

Action List from a meeting of the East Hoathly & Halland Action Group against Wealden Overdevelopment			
Date & Location:	9th Feb 2017, 8pm to 9.15pm Belmont room village hall		
Attendees:	<u>Village Concerns Steering Committee:</u> Katherine Gutkind (KG), Gill Kennedy (GK), Andy Burns (AB), Fred Carter (FC), Kathryn Richardson (KR), Mike Hill (MH), Bill Walker (BW), Linda Partrick (LP), Jonathan Walker (JW), Tania Freezer (TF), Fiona Dobbs (FD), David Dobbs (DD), Plus: Ann Newton (AN), John Graham (JG)		
Copies to:	Attendees	Chair: KR	Prepared by BW/KG/TF
Abbrev.	WDC: Wealden District Council PD: Parker Dann WC: Ward Councillor PC: Parish Council MB: Mark Best	IOR: Wealden's, Issues, Options and Recommendations EH: East Hoathly LP: Local Plan SYLS: 5 Year Land Supply	

1.	<p>This meeting was set up between Village Concerns Steering Committee (VC) and the Acting Ward Councillor (AN) to discuss two planning applications in East Hoathly that will shortly be coming up for Committee hearing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hesmond hybrid planning application (WD/2016/2796/MAO). 2. Hesmond – Buttsfield Lane planning application (WD/2016/2268/F). <p>Three objectives were set for the meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Acting Ward Councillor should represent the residents of East Hoathly by joining three speakers in presenting objections to planning application (WD/2016/2796/MAO) at the meeting of the WDC Planning Committee. 2. The Acting Ward Councillor will support the Parish Council, wherever possible , to arrange a Public Meeting to discuss the Hesmonds Stud Application on a date which gives the Parish Council sufficient time to formulate a detailed response to this complex application incorporating the views of Parishioners. 3. The Acting Ward Councillor will seek to have the Buttsfield Lane planning application (WD/2016/2268/F) called for committee scrutiny. 	
2.	The Acting Ward Councillor agreed to this meeting on the basis that a silent observer could be present. It was agreed at the Councillor's suggestion that this would be JG. This was for assistance with corroboration of the notes.	
3.	<p>The Acting Ward Councillor agreed to speak in her own right at the Hearing on the Hesmonds Stud Application at WDC. The Acting Ward Councillor will voice the resident's opposition and our views. There has been very little support for the development, more a reaction that it was a done deal. There will still be the opportunity for three other speakers to speak against the development. The Acting Ward Councillor cannot vote.</p> <p>A draft of Acting Ward Councillor's speech will be made available to VC steering committee to avoid repetition.</p> <p>It was noted that the speeches should be continuous.</p> <p>It was noted that this was an odd Hybrid Application.</p>	AN
4.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u></p> <p>AN: The Highways Report has raised objections; however, as said at the recent Protocol Meeting (30th Jan: WDC, PD, WC, PC reps), this is solvable; although it might mean new drawings and possibly restarting a 21 days public consultation. This will be verified.</p> <p>As we finalise these notes on Tuesday, February 14th, this new submission is online on the</p>	AN

	WDC website.	
5.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: The developer will not be asked to address infrastructure problems. CIL money will go into the Wealden pot for priority distribution throughout the Wealden area. CIL money will not provide for all infrastructure. If mains sewerage connection is not economic, the developer could use a package system; although the Environment Agency is loathe issuing a licence for these. A section 106 can be negotiated with the Parish Council (PC); The PC should make a priority list of district infrastructure projects which they believe the Parish would benefit from any available funds. WDC will manage the offer. This will be verified.</p>	AN
6.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> Mark Best of Parker Dann is reported to have said that no section 106 money will be required. AN: WDC relies on reports from statutory consultees to say what is required in the way of additional infrastructure. Developers can offer more and the PC are in a position to take the initiative if wishing to ask for anything extra'. The PC must take the initiative in asking for extras.</p>	
7.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: In my opinion Waldron Rd access is a bad part of this plan: a simple bollard to ensure only emergency vehicle access will not work (examples given of other area). Reject this.</p>	
8.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: In the speech to the Planning Committee, it is permissible to indicate a compromise e.g. reject parcel of land not in SHELAA (about 70 homes).</p>	
9.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: The Ailies Lane development is 'cheeky' and could become the reason for the rejection of the whole application. 'If any application has more than one part, either part would lead to the rejection of the whole application as decisions cannot be split'. AN: A site visit before the hearing will be recommended to Committee members to both Ailies Lane site and Waldron Road / London Road site.</p>	AN
10.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: In my personal opinion employment doesn't work in residential areas. The Local Plan will have employment sites (though AN is not sure yet about East Hoathly). Affordable housing (35% of 200) is way above what's needed so would help to meet District needs (some apprehension expressed at this by VC).</p>	
11.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: The new Local Plan will be published by 9th March. The recent White Paper promotes community involvement on good design but also says 'we are changing the way local councils make assessments...' This probably means more housing. AN: 'It would be ideal if the Committee hearing for the Hesmonds application was 9 March and not 2 March as by the ninth the next stage of the Local Plan will have been published so it will be clear as to what is detailed for the Parish in the way of housing numbers'. Will try for hearing on 9th March.</p>	AN
12.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> AN: In my personal opinion the development boundary removal was wrong. East Hoathly is more sustainable than other villages (some surprise expressed at this by VC). More homes can make a place more sustainable because of extra footfall. Look at the IOR document to see why East Hoathly settlement hierarchy changed. A lot to do with proximity to Uckfield (e.g. Ninfield near to Bexhill).</p>	
13.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u> VC: What is negotiable on percentage of affordable housing? AN: Viability test. Affordable housing will meet the District's not just Parish housing need. At 72, we (EH) will meet the District's need. VC: EH has 3 on the WDC housing list. VC pointed out that a development in Uckfield started out with one housing need number which slipped drastically lower in the end.</p>	

	VC: What is the right place for affordable?	
14.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u></p> <p>VC: Can we make reference to other potential developments in our objections/3 minute speeches?</p> <p>AN: We can voice it. In my personal opinion, I would never build a house on green field sites. Central government do not understand rural area but if WDC as the Planning Authority do not put together a Local Plan together, the Government will impose one.</p> <p>VC: How can we protect / preserve the village?</p> <p>AN: With difficulty. When the Local Plan is published, it will carry a certain weight. Can be used as guidance. Will still help us out even if in draft form. There will be opportunity for the communities to respond, though the revised Local Plan will be mainly what goes for approval in front of the Inspector.</p> <p>VC: Will it be of benefit to EH?</p> <p>VC: Asked about evidence still to be submitted aside from the Gypsy and Travellers report.</p> <p>AN: Evidence will be in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>VC: What about the allocated number of 190 for EH? Will this number change in the revised LP?</p> <p>AN: The numbers in the Local Plan should reflect what is recommended for approval although the issue of the 5YLS remains the same.</p>	
15.	<p><u>objective1: WD/2016/2796/MAO</u></p> <p>VC: Sustainability? Are bicycles a strong point for us to make?</p> <p>AN: Yes.</p> <p>VC: WDC regard it as acceptable to cycle, walk or use the bus even though it is not feasible, to Uckfield, and most people will use their cars.</p> <p>AN: More houses will make EH more sustainable. More foot fall for local business. Close to Uckfield makes EH also more sustainable.</p>	
16.	<p><u>objective2</u></p> <p>A PC meeting has now been fixed for 20th Feb and the public can speak on WD/2016/2796/MAO between 7pm to 7.30pm. The public may want to stay after 7:30 to hear the discussion on the Hesmonds Stud application.</p>	
17.	<p><u>objective3</u></p> <p>AN: The Buttsfield Lane planning application (WD/2016/2268/F) has been called for committee scrutiny – date yet to be advised My reasons for referral will be forwarded to VC.</p>	
18.	<p>It was agreed that Village Concerns and the PC should aim to work together. VC has sent to the PC, via the Clerk the VC's objection submitted to WDC and pointed out important Consultee reports as well as important objections.</p>	
19.	<p>There was a brief discussion on a new Community Hall. When a feasibility study was done several years ago by the PC, £3m was an estimated cost of a new Hall. Members of the VC suggested instead land given to the village in perpetuity, such as Harrison's Field as a minimum - preferably more.</p>	