For official use only (date received): 03/07/2023 15:59:28

The Planning Inspectorate

COMMENTS ON CASE (Online Version)

Please note that comments about this case need to be made within the timetable. This can be found in the notification letter sent by the local planning authority or the start date letter. Comments submitted after the deadline may be considered invalid and returned to sender.

Appeal Reference: APP/C1435/W/23/3321978

DETAILS OF THE CASE

Appeal Reference	APP/C1435/W/23/3321978
Appeal By	GLEESON LAND AND JOHN ALISON LAND AND RESEARCH LTD
Site Address	Land at Downlands Farm Uckfield TN22 3PU Grid Ref Easting: 546619 Grid Ref Northing: 122026

SENDER DETAILS

Name	[redacted]
Address	[redacted]

ABOUT YOUR COMMENTS

In what capacity do you wish to make representations on this case?

- ☐ Appellant
- ☐ Agent
- ☑ Interested Party / Person
- ☐ Land Owner
- ☐ Rule 6 (6)

What kind of representation are you making?

- ☐ Final Comments
- ☐ Proof of Evidence
- ☐ Statement
- ☐ Statement of Common Ground
- ☑ Interested Party/Person Correspondence
- ☐ Other

YOUR COMMENTS ON THE CASE

1. Loss of amenity. Lake Wood is an open but quiet space for local residents and their families to use. This development will put at risk that public amenity of being enjoyed in the same way.

2. Housing development this close to Lake Wood will most certainly impact negatively on its biodiversity and the tranquillity enjoyed by its wildlife.

3. I have reproduced her the comments from the Highway Authority, East Sussex CC:

1. All 3 accesses and accessibility measures for active travel cannot be accepted as being deliverable from both a design and highway safety perspective.
2. Public Right of Way (PRoW) routes are inappropriate for everyday use as surfaces and gradients are unsuited to vulnerable users, prams/buggies, and require solid footwear.
3. The community transport option has received objections from the Passenger Transport Team, though there is a further option to explore and discuss.
4. Highway impact on the town centre roads has not been addressed.
5. The scheme is detached from the urban fabric of the town, and this prevents any efficient connectivity to the local amenities.

4. London Road, Snatts Road and Rocks Road are already very heavily trafficked for their capacity, leaving aside the hazardous nature of the latter two. Neither Snatts Road nor Rocks road can be used by pedestrians or cyclists. Both are simply too dangerous and there are no footways for most of the length of those two roads. Both would need to be reconstructed from London Road all the way through to a point on Rocks Road south-east of the proposed development.

5. Even more traffic on those roads will increase the risk of traffic collisions and injuries to pedestrian and cyclists, especially along London Road, where many primary school children use to walk to school along its very narrow footways. Additional traffic from the residents of 424 new homes will just add to congestion on these roads AND on the already busy A22.

6. Without doubt, an additional access roundabout on the A22 will further reduce the capacity of this busy road. A new yet still redundant roundabout on this road has been recently constructed for access to the site of 1000 homes just a few Kilometres further south. It already has the effect of slowly traffic, yet has served no useful purpose. With the intention of all vehicular traffic accessing the site directly from the A22, I estimate that at least another 500-600 vehicles will used the road and probably more than that This development will also be isolated from the town.

7. Surely, the many informed bodies such as the District, Town and Parish cannot all be wrong in their objections to this over development? Regarding the impact on biodiversity in this area, the comments of expert organisations like the Sussex Wildlife and Woodland Trusts can likewise not be rejected out of hand.

8. Where is the infrastructure going to come, who is going to provide it and on what timescales and where is the funding for it? The northern end of Uckfield town already needs new schools, GP surgeries, improved roads and a public park.

9. The irreplaceable habitat afforded by this site to wildlife and its biodiversity will be lost forever if the development were to go ahead.

10. Given these issues, this proposed development cannot remotely be considered to be sustainable and must be rejected.

COMMENT DOCUMENTS

The documents listed below were uploaded with this form:

Relates to Section: REPRESENTATION
Document Description: Your comments on the appeal.
File name: Objection Downlands Farm site.docx

PLEASE ENSURE THAT A COPY OF THIS SHEET IS ENCLOSED WHEN POSTING THE ABOVE DOCUMENTS TO US

1. Loss of amenity. Lake Wood is an open but quiet space for local residents and their families to use. This development will put at risk that public amenity of being enjoyed in the same way.
2. Housing development this close to Lake Wood will most certainly impact negatively on its biodiversity and the tranquillity enjoyed by its wildlife.
3. I have reproduced her the comments from the Highway Authority, East Sussex CC:

> *1. All 3 accesses and accessibility measures for active travel cannot be accepted as being deliverable from both a design and highway safety perspective.*
> *2. Public Right of Way (PRoW) routes are inappropriate for everyday use as surfaces and gradients are unsuited to vulnerable users, prams/buggies, and require solid footwear.*
> *3. The community transport option has received objections from the Passenger Transport Team, though there is a further option to explore and discuss.*
> *4. Highway impact on the town centre roads has not been addressed.*
> *5. The scheme is detached from the urban fabric of the town, and this prevents any efficient connectivity to the local amenities.*

4. London Road, Snatts Road and Rocks Road are already very heavily trafficked for their capacity, leaving aside the hazardous nature of the latter two. Neither Snatts Road nor Rocks road can be used by pedestrians or cyclists. Both are simply too dangerous and there are no footways for most of the length of those two roads. Both would need to be reconstructed from London Road all the way through to a point on Rocks Road south-east of the proposed development.
5. Even more traffic on those roads will increase the risk of traffic collisions and injuries to pedestrian and cyclists, especially along London Road, where many primary school children use to walk to school along its very narrow footways. Additional traffic from the residents of 424 new homes will just add to congestion on these roads AND on the already busy A22.
6. Without doubt, an additional access roundabout on the A22 will further reduce the capacity of this busy road. A new yet still redundant roundabout on this road has been recently constructed for access to the site of 1000 homes just a few Kilometres further south. It already has the effect of slowly traffic, yet has served no useful purpose. With the intention of all vehicular traffic accessing the site directly from the A22, I estimate that at least another 500-600 vehicles will used the road and probably more than that This development will also be isolated from the town.
7. Surely, the many informed bodies such as the District, Town and Parish cannot all be wrong in their objections to this over development? Regarding the impact on biodiversity in this area, the comments of expert organisations like the Sussex Wildlife and Woodland Trusts can likewise not be rejected out of hand.
8. Where is the infrastructure going to come, who is going to provide it and on what timescales and where is the funding for it? The northern end of Uckfield town already needs new schools, GP surgeries, improved roads and a public park.
9. The irreplaceable habitat afforded by this site to wildlife and its biodiversity will be lost forever if the development were to go ahead.
10. Given these issues, this proposed development cannot remotely be considered to be sustainable and must be rejected.