

CHAPTER 9 INFRASTRUCTURE	
POLICY INF1	Infrastructure provision, delivery and funding
Q61 a) Do you agree?	No.
b) Should we change anything?	<p>We support the principles of the policy and infrastructure is key to ensuring new developments and householders can be adequately integrated into the existing community, but we have serious concerns about how this will work in practice. Policy INF1 1) to 5) is fantastic, and for that we support this policy, but it is then let down by the caveat of Viability 6) onwards in order to meet UK Govt housebuilding targets.</p> <p>INF1 states that <i>'planning permission will only be granted where it can be demonstrated that there is or will be sufficient infrastructure capacity to support and meet all necessary infrastructure requirements.'</i> Major planning applications in Uckfield have to date provided limited infrastructure and have actually depended on Town Council or local town facilities to meet their infrastructure, and open space/play requirements.</p> <p>What is the basic criteria that needs to be met? At present, the infrastructure being provided consists of play areas and SANGS for major developments even in the region of 200-350 homes. The applications seen on the periphery of Uckfield, do not provide walkable and '20 minute walking distance' to medical services, schools, nor do they all have access to 'frequent' bus services. There is no play provision other than a play area which meet the needs of ages up to 8 year olds, and walkways are often limited to onsite residential pavements, linking up to existing East Sussex Rights of Way (this is Ridgewood Place/Ridgewood Farm site) which themselves are in desperate need of resource (people and financial) to upgrade their condition.</p> <p>As detailed in INF1 3), the timing of infrastructure provision is vital. This has already been seen by residents in Red Clover Road and Meadow Grass Lane (new Taylor Wimpey development named Ridgewood Place, off Lewes Road, Uckfield), where the highways are not adopted and unlikely to be for another couple of years. Residents are struggling with speeding vehicles and altercations at a junction which has yet to be marked out. Road markings and signage should have been insisted upon much earlier in the S106 agreement to ensure the safety of the families moving into these properties.</p> <p>There is also a delay in receiving the CIL monies, attributed to new house building. Having seen most of the 250 homes built on the Ridgewood Farm site, and 119 homes being built off Mallard Drive, Uckfield, we have yet to see any substantial CIL contributions, nor impact on the Council Tax Base, which assists with determining the precept for the following financial year. This time lag, delays the work that could be done in association with partner agencies to provide for our new residents.</p>
c) Have they missed anything?	As discussed above, in practice we have grave concerns around the caveat in this policy outlined in INF1 6) - viability. Figures can be manipulated for and against a position, so we have concerns that if certain requirements are not set out and worked to in the early stages/outline planning permission element of the application process, that the infrastructure required will be lost during the reserved matters phase, once their costings, increase.
POLICY INF2	Active and sustainable travel
Q62 a) Do you agree?	Yes.
b) Should we change anything?	The aims as set out are ok. They are very desirable. The more the town extends and spreads out, the more people will use their own cars, not public transport which is infrequent, a distance away and does not have depth of coverage.

<p>c) Have they missed anything?</p>	<p>We have a very hilly topography in the Uckfield area and people are less likely to walk or cycle. The proposed routes to access the town centre in the Ridgewood Farm applications were unfortunately proposed via a very undulating route, whereas a footway along the bypass could have been wider to provide for cycling, and flat to ensure inclusivity for all.</p> <p>Further to INF2 4). We continue to advise that where there are a number of applications in one area, planners need to consider the cumulative impact of multiple new junctions, on existing vehicular movements. The south of Uckfield is due to see the following sites be built out:</p> <p>Siggs Yard – 9 homes Southside of Uckfield – up to 15 homes Ridgewood House – 9 homes Eastbourne Road – 90 homes Mallard Drive – 119 homes Ridgewood Farm (southern access for Phase 1) – 250 homes Horsted Pond Farm – 340 homes Plus any further approvals such as Cysleys Farm and those allocated in the Site Allocations document -</p> <p>Lewes Road, which is rural in its landscape and layout from New Road south towards Little Horsted roundabout is due to see four new access points in the space of 2-4 years, and will see at three to five new access points between New Road and Sand Ridge north. There seems to be no overall cumulative consideration, and the memorandum of understanding with ES Highways and the major applicants of developments in the vicinity of Uckfield has resulted in no communication or engagement with the local Town Council since its establishment.</p> <p>As seen in response to INF1, the timing of infrastructure provision is vital. INF2 4 d). refers to the need for safe vehicle speeds and prioritising non-motorised travel, and we already have evidence of the delays in the S106 agreement requirements and requirements on the developer themselves once the houses have been built in Red Clover Road/Meadow Grass Lane (new Taylor Wimpey development named Ridgewood Place, off Lewes Road, Uckfield), where the highways are not adopted and unlikely to be for another couple of years. Residents are struggling with speeding vehicles and altercations at a junction which has yet to be marked out. Road markings and signage should have been insisted upon much earlier in the S106 agreement to ensure the safety of the families moving into these properties.</p>
<p>POLICY INF3</p>	<p>Parking provisions</p>
<p>Q63 a) Do you agree?</p>	<p>We agree.</p>
<p>b) Should we change anything?</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>c) Have they missed anything?</p>	<p>The biggest issue we see now, is not parking provision for the properties themselves but adequate space being provided for larger households, extended/concealed households where young people are still living at home, and trade vans of home owners/tenants, and this is before any visitors visit the sites. A specific example is Fernley Park, Uckfield. As you travel across the mini roundabout at the entrance to Fernley Park (accessed by Teelings Drive, Uckfield), you will see a number of vehicles parked all round the bend on the entrance to the estate. This is a fairly new development which just doesn't have the space to accommodate these additional vehicles over</p>

	<p>and above the set parking guidelines for residential properties.</p> <p>Parking spaces must also allow for increased vehicle sizes.</p>
POLICY INF4	Utilities
Q64 a) Do you agree?	Yes.
b) Should we change anything?	No development should be allowed until utility provision is in place. This should not be post development. It must be a condition of permission that the facilities are already there.
c) Have they missed anything?	<p>The disposal and dispersal of sewage has become recently a national topic as a result of untreated sewage being discharged into the sea at various locations around the coast of the British Isles. The issue is partly due to lack of funding and infrastructure also as a result of lack of forward planning. This is now highlighted by pollutive effect on key areas which during the summer months are utilised for leisure. The concern is that with projected major development (primarily residential) the existing system is inadequate and potential risk to health and safety. On a recent trip down the M1 Motorway what stood out was the increasing commercial and industrial (perhaps one should say technological) complexes which did not exist even 10 years ago. These huge buildings must house a large number of people (think Amazon) which again puts pressure on the sewerage/drainage capacity that previously may only have catered for agricultural usage.</p> <p>The above overview therefore highlights the major changes which have taken place to existing land usage compounded by substantial increase in the built environment. Whereas up to the middle of the 20th century much of the created sewage in rural locations would be disposed by natural dispersal and collection i.e. Cesspools and Septic Tanks, modernisation requires that effluent (and not just sewage but commercial waste products) needs to be controlled by much more efficient and safe means taking into account short and long term environmental impact. In short this determines that sewage, before any outflow is permitted, has to be properly and carefully treated.</p> <p>Within Uckfield there is a Sewage Works very close to the town centre. This has been plagued with many faults again worsened by the substantial increase in housing and population for the last quarter of a century. Health issues have become critical from the large number of small flies which on some days swarms the properties close to the works. As yet no solution has been found to alleviate this problem. Local residents have been severely affected, the matter is most pronounced during the warmer and hot weather.</p> <p>The proposals for many more residential units to be built over next 15 years (the period of this study or thereabouts) will exasperate the situation without radical projects to provide a much better (and larger) "Sewage Works " in a different location to the existing and positioned away from new estates. Associated improved drainage systems will be required involving the laying of new pipes and drains. The system should also have different flows for sewage (and possibly waste water i.e. sink and bath outflow) but subject to size of pipe and drainage fall (partly controlled by geological factors such as steep land, hills, hollows, rivers etc as exists in part at present) Surface water including rain and other precipitation should feed via independent " surface water drains " these may have to take into account the periodic local flooding which can occur for example from the River Uck (as seen in 2000).</p> <p>To summarise the following are important matters in relation to future drainage works</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish the full extent of the current drainage/sewage disposal system. The location of the principal drains and sewers need to be confirmed.

	<p>2. Investigate siting of new Sewage Works (maybe more than one) away from residential units.</p> <p>3. In relation to the physical features of Uckfield (it is very undulating being on southern edge of Ashdown Forest) design new drainage routes to avoid deep Invert levels.</p> <p>4. A complete ban needs to be in place to prevent any raw sewage discharging into River Uck/ River Ouse and surrounding watercourses.</p> <p>5. An early design proforma and potential course of new drains to be initiated prior to further major developments.</p>
POLICY INF5	Safeguarding of infrastructure
Q65 a) Do you agree?	Yes.
b) Should we change anything?	We agree that development should not be permitted on the land that would need to be utilised to reinstate the Lewes to Uckfield line (Wealden line).
c) Have they missed anything?	-
POLICY INF6	Digital and communication infrastructure
Q66 a) Do you agree?	Yes, we agree.
b) Should we change anything?	
c) Have they missed anything?	
POLICY INF7	Local services and community facilities
Q67 a) Do you agree?	Yes, the basis of the policy is sound.
b) Should policy EC8 apply to all local services and community facilities including publicly owned services and facilities (such as public schools, public libraries, public medical facilities or should Policy EC8 just apply to commercial local services and facilities, such as public houses and shop	We believe it should relate to all. Policy EC8 should be applied to all premises and services which benefit the public.
c) Should we change anything?	Greater scrutiny should be given to evidence providing by those seeking to dispose of assets of benefit to the community. For example, a landowner or agent's statement that a premise has not been let or sold for use in its current function must who proof of its genuinely full and fair marketing before a change of use or demolition is countenanced.
d) Have they missed anything?	A reasonable expectation that new development must bring with it an enhanced offering of beneficial infrastructure should be incorporated.

	<p>A resident suggested that if the health services combined locations, there is potential to utilise existing sites in Uckfield to meet not only our affordable housing requirements (1 bed units close to the train station at the rear of the Police station, or the potential for further car parking close to the centre). The existing ambulance station within Uckfield Hospital in Framfield Road could be used as a 111 paramedic surgery alongside the minor injuries department. With the local GP surgeries over subscribed and pharmacies being able to prescribe more non urgent advice and medications, this could be a vital town resource.</p>
POLICY INF8	Open spaces, sport and recreation facilities
Q68 a) Do you agree?	Yes we agree.
b) Should we change anything?	-
c) Have they missed anything?	<p>Views from the Ashdown Forest can be stunning with a particular feature of sunsets on both mid summers and mid winter days. Across the northern section of Wealden there are many historic footpaths, including lengths of the Weald Way, a long distance path extending from Gravesend in the north of Kent and adjoining the Thames Estuary to Eastbourne on the south coast, a distance of nearly 140 kms.</p> <p>The proposed substantial increase in population will put pressure on the need for more and improved sporting facilities. There is already a shortage of pitches – Soccer, Rugby, Cricket, Stoolball (a game very local to Surrey, Sussex and Kent) and to date there is no athletic track (all weather) within Wealden District. Premises for indoor activities are available but will not be sufficient for expected growth.</p> <p>Cost is understandably a major restricting factor, but serious consideration must be given to activities which improve and enhance health and wellbeing. There are three active swimming pools, Uckfield, Crowborough and Hailsham although it is unlikely that these can match the anticipated growth over the next decade. Targets to ensure very child learns to swim by the time they leave primary school, must be retained.</p> <p>In general terms projects up to 2030 and allowing a further five year period for implementation will need to address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) significant development of cycle paths, encouraging developers to incorporate; (ii) highlighting sites which can be developed for outdoor sports; (iii) improving public footpaths, and maintaining existing routes – adapted for wheelchair, pushchairs, scooters etc; (iv) investigate a suitable site for provision of 400m Athletic track, with ancillary buildings to include changing rooms, gym and allow for training, coaching and development and improvement to UK Athletic disciplines. Briefly termed track and field. Ideal locations often are best adjoining a school or existing sports complex. A suitable undeveloped site however is often more practical.