

BARCOMBE PARISH COUNCIL

Minutes of Barcombe Parish Council's Planning Meeting, held on Wednesday 12th November 2025 at 7.15pm in the Sports Pavilion.

Attendees: Cllrs Alexander, Parson, Smith and Sokoloff. Julia Shelley (Clerk).

MINUTES

Apologies: Cllrs Arnold, Holman and Skan

Declarations of Interest: None

Planning Applications:

Reference: LW/25/0600

Case Officer: Mr James Emery

Address: Bunces Farm Sharpsbridge Lane Newick

Planning Application - Single storey side and two storey rear extension, replacement garage and reinstatement of historic vehicular access for Mrs J Smart

Barcombe Parish Council is **neutral** towards this application.

Reference: LW/25/0594

Case Officer: Mr James Emery

Address: Clayhill Woods Isfield Road Ringmer East Sussex

Proposal: Replacement of agricultural barn with a residential - commercial unit (retrospective), extension to hardstanding, construction of equestrian manège and associated works

Barcombe Parish Council has **no comment** on this application.

Reference: LW/25/0597/CD

Address: Land At Bridgelands Barcombe Cross East Sussex

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions: 5 (Invasive Species), 8 (Foul Drainage) and 12 (CEMP) relating to approval LW/20/0245
Open for comment icon

Barcombe Parish Council's **comment attached as appendix.**

Reference: LW/25/0596/CD

Address: Land At Bridgelands Barcombe Cross East Sussex

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions: 8 (Drainage Monitoring), 13 (Access of Construction Traffic), 15 (CEMP), 18 (Energy Strategy) and 23 (WSI) in relation to approval LW/18/0627

Barcombe Parish Council's **comment attached as appendix.**

Reference: TW/25/0094

Address: Magnolia Cottage, School Hill

Proposal: Prune and shape magnolia, cherry, pear and crab apple.

Barcombe Parish Council is neutral towards this application.

Reference: LW/25/0589/CD

Address: Land West Of Barcombe Mills Road Barcombe East Sussex

Proposal: Discharge of condition 12 (BNG Details) relating to approval LW/22/0459

Barcombe Parish Council's **comment attached as appendix.**

ALL MEETINGS OF THE PARISH COUNCIL ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC

Decision Notices – Noted

Discharge condition 14 (ecological mitigation) in relation to planning approval LW/18/0627
Bridgelands Barcombe Cross East Sussex

Approved

Regularisation of works Ref. No: LW/25/0241
The Old Post Office Deadmantree Hill Barcombe East Sussex BN8 4SS

Approved

Discharge of Condition 10 (CMS) of Planning Appeal Decision APP/P1425/W/23/3323308)
Land West Of Barcombe Mills Road Barcombe East Sussex

Approved

Next Meeting: December 2025, TBC

Barcombe Parish Council's Objection to Application Reference: LW/25/0597/CD

Address: Land At Bridgelands Barcombe Cross East Sussex

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions: 5 (Invasive Species), 8 (Foul Drainage) and 12 (CEMP) relating to approval LW/20/0245

Date: 19th November 2025

Barcombe Parish Council is negative towards this application and seeks further information and clarity regarding the following:

Condition 5: (Invasive Species)

There is concern for both present and future residents over the removal of Japanese Knotweed due to its invasive nature and potential for property damage.

The Parish Council requests further information and clarity on the method taken for removal of JKW as there are two separate documents outlining different methods.

It was stated in the Strategy for the Responsible Removal of all Invasive Plant Species, submitted on 22nd September 2025, that "The site will be monitored for 2–3 growing seasons to ensure no regrowth occurs. If regrowth is identified follow-up herbicide treatments will be applied."

If herbicides are to be used, it is noted from the Environment Agency (<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/prevent-japanese-knotweed-from-spreading>) that:

You'll have to respray. It usually takes at least 3 years to treat Japanese knotweed. Knotweed rhizome can remain dormant in the soil for many years and will regrow if disturbed or if the soil is relocated.

Who will be responsible for monitoring and respraying during this period?

It is also important to note that, like any weed, JKW is best treated in late summer and autumn as it is far more likely to reach deep into the plant and kill the entire plant by applying at this time of the year.

While it is welcomed that invasive plant experts will be undertaking the work (Method Statement, Environment UK), we wish to highlight the following points made by the Ecology Officer, ESCC, from his letter, 7th November 2025, and request that further information be provided before this condition is approved:

- 5. The JKW MS (para 12) states that the pit to bury the JKW will be between Plots 3 and 5, under the proposed road. The exact location is not shown on a plan, but we note its location and depth will be accurately recorded using GPS. We note from review of the Foul Drainage Layout Plan (Meridian, 04/10/2025, Ref:MC0711-FW02-P1 Rev-) submitted to discharge condition 8, that there is limited room for burying JKW between Plots 3 and 5 due to below ground geo-cellular attenuation tanks, foul and surface water pipe runs and inspection chambers (see extract below). **RPS 178 also requires that any burial is more than 7 metres away from an adjacent landowner's site**, which may restrict use of the road's bell mouth (see extract below). **The**

Council may wish to check in advance where the proposed pit will be located and that it can remain unaffected by ongoing development.

- 7. Any ground works in the JKW exclusion zone from November, and into the winter period, will be carried out at the Applicant's (and their consultant ecologist's risk) and must be evidenced as appropriate by the use of recent and forecasted temperature data. As previously advised, this evidence must be sent to LDC prior to the start of works in the JKW exclusion zone.
- 8. We note that the JKW MS (para 25) states that where soil containing viable rhizomes cannot be excavated (due to underground obstructions, tree roots, groundwater, hazardous substances etc.) to ',,, agree alternative course of action with client. This may involve use of root barrier along property boundaries or herbicides'. The Council may wish to know what the intended course of action is should tree RPAs restrict excavation.

The Parish Council requests expert removal and off-site disposal of the longstanding Japanese Knotweed, plus independent verifications of its extent and removal, for the sake of current and future parishioners. The PC is disappointed by the confusion in both submissions and ESCC advice, and notes that the ESCC Ecology department states that it lacks expertise but gives approval in principle for burying JKW in an on-site pit of unspecified location – this is neither clear nor seems acceptable best practice for a high-risk species and wet site that will be heavily dug as it is small and without leaway.

Condition 8 (Foul Drainage)

The reserved matters application to provide details of the layout and appearance for this development was approved on condition that houses would connect to the Southern Water sewage system but this condition application includes provision for a sewage package plant due to the distance from the main sewer. Surely it was known before the first submission that the distance of the drain run to the nearest Southern Water foul manhole was greater than 180m.

8. No development shall commence until a detailed foul drainage plan has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The drainage plan shall be supported by correspondence with Southern Water along with confirmation of an appropriate connection agreement, agreed discharge rates and details of any necessary improvements that would need to be made to the existing sewerage infrastructure.

No part of the development shall be occupied until the relevant foul drainage system has been installed in accordance with the approved plans and any required improvements made to the drainage network.

Reason: In order to ensure drainage is managed correctly and surrounding water bodies are protected from pollution in accordance with LLP1 policies CP10 and CP12, LLP2 policy DM22 and paras. 187 and 198 of the NPPF.

It is also noted in the Planning Applications Committee report from April 2025, that:

8.33 Policy BA03 includes a requirement that foul drainage of the site should be via a connection to the public sewerage system at the nearest point of adequate capacity, as advised by Southern Water. The submitted plans do not show a sewerage connection. However, it is considered that details of an agreed connection can be secured by condition, noting the duty of Southern Water as a statutory undertaker to provide a foul connection.

There is serious concern from the PC on the use of private sewage systems within the village. We therefore request that additional information is sought before any approval is given.

Specific concerns include:

- The developer will provide a maintenance contract for a short period and then it will be left to homeowners to invest sufficiently to ensure proper maintenance. How is this enforced?

The sewage treatment plant operating model is available online and raises additional questions:

- The plant needs to be installed at a minimum of 7m from any dwelling and 3m from any site boundary. The location provided seems very close to the 7m (from plot 5) and it is not clear where the site boundary is.
- The plant needs to be 10m from a watercourse. It is next to the pond.
- The plant needs access for desludging and this includes the requirement that the truck access area cannot be closer than 4m from the covers of the plant.
- The plant should have a ventilation pipe that takes into consideration the prevailing wind. It should also terminate from a "suitable distance and height" to consider the surrounding dwellings.
- The plant seems to need a compressor. What is the plan to manage noise?
- There is a clear service checklist (section 5). Who will undertake this work?
- In regard to discharge and "drainage fields" the manual specifically mentions **"Take account of the requirements of Building Regulations and discuss with the local planning authority at an early stage - well before any planning application is made."** It recommends the use of a drainage field and no mention of a discharge (to pond outlet) as proposed by the developer.
- Desludging is required. Who will manage this? Is there infrastructure for the desludging tank to access the site (and not pass the 4m boundary)? It seems that this would need to be done every 6 months. Is this understood by the new residents and planning authority?
- How long can the treatment plant accept wastewater when the power is out (or if there is damaged equipment)?
- What is the level of treatment proposed? Will this include Nitrogen and Phosphorus removal?

- Will treated water discharge into the pond?

The Planning Applications Committee report from April 2025 stated:

8.40 It is noted that the County Ecologist initially had reservations about the existing pond being used for the discharge of surface water. However, as the pond will only be used to manage discharge from one of the three tanks and that additional rainwater planters (roof run-off only), permeable paving and filter drains, along with the attenuation tanks and the existing ditch and culvert themselves will allow for pollutants to be intercepted, the ecologist has now confirmed that (they) approve of the drainage arrangements and that their concerns have been addressed.

Condition 12 (CEMP) - Construction Environment Management Plan

The PC notes that the ESCC Ecology department has not yet addressed this condition and that is unsatisfactory in relation to the timescale of the developers and the PC response.

The PC wrote to Neil Collins, Head of Development Management, in September, seeking a summary of his expectations on ecological details but did not get a reply.

Barcombe residents have raised a number of ecological concerns about the CEMP.

The Planning Applications Committee report from April 2025, stipulated in 8.38 that:

Boundary treatment in the form of fencing as well as thorny native planting such as hawthorn and blackthorn will be used to restrict incursion into the wildlife enhancement areas by people as well as pets such as cats that can result in significant harm to wildlife.

The pond would be included in the enhancement area and would also be subject to controls on access in order to prevent disturbance to the habitat it provides.

- Is there any specification about the details of this particular area of planting and fencing and controls on access, based on expert advice because of the ecological sensitivity of the area and the ecological impact of developing this site?
- The ESCC Ecologist advised the Planning Committee in 2025 that the nightingale corridor here is significant at district level at least and that as the risk from cats is so high, households should be asked not to own a cat. This was overruled by the head of Planning and instead 'fencing' was proposed without more details.
- The CEMP provides no details about Mr Collins' fencing nor on the specifications for the thorny scrub as referred to above. Will the nesting area be protected from all sides? Who will address off-site planting to reduce the harms caused by on-site cats? The most effective fencing to exclude cats needs to be specified from the variety of options, materials and heights. Independent expert Ornithology advice is requested.
- Works are expected to run throughout 2026 : Will works be adapted during the nightingale breeding season of April – July? Will effective fencing be put in place before the breeding

season? Who will advise about this and oversee this in practice? Has the offer of advice from Sussex Ornithological Society been followed up by LDC?

- **Claims about “maintaining connectivity”:** Clarification is needed on what connectivity is being maintained, where, and how—particularly given the current ecological clearance across the site and the loss of what can be defined as a connected nature corridor in the development plans.
- **Tree root protection zones:** we ask that effective fencing is in place before there is any more surface scraping or digging. The mid-site tree with a TPO requires particular care because of its location. We seek supervision of RPZ interventions by LDC in advance of works in light of LDC’s experience of the failure of compliance on the Hillside site. We seek application of ESCC advice that the AIA is out of date and did not assess the impact of JKW excavations.
- **Ecology Condition 5 Invasive species.** The PC seeks expert removal and off-site disposal of the longstanding Japanese Knotweed, plus independent verifications of its extent and removal, for the sake of future parishioners. The PC is disappointed by the confusion in both submissions and ESCC advice and notes that the ESCC Ecology department states that it lacks expertise but gives approval in principle even for burying JKW in an on-site pit of unspecified location – this is neither clear nor seems acceptable best practice for a high-risk species and wet site that will be heavily dug as it is small and without leaway.
- **We note that a lot of habitat information is out of date and that effective surveys are out of date or were never done.** For example, the description of “ruderal grass” is now inaccurate and fails to acknowledge the extensive connected bramble across the site. This is very suitable **Dormouse habitat according to recent peer reviewed research and this was overlooked or denied.** The assertion that LWS species are absent is not credible without full surveys, and the connectivity with the LWS that the ESCC Ecologist stated has been downplayed. Combined with the out of date AIA, these gaps lead us to question the quality of the ecological perspective and management approach of these developers and suggest that supervision is needed.

Barcombe Parish Council's Objection to Application Reference: LW/25/0596/CD

Address: Land At Bridgelands Barcombe Cross East Sussex

Proposal: Discharge of Conditions: 8 (Drainage Monitoring), 13 (Access of Construction Traffic), 15 (CMP), 18 (Energy Strategy) and 23 (WSI) in relation to approval LW/18/0627

Date: 19th November 2025

Barcombe Parish Council is negative towards this application until further information can be provided.

Condition 8 (Drainage Monitoring)

We note the position of the LLFA seeking further information in their letter dated 10th November 2025:

There is also a condition attached to the Reserve Matters consent which requires investigation into the private surface water sewer thought to cross the site, which may affect the drainage designs.

While we can't comment on the drainage monitoring report itself, the Parish Council has concerns we wish to reiterate about the management and maintenance for the drainage system, the details of which were included in both the SuDS report from March 2025 and the Management and Maintenance Plan from February 2025, as these are particularly onerous with checks needing to be carried out frequently.

Who will oversee that this work is carried out in accordance with the Nimbus report and who will be responsible for the long-term management of this?

Additionally, we seek clarity on the following:

Will details be provided for the improvement and maintenance works to the existing ditch network to ensure functionality? Who will oversee this work is carried out?

Has the treated wastewater run-off from the on-site sewage plant been factored into the surface water drainage calculations and maintenance of the drainage system? The reserved matters application to provide details of the layout and appearance for this development was approved on condition that houses would connect to the Southern Water sewage system but the latest submission includes provision for a sewage package plant. Will this substantial change affect the drainage system in any way?

Condition 13 (Access of Construction Traffic), Condition 15 (CMP)

Consideration should be given to the maximum size and type of delivery vehicle accessing the site considering its location off the High Street, which is narrow with parked vehicles, and the width and weight constraints of Bridgelands roadway itself. The Parish Council would suggest a condition is placed limiting access to six-wheeler rigid body delivery vehicles.

The PC respectfully request that there is no parking on Bridgelands or the High Street and that HGVs do not travel through the village from Barcombe Mills Road for the reasons stated above.

Condition 18 (Energy Strategy)

We wish to highlight the comments of the Lewes District Air Quality Officer pertaining to this condition:

6.7 Representation -

"I have no comment to make in respect of the above planning application with regard to air quality as it is not a major planning application nor will it unduly affect any nearby air quality management area. I would however request that EV charge points are installed at all properties and if a zero emission (air source heat pumps or similar) building energy source is not feasible, that ultra-low NOx boilers are installed and approved by the LPA prior to installation.

Officer comment – The officer requests can be addressed through conditions attached to the outline approval that secure a sustainable energy strategy and the provision of electric vehicle charging points.

There is no mention of EV charge points in the Energy Statement. Please can we confirm that these will be included in the design as per the Air Quality Officer's representation?

Condition 23 (WSI - Written Scheme of Investigation for Archaeological Evaluation)

There is no mention of the Japanese Knotweed known to be present on this site in The Written Scheme of Investigation (WSI) for Archaeological Evaluation.

The WSI mentions in the methodology section that:

The trial trench evaluation will comprise 6 x 20m x 2m trenches (Fig. 2). This represents a 5% sample of the c.0.55ha development area. Trench locations may be altered, subject to unforeseen on-site constraints. Provision will be made to expand/add additional trenches to clarify initial results, if required.

Given that large trenches are to be dug and that the soil will be disturbed and sifted through, will this require an additional risk assessment prior to the commencement of work to prevent the possible spread and contamination from the JKW?