

From: Village Concerns villageconcerns2016@gmail.com
Subject: Update 105 South Street Planning Application Three objection information & suggestions
Date: 4 December 2020 at 08:53
To: Village Concerns villageconcerns2016@gmail.com



WD/2020/1848/MAO

Further to Update 104 we are urging our supporters to object to the above planning application in South Street. This is now the 3rd time planning has been submitted for the same site and, unfortunately, because this is a new planning application, **any objections that you have submitted to previous applications will not be counted as part of this objection.**

In brief summary, the first planning application was not heard within the statutory timeframe and so the Applicant appealed to the Planning Inspectorate, this appeal was declined. The second planning application was declined by Planning Committee South earlier this year and the Applicant has again appealed.

It is important to object as the Officers for Wealden District Council have stated at Pre-Application stage that they “in principle” support residential development at this location. This means it is doubly important that the Councillors on the Planning Committee South hear our views.

If you need inspiration and would like to recycle any words, both objections submitted by Village Concerns to the two previous applications can be found on our website: <https://villageconcerns.co.uk>

Objection to South Street 1:

<https://villageconcerns.co.uk/onewebmedia/South%20Street%20Village%20Concerns%20Objection.pdf>

Objection to South Street 2:

<https://villageconcerns.co.uk/onewebmedia/South%20Street%20-%20Village%20Concerns%20Objection%20to%20New%20Application.pdf>

Having reviewed the documents submitted by the Applicant, the views of Village Concerns are as follows:

CONCERNS ARE AS FOLLOWS.

We object to this Application because it is an encroachment on the countryside and not compliant with Wealden's current Planning Policy. It seeks to build 50 homes which are not needed in this barely sustainable Village where there are no school places, jobs and an infrastructure that is overloaded and struggling. It will force more vehicles onto the congested A22 and through the Conservation area of the Village and cause further damage to the Ashdown Forest. New residents would be totally car dependent. This is not sustainable development.

A Planning Application for 205 houses has been given in June 2020 which will put intolerable strain on the Village. There is no earmarked Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) funding for improving the infrastructure in the Village.

Further comments and suggested objection points are as follows:

1. The Applicant states that because Hesmonds was approved, so they should be too, but this is not a valid planning argument.
2. A Legacy Development. The Applicant mentions generations of farmers but this is an exaggeration. If the Applicant was really interested in leaving a legacy they would have engaged with the Village residents, the Parish Council, the Neighbourhood Plan group and the Community Land Trust to ensure they are developing what was needed and wanted in the Village. They have not. In their response as a statutory consultee, the Housing Department at Wealden District Council makes explicit reference to the Community Land Trust in East Hoathly seeking land for sustainable development and even provides contact details for the CLT. No contact has yet been made by the Applicant to the CLT to set up what could be a real lasting legacy for the Village. The S106 agreements are vague and there has been no dialogue with the Parish Council as to what the Village wants.
3. The application proposes a new 'amenity' piece of land with a swale / attenuation pond (see the Indicative Site Plan within the planning application). We would suggest that the use of this land for Amenity is contrary to its proximity to the Sewage Plant and a large deep swale. It also continues to ignore the preference of the Flood Agency to require a connected series of swales.
4. The playground will be the responsibility of the residents, history has shown that they will fail to maintain it and seek to get the Parish to adopt it. Our PC has previously stated that they will not adopt playgrounds for new developments as evidenced by Juziers, Nightingales and Hesmonds so this potentially falls onto residents to maintain and becomes an expensive white elephant.
5. Transport: there is much made about using the cycle to commute and the reports within the application state that it is possible for a competent cyclist to be able to cycle to Uckfield Station for commuting. It also makes reference to being able to cycle to Maresfield, South Chailey and Haywards Heath. The travel plan does seem to be referencing West Hoathly in West Sussex, rather than East Hoathly in East Sussex. ESCC are currently consulting on a cycle and walking masterplan with East Sussex covering the next 10 years and the consulted plan makes NO mention of improvements for cyclists or walkers in East Hoathly. Therefore,

expecting people to use cycles rather than cars for transport is unrealistic and occupants of this development will be virtually 100% car dependent.

6. The Village is served by an hourly bus service and school buses. Commuting via an hourly bus service which is not available early evenings is highly unrealistic. Anyone using the bus to commute to Brighton, Lewes and Tunbridge Wells has to change service. The journey prices are also unaffordable to anyone using the service on a regular basis.

7. It is a requirement of any new development to provide for 35% Affordable Housing: this application does not provide for 35% affordable housing and falls short of statutory requirement.

8. Sustainability. As per points made in earlier objections by all of you, the Village is not sustainable when residents have to drive out of the Village for schooling, doctors, in depth shopping, the cinema You can reiterate some of your points here in this new objection.

9. The Applicant has included ecological reports for badgers and dormice but fails to reference other wildlife known to use this green habitat corridor such as deer, adders and slowworms.

10. Renewable energy. Huge promises regarding renewable energy initiative and green sustainability are being suggested by the developer – we urge Wealden District Council to ensure that any ‘green’ proposals are included as enforceable planning conditions if they are minded to approve the application.

11. Entrances & Exits. Visibility Splay and proposals make no reference to the neighbouring potential development, its entrances and exits and any conflict arising. Cars frequently speed on the bend but no speed watch can be conducted there due to safety concerns. The speed limit there is already 30MPH so suggesting reducing it to 30MPH shows lack of knowledge.

12. The transport plan fails to take into account the new development of 205 houses that has been approved in the Village and this will impact significantly on road use. The application acknowledges that the traffic survey is 5 years out of date but traffic has grown since then, because of increased housing in Uckfield, Hailsham, Polegate and Hellingly. The new Swallow Business Park has significantly increased traffic with people using East Hoathly streets as rat runs to avoid the A22.

You can make an objection to the current planning application by:

1. Commenting by email to: planning@wealden.gov.uk by the 25th of December, citing the Planning Application Number, WD/2020/1848/MAO

Include your name and address.

2. Or go to the link: <https://planning.wealden.gov.uk/plandisp.aspx?recno=151148>

and follow the “Comment on this Application” link.

Include your name and address.

3. Or via post, quoting the application number WD/2020/1848/MAO, and include your name and address to:

Mrs C Turner

Planning
Wealden District Council
Council Offices,
Vicarage Lane,
Hailsham,
BN27 2AX

Post or email objections can go in later than December 25th, but we would advise as soon as you can. Anyone in your household over 18 can send in a separate objection. The more the better.

You are in receipt of this email because you have previously requested to be part of Village Concerns email list. If you no longer wish to receive these emails please let us know.