

7 Thomas Turner Drive
East Hoathly
East Sussex
BN8 6QF

Telephone:01825 840082

E-mail: villageconcerns2016@gmail.com

Thursday, 3 March 2022

Dear Mr Robins,

Redrow Homes - Hesmond's Stud

Detailed Planning Application WD/2022/0341/MAJ

1. We are writing to you as the Co-Chairs of Village Concerns, a local Action Group from East Hoathly with Halland Parish. We represent the views of over 200 supporters against the overdevelopment of our Parish.
2. We object to Planning Application WD/2022/0341/MAJ. Further than that we object to the presentation of this application for public consultation. This is a Detailed planning application and it lacks a considerable amount of the detail that is required prior to consideration by planning committee:

Submitted documents are incomplete.

Some documents contradict each other.

Documents are still being added after the start of the consultation period.

There are errors on the red line description of the site.

Information in supporting documents including significant recommendations and matters of material significance have not been incorporated into the Access and Design Statement.

3. Furthermore, the application has a fundamental flaw in that it presumes that the principle of development has been established. This is incorrect. The Judicial Review of the Outline Consent granted for Planning Application WD/2016/2796/MAO is proceeding to a full Judicial Review hearing. You know this and the applicant know this and yet their entire case is built around a presumption of outline planning consent for this site.

4. Page 6 of the application's Design and Access Statement (Issue 3 dated 26 January 2022) states:

“The principle for residential development of the site is therefore confirmed. Striking similarities between that permission granted just over 6 months ago and that proposed now are:

Identical number of dwellings

Identical level of affordable provision

Identical level of custom-build development plots

Identical vehicular and pedestrian access points

The move from Outline to Full planning application demonstrates the clear intent by Redrow Homes as a national volume house builder to deliver these homes, infrastructure and enhanced built and natural environments”.

This statement is dated 26 January 2022 fourteen days after the date of the Judicial Review Oral Hearing on 12 January 2022 during which the decision for a full hearing was granted by Justice Lang. There is therefore no excuse for the submission of this misleading and incorrect information.

5. The applicant's claim that there are striking similarities between the Detailed Application WD/2022/0341/MAJ and the Outline Application WD/2016/2796/MAO are incorrect:

The applicant claims that Application WD/2022/0341/MAJ has identical vehicular and pedestrian access points. This is incorrect.

It remains unclear to us what access arrangements the members of Planning Committee South thought they were approving on 16 July 2020. The Officer's Report proposed that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions. Condition 18 states “No development shall be occupied until the vehicular access serving the development has been constructed in accordance with the approved drawing no 39667/5508/005 Rev C as amended as part of the s278 agreement and detailed design. HW08(M)”. The only plans in the Officer's Report that show the access arrangements show a roundabout access onto London road. This plan is shown twice. However, the decision notice included Revision G, not Revision C. The brief planning meeting did not include any debate on the access arrangements despite it being a matter of significant

public objection. No detailed plans were presented for the Waldron Road access, no Road Safety Analysis, No ESCC Highways approval (despite their repeated requests for details), and, despite significant public objection, full permission for access was granted.

The Access Drawing (Revision G) included in Decision Notice dated 11 June 2021 still shows a roundabout on London Road. It has been overwritten but is still confusing and ambiguous.

The new application proposes the speed limit is reduced to 40 mph on the London Road. This was not the case for original application. The highways authority had stipulated that the speed be controlled by visible frontage development. Village Concerns did not agree with this concept but nevertheless it was the agreed position of ESCC Highways approval of the access arrangements for the Outline Consent.

The pedestrian access point now being proposed is different to the one approved in 2020. The only plan showing the proposed route of the PROW in the Officer's Report shows the route is inside the hedge line of proposed development. This is different to the new application which also proposes removal of the pavement on the North side of London Road so that users of the PROW would have to cross the London Road to access the village.

The applicant has selected 4 matters on which they think the applications are strikingly similar. On the matter of vehicle and pedestrian access this is absolutely incorrect. Further, they have ignored matters where the applications are strikingly dissimilar. They have ignored the totally different housing mix. They have ignored the totally different proposed layout. They have ignored the approval for 55 homes to be built on South Street which will have an impact on this application (not least on the traffic analysis).

6. We note that in the pre application meetings with Redrow Homes that the planning department has on more than one occasion recommended a reduction in the number of homes on the site. Given that this was a significant issue when the Outline Consent was approved we are disappointed that Redrow Homes have ignored this advice. Redrow have also chosen to ignore that Historic England raised the issue of the number of homes being unacceptable and even Parker Dann conceded that a smaller number of homes might be considered. We trust that you will continue to pursue a smaller number of homes for this proposal.

7. We have identified 2 places where the red line boundary of the proposed site is incorrect. It does not match with the Land Registry Cadestral mapping. The 2 instances both appear to have been altered to suit the needs of the developer. The encroachments are small but this is wholly unacceptable and the landowners should be approached if the developer wishes to do anything on their land.
8. The submission of a Detailed Application with a flawed assumption of Outline Consent makes it very difficult for the public to comment. Village Concerns are still objecting to the principle of development and are not prepared to engage with a developer who has not established this principle. The detailed application stage should be one where we are be able to work with a developer to get the best outcome for a site once the principle of development has been established.
9. We request that you get Redrow Homes to update their submission to honestly reflect the situation with respect of the High Courts decision to grant a full Judicial Review Hearing. They should do this in all the documents that contain false information. We believe that as a Local Planning Authority you should not accept this application as fit for public consultation until the Judicial Review process has been concluded.
10. We request that you restart the public consultation of this application when all the supporting documentation has been published correctly.

Katherine Gutkind and Kathryn Richardson
Co-Chairs
Village Concerns

cc

Councillor Draper
Parish Council