

# HAILSHAM TOWN COUNCIL PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE



REPORT (Minutes) of the Planning and Development Committee relating to the inspection of planning applications and other planning related matters, held at the Civic Community Hall, Vicarage Lane, Hailsham on Tuesday 7<sup>th</sup> May 2013 at 7.00 pm.

Prior to commencement of formal business, a period of not more than 15 minutes was assigned for the purpose of permitting members of the public to address the Committee or ask questions (on matters relevant to the responsibilities under direction of this Committee) at the invitation and discretion of the presiding Chairman.

Mrs Hill of 36 Hawks Wood Drive strongly objected to the application, stating that the boundary between Hailsham and Hellingly will be lost. She stated that Hailsham was losing its identity and was concerned the Town was going downhill.

Mr R. Skipper of 7 Manor Park Homes Estate also strongly objected, questioning why the development was being built in this area, between Hailsham and Hellingly. He stated that up until April of this year the area had been a floodplain. He also questioned the need for extra houses and stated that houses are not selling, using the recent development, Roebuck Park in Hellingly, as an example of this.

Mr S. Veal of 20 New Road, Hellingly agreed with all the above comments and objections and confirmed that New Road is liable to flooding. He stated that he had spoken to a number of traders locally and reported that local traders were not employed on these developments and local materials are not used, again using Roebuck Park as an example. He considered that individuals cannot afford these developments. He advised he had taken some pictures of the flooded areas and would pass these onto the Town Council and Wealden District Council.

Mrs Simpson of 9 Danum Close also strongly objected and stated she was concerned at the increase in population this development would bring and how this would affect local services, such as hospitals. She considered that the local hospitals cannot cope with demand now and was concerned at what would happen once the development is built.

PLAN/  
13/1/305

## **Present**

Councillors: Mrs M. Burt, Mrs J. Cook, N. Collinson, W. Crittenden, P. Holbrook, S. McAuliffe, M. Ryan (Chairman)

Mr C. Stanyard – East Sussex County Council

Officers in attendance: K. Moralee

306

## **Apologies For Absence:**

Councillor Mrs J. Bentley and R. Grocock

307

## **Declarations of Interest**

Councillor N. Collinson and Councillor Mrs J. Cook both declared a personal interest as they both live near to the proposed development.

Councillor S. McAuliffe declared a personal interest as he is employed by Southern Water,

who is a consultee for this development.

308

### **Confirmation of Minutes**

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning and Development Committee held on Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> April 2013 Ref: 12/14/285-304 was confirmed as a correct record.

### **Matters Arising**

None were received.

309

### **Planning Applications 13/1/309 (appended hereto)**

#### **WD/2013/0637/MEA – Land East of Park Road and South of New Road**

Hailsham Town Council objects to the development for the following reasons:

The development is in excess of the emerging Strategic Sites DPD and the current number of houses proposed would lead to the site being overdeveloped.

The area covered by the proposed application includes areas which are not allocated for development in the emerging Strategic Sites DPD.

The Town Council has concerns over the high impact the development will have on the environment and protected species. The Town Council wish to impose a condition that the developer is subject to a third party audit to ensure it is following its own stipulation and guidelines in the application. The mitigation measures proposed in the Environmental Study, whilst comprehensive, are not guaranteed to succeed (particularly concerned about the nationally threatened Green Winged Orchid translocation proposal as these schemes have significantly high failure rates), and there will be notable fragmentation of remaining natural areas such as hedges, which therefore reduces the overall habitat value of the area as a whole. Whilst it's acknowledged that, in numerical terms, there will net increases in particular habitat types, the quality of those habitats cannot be guaranteed as equivalent or better to that currently existing. This is contrary to the biodiversity net gain requirement of the National Planning Policy Framework as the outcomes cannot be confirmed. Developments should work to create site designs that encompass and enhance existing wildlife features rather than trying to move them or compensate for their loss. Should permission be granted, the Town Council wish to be closely involved in working on this with the developer and Wealden District Council from the outset and not just consulted after a plan has been produced but involved in the drafting of the plan itself.

The Council also wish to impose a condition that that the developer is subject to a third party audit to ensure it is compliant to any planning conditions imposed.

If the development is granted the Council would wish to impose a condition that the infrastructure is in place before any development commences. The existing vital infrastructure: traffic management, medical provision, schooling, flood prevention are incapable, at this stage, of supporting additional major residential developments. Vital infrastructure within Hailsham needs to be brought on stream prior to significant numbers dwellings being built.

The Town Council has concerns on the impact of the road network by this development and objects to the diversion of the A271 as there is no discernable benefit to the diversion and this simply shifts the problem rather than resolving it. Park Road and New Road are of insufficient width to accommodate heavy duty vehicles. In addition, there is inadequate off street parking in New Road and therefore a large number of vehicles park on the carriageway at all times during the day and night. The Town Council is concerned about the volume of additional traffic this would divert into Hellingly itself, the detriment this would

cause to the residents of the village in quality of life terms and also the increased accident risk. The development is therefore contrary to policy SPO13 of the Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and saved policy EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998.

There being no further business the meeting closed at 8.15 pm

Global/Minutes & Agendas/Planning

## **PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

### **WD/2013/0637/MEA – Major application with environmental assessment**

Land East of Park Road and South of New Road

Residential development of up to 650 dwellings, a new primary school, up to 300sqm of retail floorspace, employment provision (business), formal and informal open space, new allotments and landscaped areas together with new accesses, highway works (including new links between Park Road and New Road), other related infrastructure and associated works including demolition of existing buildings and structures