

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Wednesday 3rd March 2021 at 10.00am by remote meeting

Present: Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs C Berry, Mrs M Piper, M Falkner, Mrs L Sargent

Not present: -

19 members of public present NB Cllr D Watts and Cllr D Murray were also present but did not participate in the meeting.

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution
12799	Suspend standing orders <i>Standing orders were suspended</i>
12800	Opportunity for public comment All comments received were circulated to planning committee members prior to the meeting.
12801	Apologies for absence None
12802	Declarations of interest in any items on the agenda None
12803	Minutes of planning Committee meeting held on 12th January 2021 <u>It was resolved that the minutes of 12th October 2020 are an accurate representation of the meeting and signed by the chair. VOTE All in favour Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs C Berry, Mrs M Piper, M Falkner</u>
12804	Any other plans received prior to the meeting - notified to the public None
12805	Planning Applications WD/2021/0174/MEA – MORNINGS MILL FARM, EASTBOURNE ROAD, LOWER 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. The chair of planning read out the application and commented as follows: As we know, this is a new application by the owners of Mornings Mill Farm. Their first application, in conjunction with the previous owners of Hindsland, was turned down by Wealden District council and that refusal was upheld on appeal. At that time, it was assumed Wealden’s new local plan would be adopted and in that plan housing was not proposed for Mornings Mill. However, Wealden’s new local plan was not adopted and they are currently working with their old one. In that plan Mornings Mill Farm was allocated for housing in their core strategy. Since then, Wealden’s supply of land for housing has become even more critical. We understand the owners of Mornings Mill Farm believe they have been able to satisfy the requirements of Highways in their application which was one of the reasons their application was refused before. We also understand Mornings Mill Farm have

not been in any negotiations with our 2 local surgeries about the provision of the medical centre although in their application this centre would come forward in Phase 1 of the development. We do know our local surgeries would prefer the new medical centre to be located on the proposed Hindsland development if that were to come forward in the foreseeable future. Assuming that did happen then presumably the area Mornings Mill have allocated on their plans for a medical centre could be used for additional housing. We have read the many letters of objection from residents of Willingdon and Polegate that have been sent to the local councils and to Wealden and I think it would be fair to sum them up in these categories .. over development, loss of green space between Willingdon and Eastbourne, major traffic congestion on the A2270, lack of employment in our part of Wealden, too close to the Southdown National Park, over-flow of education facilities and, importantly, increased pollution levels. We have also just received a round robin questionnaire from residents and my colleague Councillor Falkner will try to answer these as best he can shortly. The Town Clerk has also sent these questions to the Agent of the Vine family and we will make his responses public as soon as we have them.. She then handed over to Councillor Falkner to specifically answer the questions in the round robin.

Cllr Falkner commented as follows:

Mornings Mill WD/2021/0174/MRA

I believe this application is for 700 residential units comprising of 455 houses and 245 so called affordable residential units. I note this development includes 1836 car spaces, 13 light goods vehicles spaces, 20 motorcycles and 1140 cycle spaces.

When reading through this application, I noted some areas of concern on the application form. According to the application, the proposal is to connect to the existing mains sewerage system. There may be capacity issues here. The application states the proposed development is within an area at risk of flooding. In addition it is within 20 metres of a river. Even so it is stated that this proposal will not increase flood risk elsewhere. As ground will be taken up by the development the water will have to go somewhere, also there houses nearby and it would be unfortunate should this development lead to these houses being at increased risk of flooding. Apparently, water will go to a sustainable drainage system and an existing watercourse. I imagine there will be some effect resulting from loss of land upon these current systems.

I should like to see trees being protected within this proposed site and note there are protected species on the development site and adjacent land.

The plans apparently do not incorporate areas to store and collect waste.

With regard to TRANSPORT, it seems there is a strong possibility that a detriment effect may result from the proposed access arrangements and risk safety of all road users. The reasons for this are the effect upon the operation of strategic and local road networks, bus priority measures would become effected. This will impact on highway safety as there will be an increase in traffic congestion. Congestion on this road into Eastbourne has been an issue for decades, let alone years. Construction of Jubilee Way helped relieve this but additional developments since have resulted in increased traffic congestion and peak time gridlock. The applications transport assessment statement on page 45 volume 3 provides base data. Point 6.30 says the southern access junction needs to be changed as likely employment class would change so northern access junction needs to be used. This junction would already be used for the predicted medical centre.

Point 7.9 on page 50 confirms junction capacity assessments demonstrate that there would likely be delays associated with background traffic growth into the future....

The key junctions in terms of the proposed mornings mill development are the traffic signals at Polegate High Street and to the north of the A27. I would raise the question of traffic

coming from other directions also having an impact.

Point 7.12 confirms with regard to the four junctions to the south of the proposed development, here no capacity improvements will be made to these junctions. Surely this will hinder traffic flow further ?

With regard to the ENVIRONMENT, this destruction of greenfield land will increase traffic numbers and has the potential to impact upon air quality (point 2.10). There will be an impact upon soil and groundwater quality nearby 150 metres with residual contamination present (point 2.11)

I am aware of Wealden District Councils green agenda but data has shown air quality black particles from car fumes are harmful to children. Eastbourne has been reported as having high air pollution with recently a figure of 38, I am no expert but I did note this was higher than some outer London areas. The environment data shows some areas of this development fall into a high risk zone 3 with rivers nearby whereas others are in medium and low risk areas.

I should just finally like to mention the statement of community involvement and its conclusions. As we know there have been earlier public exhibitions and earlier meetings. I quote the statement saying the 'masterplan proposals well received with about two thirds supporting' However this statements fails to mention there were very well attended demonstrations against the plans. This may illustrate that developers fail to recognise public opinion.

The Eastbourne Herald of May 19th 2017 quotes the landowner saying ' we want to create an environment that people really enjoy living in, that they can walk and cycle around, that has plenty of green space'.

We have that now, this development will destroy it for residents and their children and future generations

Cllr Falkner also read out the responses to the "round robin" email from many members of the public to address their questions.

Questions from public:

Following the publication of the Agenda for the Planning Committee on 3 March 2021, I am writing to you, as I have questions for Polegate Town Council / Developers re: Morning Mills application, WD/2021/0174/MEA, and would appreciate these to be included in the upcoming meeting.

Response:

The developer will not be attending any pre application meetings with the town council. Therefore, some questions may not be within PTC ability to respond. The committee and public watching should be aware that PTC is only a consultee on this. Wealden District Council make the decision and the town councils comments have a similar weight to those of any resident submitting their comments to wealden district council planning. It is also important to note that only a small portion of phase 2 of the proposed application is in the Polegate boundary.

Questions from public:

Please find below and list of questions from the local community to firstly Polegate Town Council and secondly for Polegate Town Council to ask the developers (JMT Planning) and Wealden District Council on behalf of local residents.

Response:

PTC has not been granted any special treatment in asking the developers questions. The

town council may submit questions to wealden in our comments on the application which could be raised when making decisions on the application.

Questions from public:

We really appreciate your support on questioning the developers

Part 1 – Questions/Concerns from Local Residents to Polegate Town Council (PTC). For debate in Polegate Town Council meeting re: planning application.

Planning process / Wealden District Council 'Local Plan':

- We are aware that on 19th February 2020 Wealden District Council took the decision to withdraw its Local Plan after the Planning Inspector found that the plan could not proceed in its current form. Would Polegate Town Council agree that its unwise to grant approval to any major planning application in the absence of such a Masterplan for the region?*

Response:

Although we don't think it's a good idea, we can't change the situation that we or rather wealden find themselves in.

Questions from public:

- In 2019 figures detailed in State of the County (link below), showing that the Wealden Housing Core Strategy to have been planning (prior to the withdrawal of the Local Plan) 949 houses per year, when an area such as Eastbourne plan 239 per year through 2027 (see table on page 6)?*

<https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/media/13538/state-of-the-county-2019-for-website.pdf>

Moreover, the breakdown of plans for Wealden show on page 7 of State of the County details the specific South Wealden Growth Area projecting 6482 new houses, is more than Eastbourne, Lewes and Newhaven combined.

These figures, without the context of a Local Strategy are alarming as I'm sure you are aware, unless there are major local infrastructure plans for the region for new schools, medical facilities, recreational facilities and improved transport links that are being made that we haven't been able to obtain information on.

Are PTC able to discuss this issue with WDC to secure reassurance that we are not being treated unfairly locally and we have the infrastructure capacity to cope with such influx?

Response:

PTC has regularly made comment to wealden about the unfairness of having so much development in the south and continues to reflect this view in the consultations including those for the new local plan. This has been frequently put to Wealden at our parish cluster meetings.

Questions from public:

- We are aware there is a consultation process happening currently, please can you advise when this will be opened to local residents to voice their concerns on large sites such as Morning Mills and the impact on local infrastructure?*

Response:

The consultations are held by Wealden District Council and advertised by them. We do share these on social media and have done recently as their consultation was called “direction of travel”. I believe that consultation is now closed.

Questions from public:

- In recent Polegate Town council minutes from Tues 12 Jan 2021, PTC state they support “Option 4 –New Settlement(s) Growth–particularly Berwick, as it has room for expansion, near mainline station, good road connections with a future dualled A27”.*

Response:

This was the town council’s response to the direction of travel consultation.

Questions from public:

*When cross referencing with Berwick Parish Council meeting minutes from Thurs 16 Dec 2020, it appears they are not opposed to such developments.
http://berwickparishcouncil.org.uk/data/uploads/20201216%20-%20UNADOPTED%20_DRAFT_.pdf?fbclid=IwAR0vvnCrwyhg_DJJLXsbWaWFjYE3zby93nlvylOlqIV6TXTE6WJO6ZQZgQ
Have PTC has a response yet from WDC on these suggestions?*

Response:

No the consultees don’t get a direct response, but PTC comments are taken into consideration when WDC develop their new plan as are residents comments.

Questions from public:

Would PTC agree that a large-scale development in the Berwick area would negate the need for a site like Morning Mills?

Response:

This is what PTC submitted as our comment to Wealden’s consultation.

Questions from public:

- Also, please can PTC advise if during this consultation process with WDC there have been discussions relating to the impact on local Schools caused by large scale developments?*

Response:

The consultation process is not between PTC and WDC it is a general consultation process and is open to all residents and consultees. There have been no discussions with them direct although our district councillors are aware of the impact of a number of infrastructure issues.

Questions from public:

- Deadline for objections to planning application WD/2021/0174/MEA, can PTC clarify

this with the developers?

Response:

We (PTC) do not have direct contact. We are consultees only. The deadlines are set in legislation and are for the planning authority to determine. The planning authority in this case is WDC. (not PTC)

Questions from public:

WDC have advised directly the at the deadline is 28th March 2021, elsewhere online it cites 31st March and now developers 'Planning Notices' have appeared around the site state show 21st March 2021.

Response:

This is something that you would need to discuss either with the case officer or your district councillors. PTC has no influence on deadlines for planning applications.

Questions from public:

- Do PTC have plans for public meetings with the developers for both Morning Mills and Hindsland, so it's possible for local residents to be involved in the Public consultation?

Response:

The public meeting for mornings mill is today 3rd March. The developers have not indicated that they would be doing any other exhibitions (presumably as they held a number of the for their previous application).

Danescroft - hindsland have already sent out their literature for their consultation. We are able to ask them questions, the public meeting date will be set once an application is submitted to wealden and a consultation response requested from PTC. Please note that Hindsland is solely in the Willington and Jevington boundary. None is in Polegate.

Questions from public:

History of Proposed Site:

- *In the context of recent developments such as Brodricklands and Hamlands, where developers have had original masterplans rejected and then got approval on reduced housing numbers, to only apply later for the balance of houses from their original proposal once the site has been established, what is PTC's position on the division of the Morning Mills and Hindsland sites, for a total of 700 + 180 houses?*

Response:

That can only be decided at the planning meeting once both applications have been discussed. (No application has yet been set for the Hindsland application.)

Questions from public:

These were originally one site that was rejected in 2017, please see the 2017 Masterplan for Morning Mills site (WD/2021/0174/MEA application document, entitled 'Statement of Community Involvement', page 9). Site plans for the now 2 applications now clearly display access roads between both sites.

Are PTC privy to full details about the owners of both sites for transparency?

Response:

No. We are aware the owner of Mornings mill is the Vine family as on the application. It is a matter of public record. We have not yet seen an application for Danescroft which would show the landowners/agent.

Questions from public:

Education:

- **Re: the impact of major developments on local School capacity, are PTC able to reassure local residents that there are larger plans to cope with the influx caused by such a large increase in population?**

Response:

It is not within the remit of PTC to reassure residents on county council matters. Education is provided by ESCC. It is something that PTC continually comment on when major plans are submitted for comment along with other missing infrastructure. It may be something that you wish to discuss with your county councillor.

Questions from public:

*In the documents presented in the developers own Scoping application (WD/2020/6514/SCO), it demonstrates that Primary Schools in the Polegate & Willingdon area are currently at and in the case of Polegate Primary school operating above capacity:
Please see: WD/2020/6514/SCO, Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Scoping Report, Charts on Pages 41-42.
We are aware that there are plans to build a Primary School, however, within document Statement of Community Involvement, Polegate and Willingdon Strategic Expansion, WD/2021/0174/MEA
"The County Council education department will decide when to bring the school forward, but our discussions with them suggest it would be provided within 6 years of development starting on site, when about 500 houses have been built."
Are PTC able to speak with WDC and ESCC Local Education Commission on how to mitigate the increase in School aged children in the interim, and also what their plan is for Secondary Schools?*

Response:

PTC has asked these questions, however the general response is that it's a statutory duty and the county council will facilitate this when it is required.

Questions from public:

For example, are there significant plans to expand Polegate Primary School within this period to accommodation for increased demand?

Response:

This is a question that you would need to address to your county councillor.

Questions from public:

Medical Centre:

- **Given that both Morning Mills application and Hindsland both contain plans for Medical Centres, what is PTC's position on this?**

Response:

PTC is aware that only Danescroft Hindsland has any contact with the drs surgeries and land developers to build the medical centre. Mornings Mill have not. The drs manager has stated for public record that only Danescroft could provide the medical centre within the timescales needed.

Questions from public:

Also are local residents to expect 2 x major Medical Centres next door to each other? The concern being that one will be scrapped in favour of yet more houses on this site.

Response:

Please see answer above. No only Danescroft is what we have been advised.

Questions from public:

- *Are PTC aware of discussions between local GPs and the developers, as this features through both applications?*

Response:

Yes Danescroft, as the drs have written to confirm this.

Questions from public:

Through conversations with Maria Caulfield MP, we have been made aware that plans were being discussed for a Medical Centre on the ESCC land between the Esso garage and Hindsland site.

Are PTC aware of this and if so able to explain what has changed?

Response:

PTC is aware, but has been told that site is not coming forward and now couldn't come forward in the timescales that the surgeries need.

Questions from public:

Sustainability of the site:

- *The Planning Statement put forward by the Vine family pushes points that Wealden make about sustainable developments, there are plenty of counter statements made by Wealden that can be used to positively encourage this site to be left alone for environmental health, for conservation and as a Local green Space, a site that is part of the 1066 route. Do Polegate Town Council also agree that this space is a valuable piece of farmland at a time when the country has decided we should be more self-sufficient?*

Response:

Yes. (see general concerns below)

Questions from public:

- *In the Sustainability Statement from the Vine Family, their statement has many options for sustainability within the development, however it is all “could, would, should, if adopted and potentially” would Polegate Town Council agree that none of these points are conclusive enough to ascertain that these policies would actually be used?*

Response:

PTC made the following comments on the sustainability statement:

Re point 6.1.2 The statement seems full of quotes from National Planning Policy Framework

Point 6.1.9 how would the requirement to improve flood resistance of buildings through amendments to 1934 Buildings Act be detailed

Point 9.1 re Solar Photovoltaic Systems that convert light into electricity. Are houses being built with these ?

Questions from public:

Planning and Affordable Housing Statement from the Vine family

Taken from the Statement

“Following the appeal decision on the previous planning application meetings were held with planning officers from the District Council and with highway officers at East Sussex County Council. 3.5 At a meeting on 14th February 2020 District Council planning officers advised that in view of the Inspector’s conclusions following the Submission Wealden Local Plan Examination (the plan was subsequently withdrawn) the Council is seeking to meet its 5 year housing land target and that Core Strategy Policy WCS4 (SD4) is integral to the Council’s plans to meet housing needs. Officers were keen that a planning application is submitted as soon as possible but emphasised that the access arrangements were likely to be a key issue in light of the appeal decision and these should be discussed with East Sussex County Council. 3.6 The Council’s planning officers confirmed that a Habitat Regulations Assessment would not be required to be submitted as the Council would deal with the issue of impact on Ashdown Forest following the Local Plan Inspector’s conclusions. It was also suggested that the community centre should be located adjacent to the playing fields to avoid the need for additional changing facilities. The size of the medical centre site and the need for the school site were also discussed. These matters are addressed in the Planning Appraisal section”

Reading this statement leads us to believe that they rely heavily on the fact that the Wealden Local Plan is no longer in place. There have been meetings and considerable discussion between the developers and Wealden Planning Officers. The statement heavily infers that the planning officers have provided a substantial amount of advice to enable the development of this site to go ahead. Would Polegate Town council agree that the way the statement has been worded that contrary to the open planning process, that they are already persuaded that this development has attained all the correct criteria for Wealden District Council to allow it to take place?

Response:

From our knowledge pre application advice applies to all applications and the district council have to provide this?

Questions from public:

Part 2 – Questions/Concerns from Local Residents for Polegate Town Council to ask to

	<i>the developers JMT Planning on behalf of local residents, and report back to residents at future Polegate Town Council meeting prior to deadline for formal applications to planning application - WD/2021/0174/MEA / or publish written responses publicly around Polegate/social media.</i> Response: <i>It is not within the remit of the town council to ask these questions of the developer. We could contact them (and have) and would be willing to do so, they may not be able to provide the response in time for the application deadline, or indeed may choose not to respond to PTC at all.</i> <i>It is important that these questions should be directed to the <u>district councillors</u> in order that they might raise these to be discussed and publicly show the responses.</i> Further comments were made including concerns over how emergency services would handle the increase in houses; air pollution; increases in anti social behaviour and how the police would cope. What will happen if the medical centre doesn't come forward and how will the hospitals cope. Concerns about the urban sprawl and how that will look from the South downs national park and how the lighting might affect their dark skies initiative. A councillor had particular concerns over what would happen to the famer who was grazing his (organic) animals on the land currently. There were significant concerns over the loss of valuable farmland and loss of hay meadows. (Once it's gone its gone). <u>It was resolved to object to the application on all of the above grounds. (Prop. WA, Sec MP) All voted against the application. Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, Mrs C Berry, M Falkner, Mrs L Sargent. Motion carried.</u>
12806	Delegated applications – already submitted – for information only WD/2020/1837/F – ‘HOMELEIGH’, DITTONS ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6HS – MODIFICATION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY. NO OBJECTIONS. WD/2020/2419/F – LAND AT 60 GREENLEAF GARDENS, POLEGATE BN26 6PQ – DEMOLIITION OF AN EXISTING SINGLE STOREY EXTENSION AND THE ERECTION OF A NEW ATTACHED 3-BEDROOM 2 STOREY DWELLING ON THE LAND ADJACENT TO 60 GREENLEAF GARDENS. OBJECTIONS: A Councillor noted the original intention was to build a detached house which was advised against, and also noted that the advice given was to attach a new house onto the existing building to give the impression of an extension to Number 60. This would make a terraced block of three houses bearing in mind the application is for a separate house. The Councillor asked whether the neighbours at No 58 Greenleaf Gardens were aware that their semi detached was about to become an end of terrace property were this application for a separate house to be approved. The Councillor did not think that adding a number to help fulfil WDC housing target, as stated, is sufficient reason for approval. The Councillor stated he objected to this application on the grounds of overdevelopment and it would introduce a change in the immediate design of adjoining properties. The Councillor stated that, were this to be a more natural extension to No 60, it might be appropriate, but bearing in mind it is a totally new build, separate yet physically attached to No 60, it was in the Councillor's view unacceptable. WD/2020/2532/FR – 16 BRIGHTLING ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 5DB – CONSTRUCTION OF DETACHED GARDEN BUILDING (SUMMERHOUSE/GYM) AND ALTERATIONS TO BOUNDARY FENCING TO INCREASE HEIGHT TO OVER 2 METRES (BOTH RETROSPECTIVE). NO OBJECTIONS. WD/2020/2397/F – 49 HIGHGROVE CRESCENT, THE MILL, POLEGATE BN26 6FL – ERECTION

OF NEW ONE STOREY REAR EXTENSION TO REAR OF PROPERTY. NO OBJECTIONS.

[WD/2020/2642/F](#) – 23 HERON RIDGE, POLEGATE BN26 5BJ – TWO STOREY SIDE EXTENSION. NO OBJECTIONS.

[WD/2020/2379/MAJ](#) – BRODRICKLANDS AND HAMLANDS FARM, WILLINGDON – PHASE 3 – DETAILED PLANNING APPLICATION FOR 242 RESIDENTIAL DWELLINGS (COMPRISING ALTERATIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT ALREADY APPROVED UNDER PLANNING PERMISSION REFS [WD/2016/0986/MAO](#) & [WD/2019/1988/MRM](#) – TO PROVIDE 50 ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS). OBJECTIONS – The Council remains vehemently opposed to this application. Councillors asserted that there should be no further building until a medical centre is built and up and running. A Councillor stated that the increase in road traffic brought about by the building of more houses would put an unacceptable strain upon the road network and would contribute to increased pollution. The Council also re-iterates its objections to the previous applications named above, as follows:

WD/2016/0986/MAO - The Town Council submit the following objections to the application: There were serious concerns about the proposed method of sewerage treatment as the tanks proposed hold very little which could cause serious problems in the event of a breakdown in the process. The suggested access roads were not considered to be suitable access to the site. There appear to be no pedestrian access to the playing fields which inevitably mean that the small access routes would potentially not be adequate to serve the whole development. There were serious concerns about the infrastructure that would be needed to serve the site as this was an unplanned site and no consideration appeared to have been given to Dr Surgeries, schools (The county council were not moving forward with additional schools despite the planned SD4 development which was likely to come forward shortly and be better served by roads and other facilities.) Any pupils attending the local schools would have to use vehicles to go to them. The planned medical centre on the Hindlands area (which is likely to come forward at the end of this year), would also not be accessible from the proposed development. The development is therefore considered not to be sustainable. There were also concerns that development in this location would eliminate the last green gap between Eastbourne and Willingdon. There were concerns over the views from the South downs National park. There were concerns that the area was on a flood risk area. The ecological impact was considered contrary to para 109 of the NPPF

109.

The planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

- *protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, geological conservation interests and soils;*
- *recognising the wider benefits of ecosystem services;*
- *minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible, contributing to the Government's commitment to halt the overall decline in biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures;*
- *preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability; and*
- *remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated*

and unstable land, where appropriate.

The committee also had concerns over the potential contamination as identified and noted in the comments made by pollution control.

WD/2019/1988/MRM - The Committee is mindful of the fact that these are 'Reserved Matters' applications, but wishes to reiterate its objections as notified to Wealden District Council on the 4th April (reference WD/2019/0467/MRM) and 20th September (reference WD/2019/1685/MRM)

Strongly disagreed with the Local Highway Authority conclusion that traffic impact is acceptable. The roads around that area are already gridlocked at peak times and busy at other times. Councillors know residents and road users do not find the current traffic flow as acceptable and are against further unsustainable development.

The planning statement conclusion states the development is 'acceptable in terms of appearance, layout, landscaping and scale'. Again, this is acceptable to the developers but as neighbours' letters point out is totally unacceptable to people who live in the area.

The Site Drainage summary point number 3.54 states 'flood risk to and from the site following development is not increased'. The pages of data provided fail to state the common sense conclusion that water does not soak away through concrete, roads etc whereas it will soak away through fields and countryside. This summary acknowledges that a flood risk exists as stated in their sentence where they indirectly state the flood risk remains though wrongly claim it won't increase with this massive building development.

The local area does not have the infrastructure for this development. Pollution levels are already very high, this will add to pollution.

The crime rate is on the increase, more development increases the likelihood of crime increasing with no or little police presence available.

Public rights of way and remaining countryside are under threat.

The Committee also wishes to reiterate its objections as laid out in the minutes of the Planning Committee of 8th July 2019, as follows:

The application was discussed in detail including concerns over discrepancies in the parking allocation; one document stated 314 demand and another that 323 was the provision. There were also concerns that flat owners were not allocated spaces and this was considered to be discriminatory. It was noted that spaces were so tight that manoeuvrability could be an issue, tandem spaces may be inaccessible. For larger vehicles, the turning heads were not very large. If emergency service vehicles tried to access, there could be problems if there were no obstructions on the current access as cars were allowed to park there, and there would be a fair chance that vehicles will be parked in the way. The committee noted the Highways response on 24th June 2019 had objections on many grounds and concurred with these.

Flood risk was also discussed (condition 15 flood risk, 17 surface water drainage and 18 drainage maintenance) where information was lacking regarding details on the construction of a strategic drainage network and basins located outside of the phase 1 boundary. There was also no phase construction plan. The development as it stands would discharge water off into the Pevensey and Cuckmere Water Level management board area. The submitted calculations, show flooding at several locations and there is no evidence in the application of how the volumes of water would be managed on site, without it causing flooding to surrounding off site areas. No consideration has been given for any climate change, or storm event. The plans fails to meet the requirements to assess its acceptability in flood risk terms. It is very close to the South Downs National Park (SDNP), light pollution on the night sky could be an issue for the environment. (SDNP is one of two dark skies locations designated in the whole of the country). Light pollution is likely to affect nocturnal animals. The site is only 1km from Willingdon Down, which is a site of special scientific interest (SSSI). The development is likely to impact on protected species (some are on the endangered list) and local wildlife, which it was felt the council should be doing what it could to protect, before the area lost all of its green spaces.

There were also severe concerns over the local highway network, it was felt that it would not cope with the additional traffic as the roads were already gridlocked at most times of the day, and this development would only add to the problems. The lead local flood authority had not given any approval at the time of the meeting. The view of the countryside officer was that it was unlikely that Southern water would adopt the new on- site surface water drainage system (SUDS). The committee considered that they had previously objected 3 months ago to the traffic impact and that the town council had objected to the planning statement that the development was acceptable as it was clear that it was not acceptable to the neighbours as there were many neighbour objections which did not consider that it was a suitable site. The local area as a whole doesn't have the infrastructure required and pollution levels are already high. (Eastbourne has one of the highest levels of pollution and over the WHO [World Health Organisation] limits). Crime rates were on the increase and as many new developments seem to increase the levels of crime in an area, with very little or no police presence. It was also mentioned that public rights of way and countryside were under threat if this development was to go ahead.

It was mentioned and noted that Pevensey and Cuckmere water level management board has made objections to the latest plans. (The applicant has failed to meet its requirements to assess its acceptability in flood risk terms.) It was also noted that Highways had made objections to the plans as it stands, as it also required further information. There were concerns over congestion and that the traffic could not go out across the railway towards Dittons Road.

A Councillor said they had objected to this application from the beginning, and their views had not changed. The extra traffic, increased pollution from extra cars, the loss of wildlife habitat and the detrimental effect on the South Downs National Park and their Dark Skies designation is a disaster for the local area. Many objections have already been pointed out to Wealden District Council. The Councillor expressed disappointment that the view of local residents, who unfortunately will have to live with the outcome of this, do not seem to matter.

A Councillor welcomed the fact that that some smaller houses are planned for the site, but nevertheless opposed the development. A Councillor noted that the Planning Committee at Wealden has approved these developments despite the vast volume of objections and concerns from local residents. These concerns re flooding risk,

	infrastructure, traffic issues, environmental impact, loss of open space, and pollution have been raised many times. The Councillor recognised that matters are now past that stage of the planning process and are now into reserved matters. Bearing in mind that Wealden have their reasons for approving the applications and consider these to be of higher priority to that of the local population, the Councillor stated that they remain opposed to these building developments. WK/202013847 – FEASTRO, 12 HIGH STREET, POLEGATE BN26 5AA – APPLICATION FOR LICENCE TO SELL ALCOHOL. NO OBJECTIONS, but a Councillor commented that a later start for alcohol sales – 10:00am – would be more appropriate. WD/2021/0037/F – 3 WESTERN AVENUE, POLEGATE BN26 6EP – SINGLE STOREY SIDE & REAR EXTENSIONS. NO OBJECTIONS. WD/2021/0077/F – 23 SUNSTAR LANE, POLEGATE BN26 5HS – PROPOSED REPLACEMENT SIDE EXTENSION AND FRONT PORCH INCLUDING INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS. NO OBJECTIONS. WD/2021/0083/F – 78 STATION ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6ED – SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION. NO OBJECTIONS. WD/2021/0229/P19 – WATER HOUSE, PORTERS WAY, POLEGATE BN26 6RJ – DEMOLITION OF ROOF TO THIRD FLOOR OF EXISTING BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION OF TWO FURTHER ADDITIONAL STOREYS OF RESIDENTIAL ACCOMMODATION (6 x 2 BED APARTMENTS AND 6 x 1 BED APARTMENTS) AND NEW ROOF TO MATCH EXISTING. OBJECTIONS: A Councillor commented that the height of the proposed building would be out of character for the area. It appears that having different sized internal rooms does not make any difference to the height of the building. There could be an issue with the increase in parking demand. The Councillor agreed with Wealden District Council's comment in their formal determination issued on 12th November and noted the conclusion of the daylight/sunlight report. A Councillor stated that there were no five storey buildings in Polegate and to allow this development would set a precedent. A Councillor stated that they saw this as overdevelopment that would affect the nearby houses' amenity. The Committee asked that this application be called in by a District Councillor, in order that it be heard at a planning meeting, and not delegated. WD/2021/0159/F – 'HAERE MAI', DITTONS ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6HU – PROPOSED FIRST FLOOR ABOVE EXISTING GROUND FLOOR BUNGALOW WITH LOFT CONVERSION. NO OBJECTIONS. Noted by all present
12807	Planning decisions by Wealden District Council – for information only WD/2020/2035/F – 1 DOVER ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6LA – PROPOSED PORCH EXTENSION TO FRONT AND SMALL EXTENSION TO SIDE. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 14TH JANUARY 2021. WD/2020/1837/F – HOMELEIGH, DITTONS ROAD, POLEGATE BN26 6HS – MODIFICATION OF EXISTING CONSERVATORY. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 9TH FEBRUARY 2021.

	<u>WD/2020/1039/MAJ</u> – LAND TO THE WEST OF STONE CROSS GARDEN CENTRE, DITTONS ROAD, STONE CROSS BN24 5EP – PROPOSED 70 BED CARE HOME INCLUDING LANDSCAPED GARDENS AND PARKING FACILITIES. APPROVED BY WEALDEN DISTRICT COUNCIL ON 11TH FEBRUARY 2021. Noted by all present
12808	Other planning items APPEAL - <u>APP/C1435/D/3261336</u> – 37 OAKLEAF DRIVE, POLEGATE BN26 6PS Noted by all present

The remote meeting ended at 10.50am

Chair of Planning Committee _____ Date