

**UNADOPTED
POLEGATE TOWN COUNCIL**



PLANNING COMMITTEE

**Minutes of the Planning meeting held on Monday 3rd May 2016 at 7.30pm
United Reformed Church, High Street, Polegate, BN26 6AE**

Present: Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, T Bennett, D Watts (5)

Not present: - Martin Falkner

59 members of public

The chairman of the Planning committee welcomed the public and explained that the committee was convened to make comment on the Greenleaf application only. She explained that standing orders would be suspended so that the public could speak and that after that time standing orders would be reinstated and the public would then not be able to speak.

She stated that she had had apologies from Cllr Falkner who could not attend as he was away on holiday.

Minute No.	Subject/Resolution
11730	<p>Opportunity for Public comment <i>Standing orders suspended</i></p> <p>A number of residents spoke against the application giving the following comments:</p> <p>What infrastructure was available to take the scheme?</p> <p>What were the major revisions to the original that had been refused appealed and lost at appeal?</p> <p>The plans for 14 affordable houses with missed sizes interspersed with privately owned housing had not been successful in other Polegate housing estates and she believed there were some anti social issues happening on those estates now.</p> <p>Would the affordable housing be available for locals or would it merely be a place to bring those who could not be accommodated from London and further afield.</p> <p>The site access would actually cross a well used bridleway and route used by many children, adults, dog walkers, horse riders and ramblers etc.</p> <p>There were some economic factors that needed to be mentioned, the commercial units in Windsor way had already fallen into disuse, one had been converted to residential, one was used and the other two were derelict.</p> <p>There were some environmental factors to consider, the sewage treatment works originally could not take any more and now this development may be added.</p> <p><i>At a later time the chairman addressed this by explaining that the application included an on site package treatment works, which meant that the sewage would be treated and turned back to "fresh" water onsite.</i></p>

Parking was mentioned and the increase in housing in the area with no facilities for the children. Banks were closing and shopping facilities were poor and in decline.

A resident commented that not all residents of the area had received a letter and whilst he understood the excuse that there was no statutory duty for the district council to let everyone in the area know, there was a moral one. He stated that he had delivered a few notices letting people know that the development had submitted an application and that the Town Council would be passing their comments to the district council from tonight's meeting.

The resident commented that there were serious concerns with the safety of children as it was a school area and you could not safely have 20-40 ton lorries passing through the area. He urged everyone to write to Wealden as the deadline had been extended as Wealden District had got the post code wrong on the original notification.

Another resident commented that the application had already been refused, appealed and refused and he did not understand why they could resubmit again even though nothing had materially changed in the application. He stated that in his opinion the roads could not take any additional traffic and could not accommodate construction traffic safely as there simply was not enough space for that. He was concerned that Polegate had already accommodated a vast amount of housing and was due to have even more, but that the application was not suitable for the location and that the wildlife in that area would be decimated. He urged the town council to object to the application.

A resident spoke on the capacity of the hospitals and the need for most people to travel to the coast now. He commented that there was no longer a lollipop lady at the school and that normal cars speed through that area plus parking for collecting the children, he saw this as a major issue for construction lorries visiting the site.

A resident commented that he was totally emphatically opposed to the development.

Another resident commented that there were huge concerns about any construction lorries and waste lorries accessing the site, that there was already a lack of doctors and that the infrastructure could not longer take the extra houses.

A resident asked what had changed from the last application which was dismissed at appeal.

Another resident commented that the local houses had been enlarged to accommodate more families in that area and that there had been an increase in parking and traffic. Emergency vehicles would not be able to get to the site easily at all. The verges were already being churned up and the by pass had been installed. He thought that after the appeal was dismissed that would be the end of the development.

A resident commented that the traffic survey was supposed to have evening traffic noted but in the table that was not the case so believed that they had lied in the application.

Another resident commented on the loss of wildlife, bats, nightingales, finches, tree creepers and many other species.

A resident commented on the local policing and their comments on mixed use affordable housing, if they were asked about the anti social problems on the other estates nearby and was also concerned about the police

	<p>commenting that they saw no issues with the traffic. A resident commented that the cuckoo trail was beautiful and that soon all the countryside would be gone. The schools hospitals and drs were all over capacity and could not take any more.</p> <p><i>Standing orders reinstated</i></p>
<p>11731</p>	<p>Planning Application <u>WD/2016/0644/MAO</u> LAND ADJ GREENLEAF GARDENS, POLEGATE BN26 0TW. RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OF UP TO 40 RESIDENTIAL UNITS INCLUDING AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND ASSOCIATED DEVELOPMENT.</p> <p>A councillor commented that she was against the proposal and it was essential to put all of the objections before Wealden District Council and hoped that they would once again make the decision to refuse the application. She was still very concerned that all of the development seemed to be coming to the South of the district.</p> <p>A councillor commented that she had already sat through the first application and the appeal details and this application was no different and that she was also opposed to the development. She was very concerned that the wildlife would be lost and thought that it was not suitable for 40 houses. The local schools were all over subscribed and having mobile classrooms to accommodate the number of students. She wondered how the drs or the hospitals would cope. She commented that there were also petitions in the chemists and the last High Street bank in the town had been lost. She stated that she would be voting against the application. She had serious concerns about the mixed use of social/affordable housing and private housing as it simply was not working in other areas of the town. She said that areas where there was only affordable housing such as the Sidings and the Tower Mill development in Willingdon worked extremely well.</p> <p>A councillor commented on the sewage and confirmed that the application stated there would be an onsite package treatment works. She had spoken to an architect about this and they had confirmed that this was a suitable option as the water came out as "fresh" water.</p> <p>A councillor commented that the infrastructure had not changed in many years and there were concerns about the traffic congestion as it was without adding more to that. particularly with regards to the junctions onto the Hailsham Road. There were also concerns about policing and parking. He stated that he was not in favour of the application.</p> <p>A councillor stated that he agreed with many of the comments from both residents and councillors and would not be supporting the application and would be voting against it.</p> <p>Another councillor stated that he had serious concerns over the capacity of the hospitals and schools which were already in a bas state and he wondered how the roads would cope also. He stated he would be against the applications.</p> <p>It was agreed that the clerk would draft a brief letter asking residents to write to Wealden with their objections before the deadline, these would be printed by the office and delivered by a few residents and councillors.</p> <p>It was resolved to submit substantial objections to the applications based on all of the comments. This would be drafted and circulated to the committee and then sent off to Wealden</p>

	District Council. VOTE All in favour of submitting objections. Cllrs Mrs W Alexander, Mrs M Piper, B Goodwin, T Bennett, D Watts
--	---

The meeting closed at 8.15 pm

Chair of Planning Committee _____ Date