considered appropriate, if planning permission is granted, that the development should be for a temporary period only in line with the current ten-year joint waste contract. This would allow the situation to be appropriately reviewed at the end of this period to avoid any prejudice to the future delivery of Saved Policy TR17.

## **7. Conclusion and reasons for refusal**

7.1 In accordance with Section 38 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 the decision on this application should be taken in accordance with the Development Plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

7.2 The proposed development is for the continued use of the site as a waste management facility and the construction of a new MRF building. In principle, the development is supported by waste management policies, as the development is on an existing waste facility within an industrial estate, which is considered suitable for waste activities. However, the new structures would be placed along the eastern and southern boundaries of the site, which, due to inadequate space to adequately accommodate the new building, its siting would be highly likely to result in the removal of the trees along this boundary, or irrecoverable damage, thereby requiring their removal. This would result in the loss of an effective tree screen, which separates the waste facility from the adjoining office premises, thereby resulting in a change to the character of the location and a loss of amenity appropriate to the established adjoining land use.

7.3 This is a finely balanced proposal and reaching a conclusion on its merits has been difficult. However, taking into account all the considerations and matters referred to above, on balance, the development, as proposed, is not considered to be acceptable. As referred to above, the use of the site for waste management purposes is supported, in principle. Nonetheless, the scale of the building in this location and the resultant loss of screening is considered to be unacceptable in planning terms and the application should be refused. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policy WMP25a of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan 2013 and Saved Policy EN27(1) of the Wealden Local Plan 1998.

7.4 In determining this planning application, the County Council has worked with the agent in a positive and proactive manner. The Council has also sought views from consultees and neighbours and has considered these in preparing the recommendation. This approach has been taken positively

and proactively in accordance with the requirement in the NPPF, and as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015.

7.5 There are no other material considerations and the decision should be taken in accordance with the Development Plan.

## **8. Recommendation**

8.1 To recommend the Planning Committee to refuse planning permission for the reasons set out in Section 7 of this report and below:

1. The proposed new building has been incorporated into the site in such a way that it would be likely to require the removal, or lead to the irrecoverable damage and subsequent loss, of the existing line of trees on the eastern boundary of the site and trees on the southern boundary of the site. As a result, the site is considered to be too small to adequately accommodate the building without adversely affecting its boundary screening, which provides effective separation from the waste facility and the adjoining office premises to the east of the site. As such, there would be a conflict with Policy WMP25a of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan 2013 as the development would result in an unacceptable effect on the standard of amenity appropriate to the established adjoining land use and with Saved Policy EN27(1) of the Wealden Local Plan 1998 as the development would result in effects that would fail to respect the character of adjoining development.

RUPERT CLUBB

Director of Communities, Economy and Transport

10 May 2016

## **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

Application file WD/768/CM

Site History

The Development Plan