

Item 4

UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL



PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Monday 1st October 2018 at 7.30 pm
Council Chambers 49 High Street, Polegate, BN26 6AL**

Present: Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, D Dunbar, M Falkner, Ms A Snell (6)

Not present: - Cllrs D Watts (1)

No members of public also present Cllr Mrs M Phillips

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution
12502	Opportunity for public comment None
12503	Apologies for absence Cllrs D Watts
12504	Declarations of interest in any items on the agenda None
12505	Minutes of the meetings held on 20th September 2018 It was resolved that the minutes of the Planning committee on 20th September 2018 were an accurate record of the meeting. VOTE All in favour Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, D Dunbar, M Falkner, Ms A Snell
12506	Wealden Local Plan – response to Wealden District Council Councillors presented their comments on the plan including: P212 16:19 The final sentence refers to grazing marsh, the committee was concerned over the possible flooding implications. P213 SWGA38 a) there were serious concerns over the wording “where possible” the committee was concerned that this should be stronger “must” would be more suitable as anything less did not guarantee protection. P213 d) “the need to take into account flood risk and the provisions of the water Framework Directive regarding water quality” the committee commented that there was no explanation of what this was and what did it mean and also how would this be done? P214 SWGA 39 b) Although the initial paragraph states will require, section b) state “may be required” – concerns that this should be changed to “will be required” A short discussion over the express bus corridor (bus lane) took place. d) the committee was very concerned over the provision of the sewerage in that the sewerage systems were already up to capacity and the committee had serious concerns on the impact on residents and potential disastrous issues that may occur. Comments were made on the “nearest point of adequate capacity” and how feasible this actually was in real terms. P217 comments were made on the numbers included in the SHEELA sites,

the sorting office would be developed potentially into 6 units and the 76 opposite LIDL.

P591 the address was incorrect and should not read 11 North street, but 74 High Street. (622/1510)

P218 16:23 The committee queried that 2015 data was neither accurate nor relevant now and also queried the definition of "Leisure services" and asked for this to be clarified. The committee referred to the fact that 3 banks had now gone.

The committee commented that the Polegate Town Centre Vision had not yet started and this would tie in with the town centre steering group next phase.

P218 16:25 the committee referred to the study by Network Rail and East Sussex County Council and discussed the impact of the local growth. The committee queried the local growth and asked for it to be clarified if this was Hailsham and the surrounding area of Polegate or Polegate growth.

P56 the allocations and SHELAA sites total of 105 and the windfall provision of 87 houses were unclear where these figures came from.

There were concerns that with the large number of extra housing in both Hailsham and Stone cross the already busy junction at the top of jubilee way may not be able to cope with the increased traffic and the committee felt that the congestion would be exacerbated.

The committee also commented on Hailsham's large number of additional housing and referred to the comment that transport improvement "may" be required. They stated it should be "will" be required.

There was a lot of discussion of the habitats and the Pevensey Levels, Lewes Downs, and other areas of concern, and how the impact of the issues surrounding nitrogen deposition was not clarified, it stated that mitigation was required but not what that mitigation would be. There were serious concerns that levels were already OVER the required amount and therefore it was unclear how any mitigation of new development could bring it to an acceptable level lower than it was now.

Reference was made to an area in Hailsham where odour was discussed and it was stated that there as already a serious odour issue in that area. People buying houses there would not only have to suffer the effects of the dreadful odour but also then have to drive out onto narrow country road. Appendix B of the air quality report (table 2) was questioned in tat where would the money come from? Also, the predictions were to 2040 and it was felt that this was so far in advance that it was difficult to accurately predict that far into the future.

P212 SWGA38 the committee asked for written clarification that there would be no housing in this allocation as it referred to a medical centre, education, community hall, sports and leisure facilities.

P209 committee asked for clarification on the gypsy caravan site (1 caravan and one plot?) and commented that the map P2 should be within the development boundary on the purple key section or an arrow to that area.

A councillor commented on the air quality report and that it states in the plan that all developments would have electrical charging points, but the area struggles to generate enough electricity for houses yet alone electric vehicles and most residents did not have electric vehicles.

A comment was also made on that "freight traffic will seek not to have an impact on special areas of conservation but there was no explanation of

HOW this would be achieved.

It also referred to an offline A27, what did this actually mean
The committee commented how wordy the document was and felt it was "wordy with little substance". They commented that the graphics and maps were difficult to read and had no street names, so even if you knew the area it was difficult to see where boundaries were.

A discussion on provision of affordable housing for young people was essential, but that none of the development were really producing any affordable houses when even the lowest price were well above affordability for anyone on minimum wage. A discussion of national policy ensued. The committee felt it was essential that brownfield not greenfield sites were developed. The impact of dualling the A27 was discussed.

The committee noted the policy AF2(P45) supported a Parkway Station or alternative parking capacity in South Wealden.

P73 WLP13 a) should read Hailsham South and should read Hailsham South Wastewater Treatment Works.

P77 INF04/05 were noted by the committee.

P79 7.10 was noted by the committee.

P206 16.5 should read "Polegate" not "Hailsham" aged 16-74?

P207 the map should read Polegate and Willingdon as the boundary surrounds both parishes.

P213 SWGA38 c) was noted that there was no access from PW1 across Polegate Town Council land.

P214 SWGA38 it was noted that the S106 already held by Wealden District Council (£220,000) was for Polegate and there was very little of PW1 in Polegate parish.

P214 SWGA39 refers to the "Polegate Town Centre Study" and the council noted that they wished to be involved in this as it was part of the business plan.

P218 16:24,16:25 were noted by the committee.

P220 The primary and secondary shopping areas were queried as neither included the shops beyond Victoria road on both sides of the road. It was requested that these should at least be in the secondary area.

It was resolved to submit the above comments to wealden District Council
VOTE All in favour **Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, D Dunbar, M Falkner, Ms A Snell**

The meeting closed at 8.40pm

Chair of Planning Committee _____ Date

Item 5

Item 5

	£	£	£
PLANNING COMMITTEE			
Hire of Halls	200	200	200
TOTAL PLANNING COSTS	200	200	200

PROPOSED BY PLANNING FOR HALLS