


From: Village Concerns villageconcerns2016@gmail.com 
Subject: Update 136 WD/2022/0341/MAJ Guidance from Village Concerns for your objections
Date: 9 March 2022 at 10:33
To: Village Concerns villageconcerns2016@gmail.com



To our supporters,

This is the Full Planning Application WD/2022/0341/MAJ for the 205 Hesmonds Planning Application **by Redrow** meaning that Planning Committee South of Wealden District Council will be deciding on the details of this Application.

You are still able to comment on the Full Planning Application regarding lots of details. We remind you that the Developer, Redrow has put this Application in, ignoring the fact that Village Concerns' Judicial Review continues regarding the Outline Permission given in July 2021. In fact, that is one of the facts they have incorrect in many submitted documents in the Application and Village Concerns is challenging this as an initial step before putting in a more detailed objection.

Your objections were 900+ strong for the first Planning Application. We now have until **March 25th 2022** to get many objections in as possible to this Full Planning Application.

Numbers matter. We must show we are not giving up.

Below are Village Concerns short list of suggestions for your submission to Wealden but please add your own ideas. Choose the ones which are important to you, just one or two will count if you are pushed for time. We have also attached a more detailed list for those of you who wish to dig deeper.

How to object:

1)

Online: Here is the link

<https://planning.wealden.gov.uk/searchresults.aspx?SearchType=15&ApplicationNumber=WD%2F2022%2F0341%2FMAJ>

Click on the Application Number, which takes you to the next page. You will then find:

“Make comments on this application (until 25/02/22)”. Click on this and follow the instructions. Under comment, you can choose objection, comment, no objection.

You must give your name and address otherwise WDC may not count your submission.

2)

By email to: planning@wealden.gov.uk

FTAO of Stacey Robins

Quote the Application Number

WD/2022/0341/MAJ and give your name and address.

New Application

The application is incomplete and contains many errors. The Consultation should be halted until the application is complete and factually correct.

Principle of Development

The Outline Planning Permission granted for 205 houses in June 2021 is subject to an ongoing Judicial Review so the principle of development is not established as Redrow is stating and on which their argument is based. There are also many differences between this application and the Outline Permission.

Traffic Access

The proposed traffic access shows 2 junctions and a pedestrian crossing in close proximity on London Road. The Road Safety assessment for this situation is inadequate.

Traffic access now proposes a 40mph speed limit not in the original application. There is a newly designed access for Waldron Rd.

Housing Numbers

Strong arguments were put forward in the original application for a reduction in number. This has been ignored by Redrow. There are still 205 houses.

The impact of 55 houses to be built in South Street has been ignored.

Discharge of Planning Condition on Hesmonds Stud

The Planning Condition imposed by Wealden preventing Hesmonds Stud being broken up has not been discharged.

The application to discharge this Planning Condition should come before a planning committee and not be a delegated decision as Redrow have incorporated it into their application.

Redrow Ignoring Local Issues

Redrow have ignored the wishes of the community to have improvements made to the Recreation Ground and Pavilion from any monies associated with development. Redrow should consult with Wealden and the Parish Council to enable this rather than wasting money on useless Travel Plans and a temporary Sunday bus service.

Heritage

The current application has not addressed the very strong concerns and objections expressed by several Consultees to the original application.

Heritage issues are dealt with in a dismissive manner.

The Report in this application have not even identified the new Conservation area so we have no confidence in their conclusions.

Design

The detailed designs proposed for the homes are stock Redrow designs taken from a catalogue. They have nothing to do with this village or Sussex architecture. This is a large characterless urban extension to a rural Village. There are no bungalows or buildings for assisted living. The apartment block is utilitarian and totally out of keeping. There is no indication of the Heating System.

Layout

The examples of the street scenes are depressing. Each one is spoilt by being too crowded. In general, taking one house out of every line of housing would give the buildings a space to

general, taking one house out of every nine of housing would give the buildings a space to breathe and create a sense of place rather than a crowded mess. Why demolish the perfectly good buildings on the site (including one home), why not repurpose them as commercial premises and bring some employment opportunities to the site? The stable block on Waldron Road has character and fits in with the rural setting. Why not repurpose it as a commercial building? Where is the Community Land Trust plot? The roads are too narrow - one parked vehicle could completely block the road.

Why have the gardens been reduced in size, more than ever people need their own outdoor space?

Ongoing Maintenance Costs

What would the ongoing maintenance cost be for the estate? The application makes reference to many matters that will require residents to pay for ongoing maintenance and some of these may end up being something the Parish has to pay for. These should be costed now and included as part of the application.

Public Right of Way

The proposed changes to the PROW are not acceptable and detrimental to enjoyment of the area. The existing footpath along Long Pond should be retained.

Garages/Car Parking

The parking allocation is inadequate for a car dependent Village.

The real vehicle ownership in East Hoathly, established by a local survey, is 2.24 vehicles per household and until developers and ESCC start to pay attention to this then they will continue to produce development that is immediately cluttered with cars, on-street parking and access issues for delivery vehicles, refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles. There is no parking allocated for self-employed work vehicles.

Transport

The Transport Assessment produces data that does not match the reality of a rural unsustainable car dependent development. The vehicle movements from the proposed development will exceed those calculated. This is partly because the comparator sites that the Transport Assessment uses are not comparable with East Hoathly. Most of the comparator sites are urban, edge of town sites that do not compare with a small rural village with inadequate public transport and too far to walk or safely cycle to alternative places over subscribed school and Medical Centre.

Woodland Buffer

Why not have a 20 m buffer for all the woodland to the North of the site to help protect the Western Red Cedars magnificent trees? There is no indication what form of fencing there would be to the woodland in the North of the site.

Climate Emergency

The Design and Access Statement makes no mention of heating systems, use of grey water, chimneys, use of renewable energy, fibre cables, electric vehicle charging points and does not mention the CLIMATE EMERGENCY. The Energy Report essentially says that Redrow are aiming to be much better for the planet in the future but for this development it will be the minimum requirements of Building Regulations. They will not go beyond what they have to do by law. There should be a step change towards carbon neutral homes if we are to have any impact. Redrow seem to be content to leave the Climate Emergency to someone else to solve.

Sewage

The applicant proposes pumping sewage from the site to the main sewer connection opposite Thomas Turner. The existing sewage pipework cannot cope especially in times of heavy rainfall. The Sewage works does not cope and sewage has to be tankered away.

The application must give far greater detail of the proposed disposal of sewage in this Full Application for the Safety, health and protection of everyone.

Application for the safety, health and protection of everyone.

Surface Water Drainage

SUDS systems are no guarantee against flooding. The system in Juziers frequently floods the Public Footpath.

Biodiversity

Detailed plans for Long Pond should be submitted. No effort has been made to adequately survey the amphibians including Great Crested Newts in the area.

Economic Viability

The figures presented indicate the construction costs will be very high. Is this economically viable or will a reduction in affordable housing will be requested. A full viability assessment should be done.

Thank you from the Village Concerns Steering Committee.

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



Guidance for
Hesmo...ion.pdf

