HELLINGLY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT
PRE-SUBMISSION PLAN

Consultation Questionnaire

Please use this questionnaire to feedback any comments that you may have on the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). Please return completed questionnaires either to clerk@hellingly-pc.org.uk or to The Village Hall, North Street, Hellingly, East Sussex, BN24 5PQ.

We welcome your views to enable the Plan to be developed and shaped to best meet local needs/wishes.
Policy HNDP1 – Area of Locally Valued Landscape

Within the Hellingly Locally Valued Landscape Area as identified on the proposals map the inherent visual qualities and distinctive character of the area will be protected. Development will only be permitted that is not detrimental to the rural character, scenic quality or visual benefit of the area.

Where development proposals have the potential to impact upon the area a landscape assessment will be required to assess the level of impact. Where impacts are identified proposals should incorporate the recommendations of this assessment. Where such impacts cannot be satisfactorily mitigated development will not be permitted.

1. development will not be permitted if it is considered detrimental to the scenic quality or rural character of the area or impacts on the rural setting of public footpaths.

2. development, where appropriate, will be required to show how the character of the area and its biodiversity can be enhanced through provision of additional tree planting and other landscaping measures and ecological improvements.

3. long distance views of the South Downs from public vantage points will be protected from obtrusive developments.

4. developments will be required to demonstrate that lighting proposals are the minimum required for security and or working purposes.

5. the potential for light trespass or glare will be proven to be minimised.

(Core Strategy Policies – WCS13, WCS12. Saved Policies EN8, EN12, EN14, EN17)

Do you support this policy

Yes ☒ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protecting valued landscapes is in line with the NPPF (170.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protecting areas that are within the setting of the National Park from obtrusive development is in line with the NPPF (172.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 2.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requiring enhancement of area’s biodiversity has the potential to contribute to biodiversity net gain; this is in line with the NPPF (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (Chapter 1. Section 1.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It could also benefit the wider existing ecological network, in line with the NPPF (170. &amp; 174.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Minimising light pollution will be beneficial to bats and the South Downs International Dark Sky Reserve, *this is also in line with the NPPF (180.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider interweaving biodiversity net gain, green infrastructure and ecological network concepts into this policy from the NPPF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Where appropriate’ should be removed from point 2 to ensure measurable net gains for biodiversity will be secured through development, in line <em>with the NPPF (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.)</em> and the DEFRA 25 year plan <em>(Chapter 1. Section 1.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Policy HNDP 2 – Local Green Space**

Local Green Space as shown on the Proposals Map and used, managed and enjoyed by the local community will be protected from new development. Opportunities for increased enjoyment and accessibility to these spaces will be encouraged and supported.

Planning permission for development which would result in the loss or reduction of an identified Local Green Space will only be granted in the following circumstances:

1. **Where it can be demonstrated that the land no longer has any visual, recreational, amenity or ecological value to the community; or**

2. **An area of equivalent value (size and/or interest) is provided in the locality in compensation.**

*(Core Strategy SPO11, WCS13 Saved Policies LR1, LR3, LR5)*

Do you support this policy  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No  

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing and Protecting Local Green Space (LGS) from development enhances the natural and local environment by improving overall biodiversity and maintaining a coherent ecological network. <em>This is in line with the NPPF (170.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing accessibility to LGS better connects people to nature. It also increases its natural capital value as it enables more frequent delivery of ecosystem services. <em>Contributing to natural capital is in line with the NPPF (170. &amp; 171.) and is a key concept of the DEFRA 25 year plan.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allowing equivalent value compensation of LGS does not contribute to biodiversity net-gain aims of the NPPF &amp; DEFRA 25 year plan. Land providing compensatory LGS should be established before development proceeds to ensure existing ecological networks are not disrupted and prevent inappropriate compensation land being established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wording should be included to ensure this policy contributes to net gain and Green infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Wording</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. <em>Where it can be demonstrated that the land no longer has any visual, recreational, amenity or ecological value to the community; or and</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. An area of <em>equivalent significantly greater</em> value (size and/or interest) <em>is has been</em> provided in the locality in compensation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Policy HNDP 3 – Areas at Risk of Flooding**

Within the area identified on the HNDP Proposals Map as an Area at Risk of Flooding development proposals will be resisted unless the proposal has other public benefits that clearly outweigh the risk of flooding to properties or where the risk can be shown to be satisfactorily mitigated.

Where development is considered appropriate the developer shall provide a suitable sustainable drainage scheme that shall meet the requirements of the whole site. In addition, the scheme will need to demonstrate no adverse impacts from flood risk, including of surface water flood risk, on adjoining land. In implementation of an agreed SUDS scheme opportunities should be sought to contribute to locally identified Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and Biodiversity Action Plans.

(Core Strategy SPO9, SPO10, WCS12, WCS14)

Do you support this policy  
Yes ☑  
No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

| Positives | • Requiring developers to incorporate SUDS into their developments reduces flood risk but also helps improves a water catchment’s water quality as SUDS can filter pollutants from contaminated surface runoff water.  
**Improving water quality is in line with the NPPF (170.)**

• Incorporating Suds can contribute to the GI network and natural capital in Hellingly. This is in line with the aims of the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 170. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan. |

| Improvements | • Retrofitting existing drainage systems (i.e. gully pots) with SUDS should also be encouraged, where management of water quality and quantity within the water catchment can be improved where possible.  
**Improving water quality is in line with the NPPF (170.)**

• In recognition of the multiple environmental benefits SUDS can provide within a development, it may be beneficial to amend the wording of this policy to ensure that SUDS schemes contribute to identified Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and Biodiversity Action Plans, and incorporated at the earliest stages of planning. |
Policy HNDP 4

1. To minimise the risk of flooding within Hellingly Flood Risk Assessments for development purposes will be required to assess runoff from the total area of the development site, including from any associated landscaping and not solely from impermeable surfaces. Such assessments will include an assessment of the risk of flooding, including surface water flooding, to adjoining land.

2. There will be a presumption against land raise on development sites in view of the high risk and incidence of surface water and other flooding in Hellingly, including to agricultural land. Where land raise is proposed permission will only be granted where mitigation can be shown to satisfactorily deal with any identified risk. Mitigation will be required to be to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority and East Sussex County Council as flood authority.

(Core Strategy SPO9, SPO10, WCS14, Saved Policies EN1, EN4)

Do you support this policy      Yes ☐     No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

No comment
Policy HNDP 5 – Green and Blue Infrastructure

Green and blue infrastructure assets as shown on the Proposals Map will be protected and enhanced by ensuring all development proposals:

- Are based upon survey work carried out within the last 2 years
- Maintain and enhance the integrity of the green and blue infrastructure
- On or immediately adjacent to green or blue infrastructure assets clearly demonstrate, through use of up to date ecological information, that proposals will not harm the integrity or function of that feature and the benefits it provides. Where necessary proposals will include the identification of evidence and mitigation measures sufficient to avoid any harm to the green and blue infrastructure.
- Clearly demonstrate how the overall function and integrity of the green or blue infrastructure will be enhanced to provide net gains. Proposals should include a management plan to ensure the effective long term implementation and management of those green and blue infrastructure assets.

(Core Strategy SPO1, WCS12, WCS13, Saved Policies EN12, EN13, EN14, EN15, EN16)

Do you support this policy

- Yes ☒
- No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Natural England strongly supports this policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping and Incorporating Green &amp; Blue infrastructure (GI) concepts is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. &amp; 181.) &amp; DEFRA 25 year plan (Chapter 3. Section 3.i.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensuring GI is protected and enhanced contributes to biodiversity net gain. <em>In line with the NPPF (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (Chapter 1. Section 1.).</em> It also increases the natural capital stock available in Hellingly; <em>this in line with the NPPF (170. &amp; 171.) and is a key concept within the DEFRA 25 year plan.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong use of net gain concepts is in line with NPPF (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) &amp; DEFRA 25 year plan <em>(Chapter 1. Section 1.)</em>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Requiring developers to use up to date ecological information further protects both GI assets and the wider ecological network. <em>In line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 170.171. 174 &amp; 181.)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Requiring developers to produce long term management plans for GI ensures that GI will be of value for a greater length of time, increasing the total amount of natural capital it is worth; this in line with the NPPF (170. & 171.) and is a key concept within the DEFRA 25 year plan.

Improvements

Consider setting specific requirements for amounts of GI required for developments i.e. set percentage of development cost should be invested into GI and/or certain hectareage of developments. This will assist in ensuring net gains are measureable which is an aim of the NPPF (174. & 175.)

**Policy HNDP 6 – Biodiversity**

Biodiversity will be protected and enhanced by ensuring development

- is informed by up to date ecological information and considers cumulative impacts.

- contributes and takes opportunities to improve, enhance, manage and restore biodiversity so that there is a net gain in biodiversity including through the creation of new protected sites and locally relevant habitats and incorporating biodiversity features within developments.

- minimises habitat and species fragmentation through appropriate design and maximises opportunities to enhance restore and connect natural habitats to increase coherence and resilience.

- of 5 or more houses will be required to produce an ecological management plan that ensures effective long term implementation and management of biodiversity features.

(Core Strategy SPO1, WCS12, WCS13, Saved Policies EN12, EN13, EN14, EN15, EN16)

Do you support this policy  
- Yes ☑  
- No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th>Natural England strongly supports this policy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring development is both projected and enhanced contributes to biodiversity net gain; <em>this is in line with the NPPF</em> (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan’s aims (Chapter 1. Section 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encouraging the creation of new protected sites greatly contributes to net gain and is a major benefit for existing ecological networks; <em>this is in line with the NPPF</em> (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (Chapter 1. Section 1.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring developments to minimise habitat and species fragmentation reduces the impacts of development on existing ecological networks; <em>this in line with the NPPF</em> (170. &amp; 174.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring developments of 5 or more houses to produce ecological management plans ensures that biodiversity features are effective and contribute to the wider ecological network and natural capital stocks for longer; <em>this is in line with the NPPF</em> (170. 171. &amp; 174.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>• As well as using biodiversity as a single broad term the policy should mention important features of Hellingly’s environment such as 215ha of ancient woodland or protected species.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Consider incorporating Natural Capital concepts directly into the policy.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• This policy should not overlook the importance of protecting existing biodiversity features. Additional/more explicit wording should be included to ensure these features are protected, and impacts to existing features are avoided.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy HNDP 7 – Rural Economy**

*Subject to compliance with other policies in the NDP proposals for the diversification and development of agricultural and other land based rural businesses will be supported. Developments will be required to demonstrate that they are truly sustainable by providing economic, social and environmental benefits locally. In supporting such proposals developments will be required to demonstrate safe and suitable access, high quality design in any new buildings and that the character of the countryside/rural area is not adversely affected.*
Do you support this policy

Yes ☑

No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring developments to provide environmental benefits contributes to net gain; <em>this is in line with the NPPF (8. 170. 174. &amp; 175.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan’s aims (Chapter1. Section 1.</em>)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring developments to provide environmental benefits also improves existing ecological networks; <em>this in line with the NPPF (170. &amp; 174.</em>)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Requiring developments to provide environmental benefits also increases natural capital stocks; <em>this is in line with the NPPF (170. &amp; 171.) and is a key concept of the DEFRA 25 year plan.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy HNDP 8 – Isolated New Dwellings**

*Proposals for isolated new dwellings in the countryside will not be permitted unless the relevant special circumstances set down in the NPPF are met in full together with the criteria below.*

1. **Where an essential need to live at or near the place of work is argued proposals will need to satisfactorily demonstrate that this need cannot otherwise be met nearby. The essential need to live on the land as opposed to merely the greater convenience of it will be satisfactorily proven. This should include a detailed assessment of the functional needs of the enterprise as well as a financial assessment of the investment and sustainability of the enterprise over the long term. Proposals for any new dwelling should be able to justify the scale of the dwelling when assessed against the nature of and investment on the agricultural or local enterprise.**

2. **Where proposals for new isolated dwellings are argued on innovative architectural and design grounds (NPPF) proposals will be required to provide a detailed assessment of how they significantly enhance their immediate setting and are sensitive to the defining characteristics of the area.**

3. **The requirements at HNDP 8 (2) are in addition to meeting the stated NPPF tests regarding outstanding innovative design and architectural standards.**

Do you support this policy

Yes ☐

No ☐
Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

No comment

---

**Policy HNDP 9 – Housing Type**

*Where the principle of new residential development is appropriate and subject to compliance with other policies in the Development Plan, proposals that provide for a high percentage of homes for the elderly and starter homes/shared ownership (2-3 bed or smaller) will be supported.*

*(Core Strategy SPO3, Saved Policies HG5)*

Do you support this policy  
Yes ☐  
No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider mentioning the health benefits of ensuring housing, especially for the elderly, has well managed GI and good access to natural areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Policy HV1

New development within Hellingly Village Character Area will be required to clearly demonstrate

a) How it conserves and contributes to the character and appearance of the designated Conservation Area including key views into, through and out of the designated area. Further, how it conserves and contributes to the retention of the character and identity of Hellingly Village.

b) How it protects the historic development pattern of the settlement and avoids unnecessary and inappropriate incursions that detract from this pattern. This should seek to also ensure retention of existing field patterns along with hedgerows and trees along boundaries.

c) Supports the preservation and enhancement of designated heritage assets and their settings.

d) Use of designs that respect traditional and locally distinctive materials including their usage such as plain clay tile for roofing materials and tile hanging.

Unwarranted and unjustified development that erodes the rural character and identity of Hellingly and does not meet the above criteria will be resisted. Where extensions or ancillary buildings are proposed these should also, in addition to the above criteria

e) Clearly be subordinate to the host building and respect the setting of designated assets.

f) Respect traditional and locally distinctive materials. Brickwork should match the bind and pointing of the host building.

g) Where additional car parking or garages are proposed they should be unobtrusive.

(Core Strategy SPO2, Saved Policies EN19, EN20, EN21, EN22, EN27)

Do you support this policy   Yes [ ]   No [ ]

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

Positives
- Ensuring retention of hedgerows and tree boundaries protects existing ecological network; this in line with the NPPF (170. & 174.)
Improvements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Improvements | • Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; *increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).*

**Policy HV2 – Specific Design Criteria Hellingly Village**

- **Standard designs should be avoided**
- **Roofs of extensions and ancillary buildings should match the pitch of the host buildings**
- **Front dormers and roof extensions should be resisted**
- **Extensions to existing dwellings should be subordinate to the host building. Overly large extensions will be resisted**
- **New brickwork should match the colour, texture bond and pointing of the host building**
- **Loss of traditional timber doors, canopies and windows will be resisted**
- **Removal of chimney stacks will be resisted**

*(Core Strategy SPO2, Saved Policies EN19, EN20, EN21, EN22, EN27)*

Do you support this policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Improvements | • Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also |
enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).
Recommendation 1 – HV R1

In line with National Policy and as a matter of urgency, Wealden District Council be requested to produce a Management Plan for the Hellingly Conservation Area in consultation with local residents, the Parochial Church Council, the Parish and County Council. Such Plan to include the closed churchyard and to produce positive proposals for the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes □ No □

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment

Recommendation 2 – HV R2

Wealden District Council in liaison with East Sussex County Council as Highways Authority produce a traffic management scheme for Hellingly to help alleviate existing problems. Any such scheme to be the subject of public consultation and amendment as necessary prior to implementation.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes □ No □

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

Positives

•
**Recommendation 3 – HV R3**

*Wealden District Council be strongly advised that its emerging Plans proposal to accommodate an additional 30 houses within the Hellingly Core Area is inconsistent with its own adopted Development Plan and with National Policy in respect of Conservation Areas and Listed Buildings and the duty placed upon Local Planning Authorities regarding such matters.*

Do you support this recommendation

Yes [ ]  No [ ]

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment
**Policy LHB1**

Where the principle of new development within Lower Horsebridge Character Area is considered appropriate proposals will be required to clearly demonstrate

a) How it supports the preservation and enhancement of designated heritage assets and their settings.

b) Acknowledgement of buildings that make a positive contribution to the settlement and its character and appearance through designation as locally listed buildings and show how the development has no adverse impact upon such buildings.

c) How the proposed development protects the historic development pattern including any important views of the countryside between and beyond buildings.

d) Support for the use of designated areas of land for amenity purposes.

e) That there is no erosion of the sense of openness and rural character of the existing setting of the settlement.

f) How it promotes the use of locally distinctive materials including brick, tile hanging and plain tiled roofs together with use of or retention of traditional windows, doors, porches and shop fronts where they exist.

Where new development is considered acceptable, subject to other policies within the NDP developments shall

g) Ensure they respect the prevailing scale, mass, footprint, materials and appearance of positive and locally distinct buildings.

h) Seek to ensure the retention of field patterns along with hedgerows and trees along boundaries.

(Core Strategy SPO13, Saved Policies EN14, EN18, EN27, LR1)

Do you support this policy  Yes ☐  No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

**Positives**

- Retaining field patterns along with hedgerows and boundary trees protects the existing ecological network; *this is in line with the NPPF (170 & 174.*)
| Improvements | • Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; *increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).* |
Policy LHB2 – Specific Design Criteria – Lower Horsebridge

- Standard designs should be avoided
- New dwellings should not exceed two storeys in height
- Roofs should be pitched to no less than 40 degrees
- Front dormers and roof extensions should be resisted
- Extensions to existing dwellings should clearly be subordinate to the host building
- As a general principle gaps between existing buildings should be retained and not encroached upon or reduced
- Traditional features elements and proportions should be respected

(Core Strategy SPO13, Saved Policies EN18, EN27)

Do you support this policy

Yes ☐
No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. &amp; 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendation 1 – LHB R1

That Wealden District Council does not allocate further land for residential development at North Street, Lower Horsebridge since this can be better accommodated on a more sustainable site elsewhere in the Parish and as an integral part of an existing wider residential development.

Do you support this recommendation
Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?
No comment

Recommendation 2 – LHB R2

Wealden District Council in liaison with East Sussex County Council as Highways Authority seek to produce traffic calming solutions for Lower Horsebridge. In particular these should take into account enhanced provision of facilities at the Lower Horsebridge recreation ground. Any such scheme to be the subject of public consultation and amendment as necessary prior to implementation.

Do you support this recommendation
Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?
No comment
Recommendation 3 – LHB R3

Wealden District Council be advised that the previously submitted application WD/2016/281/MAJ is considered to be a sustainable proposal, providing that the previously offered understanding to donate land to the Parish for leisure/recreation purposes is confirmed, the proposal is strongly supported. Such proposal would meet the Districts own policies and objectives of addressing under provision and enhancement of such facilities.

(Core Strategy SPO11, Saved Policy LR8)

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment
Policy LD1

Where considered acceptable in principle new development within Lower Dicker Character Area will be required to clearly demonstrate

i) How it supports preservation and enhancement of designated heritage assets and their settings.

ii) Acknowledgment of buildings that make a positive contribution to the character of the area and its appearance through designation as locally listed buildings and how their scheme respects and supports these characteristics and does not impact adversely upon them. This includes the Zoar Chapel.

iii) How it protects the historic pattern of development clusters of built form and the important gaps between and view of the countryside between and beyond.

iv) No erosion of the sense of openness and rural character of the settlement.

v) Where new development is considered acceptable, respect for the prevailing scale, mass form materials and appearance of positive and locally distinct buildings.

vi) Use of locally distinctive materials including brick, tile hanging and plain tiled roofs.

vii) That, in the case of modern or contemporary buildings that are acceptable in principle, they respect the prevailing settlement pattern and grain are of high quality and make a positive contribution to the identity of Lower Dicker.

viii) Retention of existing field patterns along with hedgerows and trees along boundaries.

(Core Strategy SPO13, Saved Policies EN14, EN18, EN27)

Do you support this recommendation

Yes □ No □

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

Positives

• Retaining field patterns along with hedgerows and boundary trees protects the existing ecological network; this is in line with the NPPF (170 & 174.)
| Improvements | • Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; *increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).* |
**Policy LD2 – Specific Design Criteria – Lower Dicker**

- **Standard designs should be avoided**
- **New dwellings should not exceed two storeys in height**
- **Roofs should be pitched to no less than 35-40 degrees**
- **Front dormers and roof extensions should be resisted**
- **Extensions to existing dwellings should clearly be subordinate to the host building**
- **Gaps between existing buildings should be retained and not encroached upon or reduced**

*(Core Strategy SPO13, Saved Policies EN18, EN27)*

Do you support this policy  
[ ] Yes  
[ ] No

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological enhancements should be secured, which contribute to net gain and GI requirements. Suggestions which might be suitable for housing in this character area may include bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries. Development should also enhance existing tree boundaries and hedgerows; <em>increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. &amp; 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.)</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 1 – LD R1**

_That Wealden District Council:_

i)  **Acknowledge the detailed Village Character Assessment for Lower Dicker and the ensuing proposed preferred locations of land to enable delivery of 38,000 sq m of employment land close to the A22 growth corridor**

ii)  **Recognise that this work will best enable the retention of the identity and character of the settlement whilst also delivering their strategic identified employment need**

iii)  **Do not progress the idea of proposing a Development Boundary for Lower Dicker since this is considered unnecessary and would lead to uncertainty in delivery and probable greater adverse impact of development outside of the optimum areas now put forward.**

---

Do you support this recommendation  

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?  

No comment
**Recommendation 2 – LD R2**

i) That Wealden District Council in liaison with East Sussex County Council seek to accommodate any local waste transfer station requirement north of the A22 thereby releasing the former Dicker Pottery (Shep Plastics) site for residential development.

ii) Seek to encourage and if appropriate allocate the land for such residential use together with indicative design principles to reflect local traditions, styles and materials.

Do you support this recommendation

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment

---

**Recommendation 3 – LD R3**

That East Sussex County Council together with those bodies responsible for the monitoring of air pollution levels be requested to increase their efforts in the monitoring of traffic impacts in the area to design and implement solutions to enhance road safety and reduce local air pollution issues. Such schemes to be the subject of widespread consultation prior to their implementation.

Do you support this policy

[ ] Yes  [ ] No

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recommending action to reduce air pollution issues is in line with the NPPF(148. &amp; 170.) and is especially important in section 9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Policy RP1

Where the principle of new development within Roebuck Park Character Area and its setting, (as defined in the Proposals Map), is acceptable it will be required to clearly demonstrate:

i) How it supports and does not adversely impact upon the parkland setting of Roebuck Park.

ii) How it supports the provision of local facilities within or adjacent to the retained former hospital building to serve the development given its distance from local services.

iii) That it reflects and retains important open views within and from the development including:
   i) views over parklands to the South Downs National Park
   ii) views to the ancient woodland to the North
   iii) views towards the hospital buildings and the church
   iv) views from the south towards the parklands and Roebuck Park

iv) How designated heritage assets and non-designated heritage assets including those relating to the former Hellingly Hospital are preserved and protected including their settings.

Development that erodes the sense of openness and rural character of the setting of the development will be resisted.

(Core Strategy SPO2, SPO13, Saved Policies EN17, EN18, EN27)

Do you support this policy

Yes ☐  No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

Positives

- Requiring new development to retain landscape value is aligned with the NPPF (170.).

Improvements

- Could mention specific ecological enhancements & GI that might be suitable for housing in this character area i.e. bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs, or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries; increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).
**Policy RP2 – Specific Design Criteria – Roebuck Park**

- **Roofs should be pitched to no less than 45 degrees**
- **Designs of dwellings should be grouped to help reinforce local identity**
- **New dwellings should be no higher than 2 storeys with ‘true attics’**
- **Where new development is considered acceptable it should provide for suitable and appropriate levels of parking ensuring that garages, car parking courts and spaces are unobtrusive. Blocks of garages should be avoided in any additional housing developments. On street parking should be avoided.**

(Core Strategy SPO2, SPO13, Saved Policy EN27)

Do you support this policy  
Yes ☐  
No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Could mention specific ecological enhancements &amp; GI that might be suitable for housing in this character area i.e. bat/bird nesting blocks, green roofs, or hedgehog permeable garden boundaries; increasing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. &amp; 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Recommendation 1 – RPR1**

That Wealden District Council liaise with and encourage development and other interests as appropriate to bring forward early implementation of the ‘village centre’ focus identified within the Masterplan for Roebuck Park including proposals for a multi purpose community and social use of the former Hellingly Chapel building.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment

---

**Recommendation 2 – RPR2**

That Wealden District Council require the provision of an outdoor playing area for youth and adult recreation of a minimum of 2.8 hectares as a physical extension to Hellingly Country Park to serve the new residential development north of New Road Hellingly and nearby. And further be requested to urgently address the significant under provision of parks and recreational open space identified within the 2017 Wealden Open Space Study for Hellingly and Arlington Parishes and Hailsham Town.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐

No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

**Positives**

- Recommending extra provisioning of parks and open space would contribute to the GI network within Hellingly, provided they are designed well to enhance existing ecological networks. *Enhancing GI is in line with the NPPF (20. 91. 150. 171. & 181.) and the DEFRA 25 year plan (chapter 3 section 3.i.).*
**Policy LHA1**

All development affecting a non-designated heritage asset (local list) or its setting will be required to clearly demonstrate:

i) How it conserves, preserves, respects and enhances the heritage asset and its setting including through use of design, materials and understanding of the heritage importance of the building or asset

**Development proposals requiring the demolition or substantial redevelopment of a local heritage asset will be refused.**

**Development proposals which seek to support the restoration and conversion/reuse of local heritage assets including for social or community purposes will be supported subject to the setting and character of the building being converted.**

(Core Strategy SPO2)

Do you support this policy  

Yes [ ]  

No [ ]

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the Policy?

No comment
Roads and Transport – Recommendations

That East Sussex County Council as Highways Authority be asked to

i) Provide a comprehensive road design for the area west of the Cuckoo Trail and North of the A271 to provide suitable and safe access to and egress from the present and proposed developments using Park Road and the A271. Such design to discourage and reduce use of Station Road by through traffic and improving traffic calming through Hellingly Village.

ii) To extend speed restrictions (40mph) along the length of the A267 from the Boship roundabout to Wellshurst Golf Club and on the entire length of presently unrestricted C207 (Grove Hill – North Corner – Horebeech Lane from Mill Lane to Horam).

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐  No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment
Education – Recommendations

That East Sussex County Council

i) Be requested to progress, as a matter of urgency, development of a new primary school facility on land already identified at Park Road.

ii) Give early consideration and decision as to whether this should be for a 2 or 3 form entry facility given the difficulties experienced at the existing primary school site and avoiding the prospect of a new facility competing with the existing school and thereby potentially affecting the viability of both.

iii) Urgently progress provision of separate and enhanced sixth form and secondary provision at Hailsham Community College in order to adequately address needs arising from new and proposed developments within Hellingly and Hailsham itself.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment
Sport and Leisure – Recommendations

That Wealden District Council

i) As local Planning Authority ensure that existing significant levels of under provision are urgently addressed including through support for and necessary allocation of land for a strategic sports facility for the growing town of Hailsham and surrounding areas. To use developer contributions and Community Infrastructure Levy receipts to deliver such a facility.

ii) Require the provision of an outdoor playing area of a minimum of 2.8 hectares for adult and youth recreation, as a physical extension to Hellingly Country Park to serve the new residential development north of New Road, Hellingly and nearby.

iii) Bring forward clear and enforceable proposals for the early implementation of sporting, leisure and social facilities as a requirement of its proposed residential developments in the Wealden Plan. Such proposals to be supported by a strategic overview and recommendations for levels, timing and type of provision required to service proposed growth within the Hellingly/Hailsham area.

Do you support this recommendation  

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment
**Digital Communication – Recommendation**

That British Telecommunications be required to provide the Governments’ recommended minimum download speed of not less than 10mgs to all properties within the Parish and to improve mobile coverage so as to significantly reduce or eliminate all “notspots” within the Parish.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment

---

**Retail, Employment and Other Services – Recommendations**

i) That the Eastbourne, Hailsham and Seaford Clinical Commissioning Group provide a surgery or healthcare facility as part of the new housing being developed off Park Road or within any community facility/village centre associated with Roebuck Park.

ii) Wealden District Council consider and seek to encourage the provision of local service shops for personal and professional services in association with new development proposed for the parish.

Do you support this recommendation

Yes ☐ No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

No comment

---

**Sewerage – Recommendation**
That Wealden District Council as Local Planning Authority be asked to require that all new developments within the parish that are capable of being joined to mains drains to be connected to the main sewers.

Do you support this recommendation?  
Yes ☒  No ☐

Do you have any comments; this can include changes to the wording of the recommendation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positives</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● Foul sewage connected to the mains sewers can still have negative impacts on the environment if overall sewage capacity is exceeded. To this end measures should be taken to support and encourage residents to reduce their water usage, ideally in line with southern water’s target 100.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please let us know if you have any other comments or suggestions for additional information or matters that should be included in the Plan.

As a general comment, cross referencing with other policies would aid clarity and strengthen overarching/cross policy aims and objectives. In particular we would welcome cross referencing to strengthen aims for securing measurable net gains and ensuring a robust GI network.