

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Tuesday 3rd January 2019 at 10am
in the Council Chambers 49 High Street, Polegate, BN26 6AL**

Present: Cllrs Mrs W Alexander (Chair), Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, Cllr A Snell, Cllr M Falkner

Not present: - Cllrs D Watts, Cllr D Dunbar

58 members of public present

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution
12576	<i>The chair dealt with minutes 12577 and 12578 prior to public comments.</i> Opportunity for public comment <i>Standing orders were suspended</i> A number of members of the public spoke against the application and asked questions to the landowners who were also present. • A question was asked about the meaning of outline permission. The chair explained and the District Councillor present also clarified. • The landowner commented on the need for a medical centre, new school, community centre. Although residents understood this, they had concerns over the housing and the effect on the roads, infrastructure including water sewerage and the wildlife. • A resident commented on the gridlock of the roads at many times of the day and how it was not a safe road to cross and also referred to London councils buying up the housing associations and putting their overflow of residents into the housing in the local area. Although she loved the area, she was now considering moving as it was destroying the area. • A resident asked why the medical centre couldn't go in first. • The landowner stated that the housing would be paying for the affordable housing and towards the medical centre. He stated that this was in the core strategy and that the new local plan had not yet been adopted. • The housing numbers for affordable units were read out. (123 -1 bed, 86 -2 bed 29 -3 bed and 7- 4 bed) • A resident commented on the need for GP places. • A resident who lived on the mornings mill farm commented how she would like to see any development in keeping with the surroundings and taking into consideration flooding. (She referred to enchanted places). • A resident who was also a transport and movement expert referred to the large number of cars once the whole development was occupied. Stating that there would be around 3000-5000 vehicle movements per day. • A resident commented on the lack of parking in Polegate and that

vehicles would be going into town and other areas. He also referred to the issues with traffic on the A2270 at the current time and how this would get worse if development were allowed. The entrance/exit for the medical centre would be on the brow of a hill and with traffic lights this would be four sets from A27 to go through.

- There were concerns as the plans for the new bus lane into Eastbourne would mean the road would be wider. This would not have taken into consideration the new development.
- A resident who was also a PE teacher was concerned about the loss of the recreational land and hammer cage, the land originally was gifted to Brighton University. Now it was going to be developed and the facilities there would be lost.
- Residents were concerned about the loss of green belt between Polegate and Willingdon and that there was a lot of wildlife that may be lost including bats toads and dormice. Once the land was developed the green area would be gone forever.
- Residents expressed their concerns over the Wealden District Council website and stated that to them it was confusing. They felt that even if this was turned down higher courts of appeal would probably get it passed.
- Residents commented that some of the areas were dog walking space. The landowner stated that the rights of way and trees would not be lost.
- A resident commented on the focus on the traffic lights and commented that there was also a "rat run" through coppice avenue, farmlands and Wannock road and a 30 mph limit should be extended on Wannock Road beyond the T junction (Wannock Rd/Farmlands Way)
- A councillor present in the audience (declared an interest as a District Councillor for Willingdon, Town Councillor for Polegate, Parish councillor for Willingdon and East Sussex County Councillor for Willingdon.) He stated that the Local development framework was over ten years old. He asked about the medical centre and the extensions to the schools. He also commented that the affordable housing elements had been in many cases been overturned or reduced once planning was granted under viability reasons. He felt that the 35% would probably not happen and it would be much less or possibly none.
- A resident commented on the air pollution and stated that 61 people in Eastbourne have died due to air pollution. The primary source being the congested roads. They stated that if each house had only two cars this would mean an extra 1400 cars on the roads adding to the pollution.
- Residents voiced concerns over whether a medical centre would actually happen.
- Residents were concerned over whether trees would remain and whether there were any TPO (Tree preservation orders) on that land. The landowner stated that he only intended to remove three diseased trees and the rest were planned to remain and were tagged.
- Comments were made on the rights of way and dog walking. They

	referred to signage. The landowner stated these were likely to be East Sussex County Council (ESCC) signs on ESCC land. - Residents commented on the developments in Dittons road being taken up by people from Croydon and South London. They stated that the housing should be made available to only local people in particular the affordable housing. There was no guarantee that they would go to local people. - A resident commented on the fact that a lot of the housing would be bought up by people from London buying second homes and that this could not be controlled as it was open to market forces. - A resident commented that the land was needed for agriculture more than ever with concerns over Brexit and food supply and encouraged the landowners to keep as agricultural and do more. - A resident commented that once a development was handed over often the directors would fold the businesses and conditions of the development which were imposed. - A comment was made that the infrastructure always occurred after the development had commenced and that each application was taken in isolation and in the Netherlands this was done the other way around. - A resident commented on the access onto the A2270 being too dangerous and the roads wouldn't cope. - A resident commented on whether the school at Willingdon could be sold for housing and a larger school be placed on Hindsland instead. - The District Councillor commented that the land in the local plan for mornings mill was not allocated for housing, but only for a medical centre, community centre and school. ESCC restrictions would not get rid of exiting schools as this would be considered too costly. - Residents commented on Bovis home and London boroughs where cars were set on fire and there was drug dealing and this was not helped by cuts in policing. - A comment was made on anti-social behaviour locally. Some residents took offence at a comment made by the chair of the meeting. The chair later apologised for her comment. - A resident commented on the loss of land for wildlife with all the development in the area. - A resident asked about the land at foulride green and referred to it as being common land. The landowner stated that the grassed area near the housing was owned by Willingdon Parish Council having been given to the parish council by his grandfather and the area on the other side was owned by his father's estate. - A resident commented on the problems exiting broad road, traffic being at a standstill on the A2270 and problems with emergency vehicles. <i>Standing orders reinstated</i>
12577	Apologies for absence Cllrs D Watts, D Dunbar
12578	Declarations of interest in any items on the agenda Cllr Ms A Snell – Wealden District Councillor, Planning Committee South
12579	Planning Applications WD/2017/1942/MEA - MORNINGS MILL FARM, EASTBOURNE ROAD, WILLINGDON BN20 9NY - OUTLINE APPLICATION

WITH ALL MATTERS RESERVED, EXCEPT FOR THE MEANS OF ACCESS FROM EASTBOURNE ROAD, FOR THE COMPREHENSIVE DEVELOPMENT OF A MIXED-USE URBAN EXTENSION COMPRISING UP TO 700 DWELLINGS INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING, 8600 SQ.M. OF EMPLOYMENT FLOORSPACE, MEDICAL CENTRE, PRIMARY SCHOOL, COMMUNITY CENTRE, RETAIL, PLAYING FIELDS, CHILDREN'S PLAY SPACE, ALLOTMENTS, AMENITY OPEN SPACE, INTERNAL ACCESS ROADS, CYCLE AND FOOTPATH ROUTES, AND ASSOCIATED LANDSCAPING AND INFRASTRUCTURE.

Councillors commented on:

- Recreational space and the requirements
- Building of housing would not be overnight but there were concerns over the needs for school places.
- The loss of the greenbelt
- Flooding of the stream and areas on the land
- Social housing was not affordable to buy or rent
- Roads and infrastructure to support the development was not there
- It was not possible to screen out the adverse effects open the RAMSAR site and the consultees had not changed their conclusions that it could not support the development
- Sewerage leaks (foul water pathway) were of major concern the infrastructure was not there to take the number of housing proposed.
- Significant effect on Ashdown Forest and the nitrogen deposition and pollution in the area.
- Concerns over the potential harm to the environment
- WDC measures and mitigation did not reassure that pollution would not increase as it was already over the acceptable limits.
- Waste water capacity was not available at Hailsham to provide for this development. Any additional measure to deal with waste treatment would also have an environmental impact
- The development would result in severe transport and network gridlock
- The increase in traffic would increase the air pollution
- Medical centre although needed was not wanted in exchange for the decimation of the local environment
- Affordable housing was ok, but the likelihood that it would go ahead was not guaranteed if it was not profitable for the builders as had been shown in other applications.
- Housing was not guaranteed to be given to local need
- Infrastructure was simply not in place for 700 houses
- The report has stated that the development would be harmful to the local network: Cophall roundabout the A27, A2270 and A22 and Polegate High Street and Dittons Road
- Pollution concerns. Polegate was the highest polluted area except London. There was a lot of asthma in the area which was increasing and it was already a serious situation.
- SAC and Ashdown forest already pollution levels were above acceptable levels. High levels of ecological damage
- Concerns over the Pevensey Levels, RAMSAR site, SSSI and SAC, more development has the potential negative impact on waste water.
- Concerns over the impact on the South Downs National Park Dark skies.
- Concerns over the impact on wildlife including badgers, birds, Herring gulls, sparrows, house thrush, green woodpecker, bats, linnets and

	starlings and loss of habit and breeding and roosting. • It would be a disaster to lose the countryside aspect even though the rights of way are being kept. A councillor commented that it was the moral duty of councils to provide housing for people to live, however she conceded that there were many reasons for the development not to go ahead. <u>It was resolve to submit objections to the application based on previous comments plus the serious concerns on infrastructure not in place as stated above. VOTE 3 for submitting objections Cllrs Mrs M Piper, M Falkner, B Goodwin 1 against Cllr Mrs W Alexander 1 abstention Cllr Ms A Snell</u>
--	--

The meeting closed at 11.53 am

Chair of Planning Committee _____ Date