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HELLINGLY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

PUBLIC CONSULTATION PHASE I

SUMMARY

1. The first phase of the public consultation on the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan was held in March, April and May 2016. The primary purpose was to identify the issues which the plan should address.

2. As previously agreed by the Steering Group, the consultation mainly took the form of eight Discussion Group meetings. Four of these were with Parish residents, four with special interest groups.

3. Opportunity was then taken at the Annual Parish Meeting of 12th May to report the main findings of the Discussion Groups and to seek views on what might be proposed in the plan.

4. This report describes how the Discussion Groups were organised and summarises the main findings of both these groups and the Annual Parish meeting.

Residents’ Groups

5. In early March around 1,100 leaflets were hand delivered to homes in the Parish inviting their occupiers to join one of the four Discussion Groups (approximately 98% coverage). The leaflet explained that ‘each group will first consider issues affecting the whole Parish and then focus on one of the four main settlements’ – i.e. Lower Dicker, Lower Horsebridge, Hellingly Village and Roebuck Park. It added that ‘if you cannot attend the meeting relating to where you live, please come to one of the others’.

6. Notification of each of the meetings was posted on the Parish Council’s noticeboards and website, reported in local press and included in the winter edition of Hellingly Highlights, a community magazine circulated throughout the Parish. It was also entered on the website of the Roebuck Park Residents Association as well as on Facebook to attract the attention of younger residents. Details of these publicity arrangements are attached as Appendix A.

7. The 4 residents’ meetings were all held at 10.00am in the Village Hall on Saturday mornings. This day was chosen as probably being the most convenient for commuters and other workers. Light refreshments were provided before the meetings commenced and an attendance list was circulated.

8. Three of the four residents’ meetings were chaired by members of the Steering Group who lived in the settlements concerned, the other by the Chairman of the Parish Council.

9. The discussions were led by the project’s planning consultant. David Phillips, who explained in a PowerPoint presentation the purpose of and constraints on a Neighbourhood Development Plan. In the ensuing discussions, pre-prepared briefing notes were used to highlight some of the key issues which the Project Team considered relevant to each settlement.
10. Excluding the Project Team, the numbers of residents attending the four Discussion Groups were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Dicker</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Horsebridge</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellingly Village</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roebuck Park</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Notes of the discussion at each meeting were taken by the Clerk to the Parish Council, Suzanne Collins. After being checked for corrections by the Project Team, they were posted on the Parish Council’s website. Copies of these meeting notes, together with the briefing notes mentioned in para. 9 above, are attached as Appendix B.

**Special Interest Groups**

12. As previously agreed by the Steering Group, 4 other meetings were arranged with specialist interest groups – business, farming, community and the environment.

13. Because firms change or move quite frequently and earlier lists were found to be out of date, invitations were hand delivered to 55 businesses in the Parish (43 being in the Hackhurst Lane, Broad Farm, Mill Lane and Northfield Business Parks). Otherwise invitations were sent directly to groups or individuals with a known interest in the subject area within the Parish. (17 environment, 19 community and 35 farming). Details of these publicity arrangements are included in Appendix A.

14. The business and farming Discussion Group meetings were held in the Boship Hotel between 7.30-9.30am. Breakfast provided. This was thought likely to fit best with the working patterns of the invitees. The other two Discussion Groups were held in the Village Hall on Saturdays, one at 1.00pm and the other at 2.30pm.

15. Following the introductory PowerPoint presentation, the discussions were chaired by members of the Project Team and followed the same process as with the Residents’ Groups.

16. Excluding the Project Team, the numbers attending the 4 Specialist Interest Discussion Groups were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Group Findings**

17. Excluding the Project Team and 6 attendees living outside the Parish and avoiding the double counting of 4 attendees at more than one meeting, 103 residents of the Parish attended these 8 Discussion Groups. They accounted for 5.4% of the 1,907 electors on the 2014-15 Electoral Register, about one elector in every twenty.
The main issues discussed at the meetings were as follows:

**Hellingly Village (12th March 2016)**
- Timetable for the development of the NDP and when it would come into force
- What influence the NDP could have on new developments
- Parking issues particularly around the school and Village Hall
- Provision of new school
- Distinctive character of the village
- Whether criteria could be included in the NDP to influence design and layout of new developments
- Geological survey and water table levels
- Speed limits particularly New Road and Grove Hill
- Broadband

**Lower Dicker (2nd April 2016)**
- The Potters Arms and more generally the Wealden Local List.
- Hackhurst Lane and Zoar Chapel – in particular notifications and consultation on applications.
- Future development of Hailsham
- Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL)
- Infrastructure
- Traffic issues particularly large lorries using roads that are not appropriate
- Swallow Business Park – access to and the use of the adjacent field
- Flooding and location of floodplains

**Lower Horsebridge (9th April 2016)**
- Housing numbers and the allocation thereof
- Poor broadband provision
- Infrastructure requirements
- Timescale for production of NDP and links to WDC Local Plan
- Flooding
- Conservation area designation

**Roebuck Park (23rd April 2016)**
- Where are the areas that flood and therefore where are the areas that housing should go?
- Why was Hailsham chosen as the location for the additional 9,000 houses?
- Lack of employment opportunities
- Infrastructure
- Schools – need for a new one and the location of that school
- Facilities for older people
- Requirement for a new Doctors Surgery and the availability of GPs to work in them
- Are the targets in the Local Plan deliverable i.e. the 9,000 houses?
- CIL

**Business (1st April 2016)**
- Provision of small scale rural workshops with decent landscaping/not too close to residential.
• Support for expansion of rural tourism/camping/glamping and equestrian – again subject to minimising any landscape impact.
• Upgrading of broadband provision

Environment (7th April 2016)
• Surface water flooding – support and input from EA and SE Water
• Ancient woodlands, SSSI and SNCI being mapped/protected
• Biodiversity corridors being mapped/protected – Cuckoo Trail, Hurst Haven, Cuckmere and Stunts Green (as it feeds into Hellingly)
• Locally important landscapes to be mapped – possible congruence with the landscaping/tree planting work that EA is supporting with farmers.
• Support in the NDP (with local evidence) for some of the emerging WDC policies e.g. Biodiversity and air pollution (with specific reference to A22 in Lower Dicker area).
• EA and SE Water support removal of permitted development rights and use of permeable surfaces in new developments to reduce impact of surface water runoff and the adverse impacts it has on water quality in Pevensey Levels.

Community (9th April 2016)
• Lack of car parking (Village Hall and Lower Horsebridge Recreation Ground)
• Lack of sports facilities in Wealden district generally
• Flooding issues at the current sports facilities in Lower Horsebridge.
• The need for short and long term plans
• That strategic sports facilities were needed and that this could not be dealt with in the NDP but recommendations could be included around this.

Farming (22nd April 2016)
• Ageing farmers
• The changing nature of farming
• Lack of affordable housing for farm workers
• Diversification of the farming business
• Small farms not large enough to employ staff
• Include a list of farming land that should be avoided for development purposes
• Density of housing, i.e. maximising the use of the land and requiring less use elsewhere.
• Urban design to include sufficient car parking
• Broadband/mobile coverage

Individual Responses

19. Richard Mortimer-Lee, a local Farmer, Landowner and Business Man had been due to attend the Farmers discussion group but at the last minute was unable to attend. Members of the Project Team met separately with him. He explained that about 250 people were employed on the Broad Farm Industrial Estate and that any expansion would be demand led.

20. At each of the Discussion Groups, attendees were asked to send any further comments or suggestions to the Parish Clerk. Two individual responses were subsequently received. These are included in Appendix C and raised the following points:
• (From New Road, Hellingly) Land to the north east of the houses in New Road slopes southwards and surface water drainage results in regular flooding. The view from New Road northwards to the Oast at Park Farm should be protected from development, as should the field north of Station Road and an area around Horselunges Manor.
• (From Lower Horsebridge) Support a conservation area in Lower Horsebridge and some small scale development there; use the fairground field to provide additional recreational/play areas; flooding is a major issue and the possibility of creating a lake between the A22 and the Recreation Ground to mitigate flooding and for recreational activities should be investigated.

21. The Roebuck Park Residents Association invited its members to respond directly to them. Four responses were received (see Appendix C) raising the following points:

• Removing the ‘green belt’ between New Road and Roebuck Park will cause Hailsham to coalesce with Hellingly Village and Roebuck Park and add to traffic on Park Road and through the village.
• The NDP should re-emphasise low density housing west of The Drive and retain the green strip along the road.
• The Chapel should be listed and used for community purposes.
• Any further development must be accompanied by improvements to infrastructure, especially schools and medical facilities.

Annual Parish Meeting

22. At the Annual Parish Meeting held on 12 May 2016, attended by around 60 residents the main focus was on the Neighbourhood Development Plan. A report was given on the progress made so far and on the key findings of the Discussion Groups. Attendees were asked to say whether they agreed or disagreed with the 7 conclusions listed in para 24 below. In each case the reply was in the affirmative. In the ensuing question and answer session the discussion centred mainly on Wealden District Council’s housing proposals for the area as set out in the Local Plan: Issues, Options and Recommendations. The Minutes of the meeting, which summarise this discussion are included in Appendix C.

Conclusion

23. In none of the Discussion Group meetings, nor in any of the individual responses, were the two proposed principal aims of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (i.e. to protect the rural character of the Parish and to retain the separate identity and character of its four main settlements) either questioned or criticised.

24. Some themes of common concern emerged from this early consultation in terms of the frequency or intensity with which they were expressed. These were endorsed at the Annual Parish Meeting and may be summarised as follows: (in no particular order of importance):

• That the northward expansion of Hailsham may engulf the existing settlements and that separation gaps should be retained around them (to prevent coalescence).
• That locally valued landscapes should be protected from inappropriate development and biodiversity should be enhanced.
• That development should be steered away from areas at risk of flooding (likely to increase with climate change), with high water tables, or where it might add to flooding problems elsewhere.
• That the rural economy should be strengthened through the provision of small low-cost business premises and tourist and equestrian facilities.
• That broadband facilities are seriously inadequate and need to be improved if the rural economy is to be sustainable.
• That inadequate parking provision is holding back the ability of various existing community and recreational facilities to expand or operate efficiently.
• That improved infrastructure, particularly education and medical services, has not kept pace with recent housing development.

25. The public response to the way in which the consultation was carried out was generally supportive and provided a positive basis upon which to proceed to the next phase.

Cllr. John Blake
Project Team Leader
HELLINGLY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Have Your Say on the Future of Your Community!

You are invited to join in a Discussion Group for your local Community. The stated aims of the Neighbourhood Development Plan for Hellingly are ....... to protect the rural character of the area and to retain the separate character and identity of the four main settlements in the parish.

Whilst a Neighbourhood Plan cannot seek to stop or reduce the amount of development proposed in Wealden’s Plan it can have considerable influence over where development takes place and what type of development is approved. The Plan can, for example, include policies relating to design and density of developments as well as seeking to identify those areas of the Parish that are felt to be unsuitable or less suitable for development. Policies could also be included in the NDP to support businesses and the conversion of buildings to alternative uses.

Each group will first consider issues affecting the whole parish and focus on one of the four main settlements. If you cannot attend the meeting relating to where you live, please come to one of the others.

Discussion Groups will all be held at Hellingly Village Hall on the following dates

Saturday
12th March
10am
Focus on Hellingly Village

Saturday
2nd April
10am
Focus on Lower Dicker

Saturday
9th April
10am
Focus on Lower Horsebridge

Saturday
23rd April
10am
Focus on Roebuck Park

HELLINGLY PARISH COUNCIL
The Village Hall
North Street
Hellingly
BN27 4DS

01323 461390
clerk@hellingly-pc.org.uk
25 members of the public were present.

Also present: Councillors Blake and White, Diane Aldridge, Steering Group Member (Chair for the meeting), David Phillips, Consultant and Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the morning.

Following the presentation, the meeting was opened to a question and answer session.

Question:
What are the timescales for the production of the Plan and when would it have an impact on what is happening locally?

Answer:
The discussion groups will go on until the end of April and following that a questionnaire for distribution throughout the Parish would be developed. A meeting would be arranged with Wealden District Council (WDC) in July. Once the NDP is submitted to examination it is in the hands of the Secretary of State, if it comes back requiring modifications it could be 18 months to 2 years before it is in place. It could be thrown off course for a number of reasons. The development industry does not stop through the process. It is likely that it will be in place before the WDC Local Plan.

Question:
What happens if there is a negative vote at the referendum, presumably that would mean a delay in the process?

Answer:
The Plan dies at that point. The allocation of land is always a contentious issue and it is best to focus on other issues. It was suggested that a better way to look at it would be to look at areas that would need protecting.

Question:
Would the Parish start again?

Answer:
It is very unlikely as residents would have essentially said they do not want a NDP. It is important at the outset for residents to advise us if production of a NDP is not supported.

Question:
How much influence would it have on developments? The bigger contractors are looking to make a profit by maximising the numbers on developments.

Answer:
It will depend on what is appropriate depending on the area e.g. conservation areas. If evidence can support it then it would be possible to suggest that development should be less dense in the village/rural area and more dense in the built area. Would want to
encourage sustainable developments. The Inspector will allow the opportunity to make the point about what has been included.

**Question:**
I think it is a good idea but why are we only doing it now rather than in 2011 when it might have been more beneficial.

**Answer:**
When the Localism Act came out there was a feeling that Parish Councils could do whatever they wanted and some early starters came up against issues. It is not a bad thing to be running later when we can learn from others. It was going to be looked at before but stalled due to a number of issues. Even if it had been started earlier it would not have stopped the development as this had already been agreed.

The Parish Council thought that it was a good idea and included an amount in the 2013 budget. A measured view was taken on the production and we are using experience from elsewhere, we are hoping to run in tandem with WDC as they develop their Local Plan it should come together nicely.

**Question:**
There is an issue with traffic, roads and school parking, also flooding certain points that flood that nobody will do anything about. Are you thinking of land raise? The churchyard is a focal point in the Village, the wall in Mill Lane will need a lot of money spending on it, the footpaths also need maintenance.

**Answer:**
It is not likely that this can be addressed in the NDP, but recommendations can be made to the relevant organisations.

Photographic evidence of flooding should be obtained; this would help support the argument for where building would not be appropriate. In terms of the roads it would have to be shown that there is a significant problem for ESCC to spend money on improvements. The new development has seen some improvements and there may be more with future developments.

**Question:**
Has anyone stood outside the school at 8.30 and 3.00 to see the parking issues, it is very dangerous.

**Answer:**
I know the issue that you raise, again take photographic evidence.

Parking outside schools is a national problem it is not just a local issue. The school know that it is an issue and are looking at remedies but many of these then lead to other issues.

**Question:**
Wasn’t another school promised? Has this not been provided?

**Answer:**
ESCC have said that it is not needed here a site has been identified for a new 2 form entry school. I don't know what will happen to the Village school.
Question:
Has the distinctive area of the village been catalogued? It is a small area will you try to keep it separate or will is eventually merge into the bigger areas?

Answer:
We are at an early stage and work needs to be done on this and decisions need to be made. This is the start of the process. If this is to be included, we would need to build upon previous work and make it bespoke.

When we looked at the designation of the area, it was decided that there were a series of disparate settlements but 4 main areas. There is the Village which is a conservation area, Roebuck Park which is modern, Lower Horsebridge a linear Victorian settlement, Lower Dicker a string of houses and then large rural hinterland and isolated settlements. We are trying to encourage the residents to come forward with what they think about the area.

Question:
To what extent can the NDP influence design and layout, will we be able to put forward criteria? Field Close is very stark.

Answer:
Yes, we can. Many people look at estates and think that they all look the same. The Government wants more house building, rather than seeing this as pessimistic it would be better to define why an estate such as Field Close is not suitable and provide evidence of what is. We would need to make a good case for the Inspector to agree. We will need to think about the evidence that would need to be supplied.

Question:
Does the Council have a good geological survey, the water table in the area is very high and we need to look seriously at where development is?

Answer:
Again we need evidence in the form of photos. We will be requesting from the Environment Agency (EA) near misses and flood alerts for the area, hopefully this will then lead to identifying significant areas that should not be developed.

Response:
I have been in touch with the EA and they have no records. WDC has not done itself any favours by not keeping the evidence.

Answer:
The EA are consulted on applications, if they do not comment and the application is refused this can lead to problems and appeals. Kelvin Williams would be able to tell you what the criteria are for an application to trigger consultation from the EA.

The WDC Local Plan will include a geological study. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment doesn't show ground water conditions.

It would help us if residents could provide the photographic evidence of standing water.
Question:
There is a 40mph speed limit on New Road, there is a residential home with some residents suffering from dementia. It has been known for these residents to wonder about in the road, they need to be able to cross safely.

Answer:
This may be another issue where evidence is needed.

Question:
Can we let you know anything that we have forgotten?

Answer:
Yes, email the Clerk or put it in the Village Hall.

Question:
We were approached recently about reducing the speed limit on Grove Hill, we have evidence of dead animals on the road.

Answer:
Through the NDP we can build a case for areas that are known to be bad, but would not be able to change the speed limit. Again evidence is needed.

Question:
Can we do speed boards?

Answer:
There are 2 issues, for speeding in restricted areas we have been told that a sufficiently straight stretch of road is needed. In Grove Hill where it has been suggested a speed limit should be introduced we need more responses from the survey so that we can then approach the police and county which may lead to a traffic order being introduced.

Question:
Broadband is too slow does this come in your remit?

Answer:
WDC is concerned and currently have a survey running which can be found on their website. It does come into the NDP.

Question:
With South Hellingly and North Horsebridge it looks like Hailsham is trying to become one, there is only a very narrow green belt.

All those present were asked to put down their 2 most burning issues, what would they want to see achieved. We would then need to see what would be needed to achieve this and what evidence would be needed.

At the conclusion of the morning the following items were raised for consideration:

Housing: WDC Local Plan is proposing 30 additional houses in the village. There is the possibility that WDC might allocate the open land between Station Road and Mill Lane to the west of Park Road for this purpose.
Do you feel that the NDP should look to allocate land?

**Coalescence:** Should the NDP seek to provide a visual divide between the eastern part of the Village and new development? We have an opportunity to include something if we think that it is appropriate, again evidence would be needed.

**Traffic:** Is the present scheme working well? What further improvements should be recommended?

**Flooding:** What changes in policy or practice might mitigate the effects of flooding? Should this be included in the NDP?

**Conservation Area:** WDC have indicated that the boundaries should be wider. Are we supportive of this and are there other issues that could improve it?

It was confirmed that the notes of the meeting would appear on the Council’s website in due course.

**The main issues discussed were:**

- Timetable for the development of the NDP and when it would come into force
- What influence the NDP could have on new developments
- Parking issues particularly around the school
- Provision of new school
- Distinctive character of the village
- Whether criteria could be included in the NDP to influence design and layout of new developments
- Geological survey and water table levels
- Speed limits particularly New Road and Grove Hill
- Broadband

The Chairman thanked all those in attendance for their contribution to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 12.00

*Suzanne Collins*
*Parish Clerk*  
*16 March 2016*
DISCUSSION GROUP ON HELLINGLY VILLAGE

NOTE TO DISCUSSION LEADER

It would be helpful if the following key issues could be addressed during the course of the meeting.

**Housing**

The Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations (IOR) issued for consultation in September 2015 proposes 30 additional dwellings in Hellingly Village – excluding Danecroft Nursery and the Golden Martlet. It does not define Hellingly Village nor indicate where they should be built.

If the NDP does not identify a site for this purpose, Wealden DC will do so in due course. The manner of its development would then be left largely to the private developer.

It is likely that Wealden DC would allocate the open land between Station Road and Mill Lane to the west of Park Road for this purpose. It is outside the extended conservation area, has access to Park Road and the owner is keen to promote its development.

On the other hand, if the NDP identified this or any other site, it could include a development brief setting out statutory guidelines for its development – type of housing, layout, design, landscaping etc.

**Question:** Should the NDP identify a site or sites for this development? If so, where should they be?

**Coalescence**

The IOR document proposes an additional 4,000 dwellings in North Hailsham (east of the Cuckoo Trail) and in South Hailsham. Given the scale of this requirement, it seems inevitable that Sussex Plants (where an application for housing is being prepared) and Park Farm to the north of New Road will be allocated for housing.

To avoid the eastern part of Hellingly Village (Station Road, Mill Lane and Park Road) merging with new development to the south and east, it has been suggested that the NDP should seek to create a visual and structural divide between the two by proposing an area of woodland along the eastern side of Park Road.

**Question:** Would this suggestion be supported?

**Traffic**

A traffic calming scheme has been introduced in Hellingly Village funded by the Roebuck Park developers. Further limited funds will become available for this purpose when the already approved development south of New Rod is commenced.

**Question:** How well is the present scheme working? What further improvements should be recommended?
**Flooding**

The Cuckmere and Bull rivers burst their banks after heavy rainfall, flood the adjoining fields and, when the floods are high, invade several properties. With climate change, such flooding is likely to become more frequent and severe.

**Question:** What changes in policy or practice might mitigate the effects of this flooding?

**Conservation Area**

At present, the Hellingly Conservation Area covers just the churchyard and nearby properties. The IOR document recommends the extension of the conservation area to incorporate the adjacent fields, reaching out to the Village Hall, Broad Farm, Hill Harbour House, the Mill and the river Cuckmere. Designation of a conservation area carries a statutory duty not just to protect but to enhance the character and appearance of the area.

**Question:** How can the character and appearance of the conservation area be enhanced?

John Blake
Notes of Lower Dicker Discussion Group
at Village Hall on 2 April 2016 at 10.00

20 members of the public were present.

Also present: Councillors Blake and White, Sarah Cottingham, Anne Mills and Sylvia Skinner (Chair for the meeting), Steering Group Members, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the morning.

Following the presentation, the meeting was opened to a question and answer session.

Question:
Do you know what is happening to the Potters Arms, is it going to be demolished?

Answer:
I don’t know, it is fair to say that in the South East a lot of pubs have been lost as they are not viable. It could be considered as something to be added to the Local List. The future use is anyone’s guess.

Question:
What about if we are too late, as I believe that the builders are already in and that it is going to be 2 houses?

Answer:
If it comes in as a planning application and it is approved then you would be too late, if you wanted to object in terms of a historical basis then it might stop the application being approved. If no application is approved the NDP could consider whether the building merits being on a Local List.

Question:
Some years ago the residents of Hackhurst Lane were consulted on the development of the Hackhurst Lane Industrial Estate. There were a number of conditions in the agreement, when the site was sold on to new developers they did not like the conditions and following a meeting with Wealden District Council (WDC) it was agreed that the conditions could be amended. It would appear that we wouldn’t have any control over anything in the future, including such modifications.

Answer:
The modifications mentioned on the NDP slides refer to modifications that the Inspector might require to the NDP. There is nothing in the development control process that stops renegotiation by developers of planning conditions attached to existing permissions.

Question:
It seems to be the responsibility of residents to monitor what is going on, WDC don’t notify us.
**Answer:**
This is the national way of dealing with it, WDC are not required to, only to put up site notices.

**Question:**
WDC don’t put up site notices for variations.

**Answer:**
It would be best to check with Mr Kelvin Williams at WDC. There is nothing in the NDP process that would stop applications to vary conditions.

**Question:**
My wife and I worship at the Zoar Chapel we are concerned that development will take place and take no account of the peace and quiet that is needed for a Chapel, what is WDC doing to ensure that this is considered.

**Answer:**
I am not employed by WDC. I can only suggest that you look at what is proposed and make representations about the need for peace and quiet, however, you would need to put forward planning reasons.

**Question:**
Do you as a Parish Council have any input?

**Answer:**
Yes, the ESCC consultation on the Waste Transfer Site has now closed, the Parish Council comments were in opposition to the site, due to the Chapel, that it was near to residential properties and that there was poor access. However, we were only consultees, ESCC will make the final decision. I can only urge you to contact your East Sussex County Councillor Nick Bennett.

In terms of Hackhurst Lane I am not sure what condition you are referring to. The Parish Council put in an objection on the new application requiring a new road linking to the site, Hackhurst Lane will be blocked off as access the Industrial Estate.

**Question:**
I was referring to the erection of a barrier; it was supposed to have been a wall. There was no consultation before they erected a fence instead.

**Answer:**
WDC would still consider a fence a barrier.

In terms of the Potters Arms the Parish Council have applied for it to go onto the Local List and for it to be added to the Assets of Community Value List. Any change of use will probably require a planning consent.

**Question:**
How can we get involved, what can we do?

**Answer:**
The Potters is clearly one historical property within the Parish but the development industry does not stop the process. If we wish to look at protecting the property by adding it to the
Local List, then an evidence base for the property would need to be built up based upon local history and local use of the building. If we wished to add something to the Plan to support historic buildings in the Parish, then information and evidence to support any policy would be needed.

We have said that we would like to try and maintain the character of the 4 settlements, but first we would need to define what this is and what you might wish to protect, preserve and enhance. It is over to you to tell us what you think is important and what you want to protect and is acceptable to you.

**Question:**
Is there anything in the WDC Plan in respect of the development of Hailsham Town Centre?

**Answer:**
Yes, there is. Further on circa. 8 May significant works will start in the High Street, this will be funded from funds from recent developments in the area (e.g. Roebuck Park).

New developments in the Wealden Local Plan as now being considered will also include improvements to future infrastructure that will need to be funded/provided.

The new Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be used to fund infrastructure, the District Council can request a contribution from developers. If the Parish Council has a NDP we would be entitled to 25% of the levy, we are less constrained than the District Council as to what it can be spent on.

**Question:**
I have a number of observations.

1. **The Lower Dicker to Golden Cross stretch of the A22 is the most polluted road in East Sussex. You mentioned the bypass, I don’t see this as a solution as the traffic will still need to get to the new developments.**

2. **The emphasis is on housing, only yesterday I read that the DGH is at crisis point with the increase in population, there is the need for new surgeries, schools etc. but these are never pushed out.**

3. **The car parking in Hailsham is horrendous.**

**Answer:**
1. The pollution is only likely to get worse before it gets better. There are a few things to look for in the Plan, some of it is about personal choices, for example using hybrid cars. There will be the planting of a significant number of trees, these will provide a willow barrier. There is the issue of public transport. Developers will make significant contributions to public transport to enable the public to make a choice.

   One of the things that the NDP can do is make recommendations to organisations who have the responsibility for roads and pollution monitoring.

2. **Most Local Planning authorities focus on housing as that is what the Government particularly requires them to focus on. If there is not a Plan in place that shows an adequate housing land supply any applications that are refused are likely to be granted at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. Health care provision does need to be**
addressed, health providers are consulted as part of the process for the Wealden Local Plan. If there is significant evidence that increased housing supports the need for additional facilities, then there may be a need to add funds from CIL. 75% of CIL would go to support the provision of such infrastructure (e.g. education and transport), it is not ignored.

3. I do believe that there is a need for additional parking in Hailsham, I have always believed that the car park adjacent to the Lagoon could be made into a multi-storey.

**Question:**
There is a development boundary round Hailsham that bisects/effects Lower Dicker?

**Answer:**
The development boundary is the boundary within Wealden’s Plan where it is ok to develop in principle. They are often very tightly drawn to exclude gardens and historically were seen as quite restrictive in extent.

**Question:**
Has the Council looked at how much it is going to cost us to produce this?

**Answer:**
£25,000 towards the cost was included in the budget in 2014/15 this is now in reserves as it has already been collected from Council Tax payers. There are also grants available up to £9,000. Ongoing I cannot say how much it will cost. The referendum falls as a cost to WDC. I am confident that we have an adequate provision without having to make a further provision.

A Parish Council without a NDP is entitled to 15% of CIL up to a capped level, a Parish Council with a NDP is entitled to 25% with no cap, therefore the receipts available to the Parish could be considerable, potentially 7 figures.

**Comment:**
We have to be in conformity with the WDC Local Plan.

In terms of the A22 employment corridor, would you want ribbon development or in concentrated locations?

We have spoken today about the housing around Hailsham it is likely that this will be around Arlington as the floodplain affords some protection to Hellingly.

I would like a flavour of how you see this affecting you and how do we put protections in the NDP?

**Answer**
I would say no to ribbon development as this means more entrances onto the road and also provides a distraction to drivers.

**Response**
Should we be asking for signalised junctions, it is for you to tell us what you want.
**Question**
Didn’t you try to get traffic lights at the Coldharbour junction?

**Answer**
Yes. With new development we have the opportunity to get them if we have Local Policies in place.

Are there areas that you think should not be built on?

**Question:**
I live on Coldharbour Road and we have 2 developments outside us, there has been a significant development in the number of lorries going passed us, are they using it as a cut through to the A27?

**Answer:**
If we are able to provide evidence of a particular issue, we might be able to put recommendations into the NDP.

Not dissimilar comments have been made at other Discussion Groups, we need evidence about the nature of the roads and comments from residents.

We need to make notes of incidents so that they can be presented to ESCC to help our cause.

**Question:**
Where are the floodplains?

**Answer:**
There are high ground water levels and when it rains the water lays on the surface. We need photographic evidence. We also suffer from flooding from drainage back up.

**Question:**
I understand that Swallows Business Park is going to break into the pipeline how will they do that?

**Answer:**
Industry is not taken into account in respect of increased waste water capacity.

**Question:**
The field next to Swallows Business Park has been cleared are they going to use that for housing?

**Answer:**
They are not currently talking about housing at Swallows Business Park.

The Neighbourhood Plan process is the very first opportunity that Parishes have had to produce a Plan that will be part of the statutory process.

In respect of enforcement matters these are always judged on whether they would have been given planning permission if an application had been submitted rather than seen as unacceptable purely because they are retrospective.
Question:
Is Planning now more relaxed, do we still need to get the same permissions as before?

Answer:
Permitted development rights have been significantly relaxed and changes of use are also relaxed, but you would need to ring WDC and see if what you are proposing is now permitted development.

Summary

Participants were asked to think about 1 or 2 things that they thought they would want the NDP to do and to email them to the Clerk.

The timescales for the project were to finish the Discussion Groups by the end of April and to produce a questionnaire for circulation in the summer. The Project Team would meet with Wealden District Council in July and would hope to have the NDP drafted by the end of the year, this would then go for examination, the public are able to attend this.

It was confirmed that the notes of the meeting would appear on the Council’s website in due course.

The main issues discussed were:

• The Potters Arms and more generally the Wealden Local List.
• Hackhurst Lane and Zoar Chapel – in particular notifications and consultation on applications.
• Future development of Hailsham Town Council
• Community Infrastructure Levy
• Infrastructure
• Traffic issues particularly large lorries using roads that are not appropriate
• Swallows Business Park – access to and the use of the adjacent field
• Flooding and location of floodplains

The Chairman thanked all those in attendance for their contribution to the meeting.

The meeting closed at 12.00

Suzanne Collins
Parish Clerk  
6 April 2016
HELLINGLY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

LOWER DICKER DISCUSSION GROUP
BRIEFING NOTE

Lower Dicker owes its origins largely to extensive brickmaking and potteries in the 18th and 19th centuries. It is a long linear village with houses mostly scattered along the A22 interspersed by areas of open farmland, with no obvious centre and few facilities. The A22 is a former turnpike road and was not concreted until the 1930s, since when it has become increasingly busy, noisy and polluting. Some of the key issues now facing Lower Dicker are:

Hailsham Expansion

The Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations (IOR) proposes as ‘first choice’ the provision of 5,380 dwellings as an urban extension to Hailsham on land to the west of the A22 (equivalent in size to half the present Hailsham). It is not known exactly where this development would be located or how it would interface with Lower Dicker, but there is a clear risk that the village could be absorbed into it and lose its separate identity.

Question: In order to avoid coalescence, should the open land between the A22 and the parish boundary to the south be designated as a countryside gap and kept free from any major development?

The A22

The Wealden Local Plan IOR proposes that the above expansion of Hailsham should be accompanied by “the re-routing of the A22 and the downgrading of the existing A22”. If this were to happen, the existing A22 would become less heavily trafficked, environmentally more favourable, and capable of improvement which would benefit residents (e.g. reduced speed limit, more frequent pedestrian crossings, signal controls at Coldharbour Road junction).

Question: How could the A22 in Lower Dicker be improved to provide better living conditions if it were to be downgraded consequent upon the A22 being diverted away from the village?

Housing

Although the Wealden Local Plan IOR does not propose any additional housing in Lower Dicker itself, this does not mean that there will be no pressure for residential development, especially if the A22 is diverted and the village environment is improved. Applications to infill the open countryside areas between existing houses are more than likely. The brownfield Sheps Plastics and Wyvale Garden Centre sites would probably be developed for housing if the County Council does not use the former for refuse recycling and if the latter were to relocate following the A22 diversion.

Question: Should the NDP seek to retain some or all of these open areas? Should it seek to concentrate any new development in one area and, if so, where?
Industry

The Wealden Local Plan IOR proposes to “focus employment provision, including retail, in the south of the District along the A22 corridor”. Lower Dicker already has two business parks at its western end (Northfield and Swallow, with the latter now being extended and upgraded).

**Question:** Should the NDP seek to allocate any additional sites for employment use in Lower Dicker and, if so, where?

Facilities

Lower Dicker has recently lost its shop and its public house, leaving it with little apart from the garden centre, Boship Hotel and the petrol station and Starbucks. The new housing development to the west of the A22 is likely to include some retail outlets which could also serve Lower Dicker residents.

**Question:** Are any additional facilities needed in Lower Dicker? If so, what are they and how can they be made viable?

Listed Buildings

There are 2 statutorily listed buildings in Lower Dicker (Boship Hotel and the Fair Place in Mansers Lane). However, Wealden DC is proposing to establish a Local List of Buildings of Historic or Architectural Interest – i.e. building of local interest or merit which do not qualify for the statutory list.

**Question:** Are there any buildings in Lower Dicker which are considered suitable for inclusion in this Local List?

John Blake
Notes of Lower Horsebridge Discussion Group

at Village Hall on 9 April 2016 at 10.00

13 members of the public were present.

Also present: Councillors Blake, White, Hopcroft and Lulham, Bill Short, Steering Group Member, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the morning.

 Following the presentation, the meeting was opened to a question and answer session.

Question: Unlike with the NDP Wealden District Council (WDC) don’t need to have a referendum for their Local Plan, therefore the amount of development has already been determined. In terms of the Hellingly NDP the only question that we can address is the numbers being applied to Hellingly.

Answer: The Inspection of the WDC Local Plan is open to the public, so you are able to attend and give your views on the allocation of property numbers and you could ask the question why there are not more allocated elsewhere. The broad numbers for the 5-year housing land supply are set by the Government.

Question: How do the Government arrive at the numbers?

Answer: It is fair to say that the numbers very often don’t marry up, since the 60’s there has not been enough house building. Changes in lifestyles have meant a greater demand for housing, for example, relationship breakups and people living on their own, people living longer, immigration etc. The South does seem to be the area where people want to live.

Question: I wasn’t aware that a proper assessment of infrastructure needs had been carried out, what happens about the Hailsham sewage system which is under stress, the fact that many areas around here don’t have mains gas and broadband provision? The Government says that 90% of the country will be able to benefit from fast broadband, we live in an area which is in the 10% our broadband is at dialup speeds and it is disastrous for small businesses. There is no point in having a NDP if it is only talking about housing.

Answer: The WDC Local Plan includes an infrastructure delivery plan, providers have been consulted and have indicated what is needed to support the housing growth. From April developers are required to pay Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), this will be prioritised by WDC to make up the gap in funding. Historically larger developments had to pay a contribution, but odd houses used to slip through with no contribution required, now every dwelling attracts CIL. If a Parish Council does not have a NDP they are entitled to 15% up
to a cap, if however, they have a NDP they are entitled to 25% with no cap and up to a rate that WDC has set. Parishes are less constrained on how the money can be spent.

It was also noted that it may be that CIL will not actually paid to the Parish, but instead can influence how the money is spent. It was suggested that it would be likely that Parishes would be under pressure from WDC and providers on how the money should be spent. In terms of the ability to influence what is in WDC’s Local Plan the consultation finished in December. On 20 April the Cabinet Local Development Framework Sub Committee will receive a report on the responses received from the consultation. Following this the proposals in the Local Plan will be refined prior to being sent off at the end of the year. There will be another opportunity to comment on the revised document as it will go to consultation again.

**Comment:**
It was suggested that part of the consultation that we need to carry out on the NDP is the youth of the community.

It was noted that youth groups had been invited to attend the Community Discussion Group.

**Question:**
What happens if the housing numbers are not met?

**Answer:**
If a Local Plan is adopted and showing a housing supply number, the presumption is that it is possible to refuse planning applications. If, however, there is not a Plan in place that shows an adequate housing land supply any applications that are refused are likely to be granted at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate.

**Question:**
What are the timescales for the production of the NDP? Surely the NDP needs to be in place to inform the WDC Local Plan and therefore run concurrently?

**Answer:**
We are able to run alongside the development of the Local Plan; we are keeping WDC informed of the progress that we are making on the NDP. The Discussion Group notes will be used to develop the questionnaire and WDC will be given a copy. We will be drafting the NDP towards the end of the year and we hope that WDC will confirm that it is not in conflict with the Local Plan. It is likely to be an 18-month process, their Plan is more likely to be delayed than ours and we wouldn’t want to delay the NDP by tying it to the WDC process.

**Question:**
I have a lot of photographic evidence of the flooding on the land near the Boship Roundabout, should I submit it to the Clerk?

**Answer:**
Yes please, we hope to be able to produce in mapped form the areas that flood.

**Question:**
It is not just the development locally that causes a problem with the flooding but also in the wider area, for example the development in Heathfield.
**Answer:**
Yes, that’s right and we need to look at possible solutions for example, removing permitted development rights in sensitive areas. If you have any ideas or solutions, then please do put them forward by emailing the Clerk.

**Question:**
It has been suggested that a lake could be created and that this could become a community asset.

**Answer:**
If you have a number of people in support of an idea, then it is likely that it would carry more weight going forward.

**Question:**
I understand that they are proposing to flood Exceat.

**Answer:**
They are looking to a managed retreat, there are a number of proposals. They are spending a lot of money moving shingle and this has led to the Environment Agency deciding not to shore up the coast line and so leaving it to flood. This will create a different type of biodiversity. This idea does not have the support of a great number of people as the Cuckmere is a tourist attraction. This will not affect the retention of water higher up the valley.

**Question:**
You mentioned the proposal for an additional 20 houses in Lower Horsebridge and the extension of the Conservation Area, how much say do we have in the decision?

**Answer:**
My understanding is that the Parish have asked for the conservation area, to be extended. WDC would look to see if an extension is warranted, broadly speaking WDC will draw on the experience of the Conservation Officers to see if the proposal fits the set criteria for a conservation area. If it is not deemed to pass the criteria, then you could look to identify some of the older buildings to be added to the Local List.

It was noted that WDC considered the whole of Lower Horsebridge not to be a conservation area, the Parish Council had put forward the central part from the Old Sweet Shop to Back Lane.

It was explained that WDC Issues, Options and Recommendations document splits Hailsham into 6 sectors, Lower Horsebridge falls into the North West sector and everything east of the Cuckoo Trail is in the North sector. It recognises that Lower Horsebridge is reasonably remote and at risk of flooding, 20 houses are allocated as a potential figure but it could be more. The sooner a NDP is in place the better able we would be to protect the area.

Most green fields are vulnerable until a NDP is in place. We can try to protect what we think is important through the NDP, by recommending areas that should not be built on.

**Question:**
Where in Lower Horsebridge are the houses supposed to be built, if not in North Street as there is not much spare land elsewhere.
Answer:
The development boundary is much more fluid.

Question:
The road up to Horam is also in Horsebridge isn’t it?

Answer:
Yes, A267. The proximity to services needs to be considered when finding sites for housing.

It was noted that the NDP should be a positive document and support the Local Plan, it is better to identify areas where we would not want to see development rather than identifying sites where it should be. All local authorities are under pressure to provide housing land.

Question:
Is there any stipulation on what size the 20 houses should be?

Answer:
No, the NDP could look to say what the parish is short of, although evidence would be needed. The Local Plan gives an idea of housing mix, but developers tend to want to build the bigger houses as that is where they make most profit.

It was noted that some years ago when there was about 65 houses in Lower Horsebridge, Field Close was built which was 14 affordable houses. The application for 32 houses in North Street, includes 18 affordable dwellings, the WDC policy is for 35% affordable housing, therefore the numbers in Lower Horsebridge are higher than this.

We could look at including a policy around numbers of properties and style.

Questions put to those present:
• Do you think that the number of 20 houses is about right? If there was to be additional housing are there any area where you would like to see it?

• There is the prospect of losing the White Hart Pub, do you think that the pub building itself should be converted into housing or demolished and housing built on the land?

• Would you wish to see more commercial property, we have lost the shop and all that remains is the Post Office? Should we be promoting the ‘Pub is the Hub’?

• Do we have enough recreation facilities?

It was pointed out that these were the sorts of things that we could look to influence. Participants were asked to think about the above.

Question
When did the calculation for the numbers start as we already have Roebuck Park?

Answer
There is always a lag between housing starting and infrastructure developments. The Local Plan runs from 2015-2037, the figures quoted are those that WDC have said are needed for the period of the Plan.
**Question:**
I am a bus user and the road in Lower Horsebridge is very dangerous to cross, should we be asking for a pedestrian crossing?

**Answer:**
It was noted that this had been requested of East Sussex County Council before but they felt that it was not needed. However, it was accepted that we could still put it in the NDP as an aspiration.

It was also noted that traffic calming had been used in a number of locations and this could be something that we could consider.

**Summary**

Participants were asked to think about 1 or 2 things that they thought they would want the NDP to do and to email them to the Clerk.

The Chairman thanked all those in attendance for their contribution to the meeting, they were asked to feedback views and to supply photographic evidence.

**The main issues discussed were:**

- Housing numbers and the allocation thereof
- Poor broadband provision
- Infrastructure requirements
- Timescale for production of NDP and links to WDC Local Plan
- Flooding
- Conservation area extension

The meeting closed at 11.45

---

**Suzanne Collins**  
Parish Clerk  
11 April 2016
Lower Horsebridge owes its origins to a junction of two turnpike roads dating from the mid-18th Century and now forming the A271. It is a linear settlement strung along the A271 with a more modern extension northward along North Street. With two public houses, a post office and reasonably good public transport, it is classified by Wealden District Council as a Local Settlement. Some of the key issues now facing it are:

**Housing Growth**

The Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations (IOR) proposes an additional 4,000 dwellings in urban extensions to north and south Hailsham. While only 20 new homes are proposed for Lower Horsebridge, it cannot be assumed that the village will not also have to accommodate some of these 4,000 dwellings. Depending on the numbers involved, there is a risk that this could lead to Lower Horsebridge merging with Hellingly and Lower Dicker.

**Question:** Should the Plan seek to designate countryside gaps between Lower Horsebridge and other nearby settlements to prevent coalescence and, if so, where should they be located?

**Flooding**

The river Cuckmere is liable to frequent and extensive flooding to the east and south of Lower Horsebridge. Some other areas are subject to waterlogging due to a high water table and poor drainage. These problems are likely to become more severe in future years due to climate change.

**Question:** Should the Plan seek to strengthen present policies regarding development in the floodplain and to minimise the adverse effects of flooding?

**Highways and Parking**

The high volume of traffic passing along the A271 causes noise and pollution. There is often congestion at the North Street junction due to turning traffic and vehicles visiting the Post Office. Elsewhere car parking can obstruct public footways. With new development in the area, these problems will grow.

**Question:** What changes should the Plan recommend in order to ameliorate these issues?
Open Space

The recreation ground on the south side of Lower Horsebridge is well used and insufficient to meet local needs. The former fairground site next to it is vacant and unused.

Question: Should the Plan allocate the fairground site as an extension to the recreation ground, possibly with some houses along the road frontage if necessary to achieve this?

Streetscape

The Parish Council has asked the District Council to consider designating the centre of Lower Horsebridge between Back Lane and the Old Sweetshop as a conservation area.

Question: What can be done to enhance the character and appearance of the streetscape in Lower Horsebridge?

John Blake
Notes of Roebuck Park Discussion Group

at Village Hall on 23 April 2016 at 10.00

20 members of the public were present.

Also present: Councillors Blake, White, Hopcroft and Jackets, Bill Short and Nina Downes, Steering Group Members, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the morning.

Following the presentation, the meeting was opened to a question and answer session.

Question:
It is important for us to know where the floods occur in the Parish otherwise we can’t participate in discussions about where housing should be.

Answer:
It is important for us to be able to support this with mapped data. In 2000 there was serious flooding in the area, there is a particular issue with Wealden clay and the high water table. We are hoping to be able to make the argument that there are areas beyond the flood zones that should also be avoided in terms of development.

It was also explained that for any development there are 2 elements that need to be considered, namely foul drainage and what to do with it and surface water, a lot of thought needs to go into planning applications around dealing with surface water. There are a number of different options one being SUDS another is using a soak away, although this option is not really suitable for this area. East Sussex County Council are the lead flood authority but they are only a consultee on Planning Applications.

It was noted that it is quite often the surface water that is the problem, one option that has been suggested is the formation of a lake on the land near the Boship roundabout, this could become an area for leisure pursuits, this would however have implications for the landowner. Government policy tries to avoid building in flood zones, however there are areas in Hellingly whilst not in a flood zone are still not suitable for development due to the high water table.

Question:
Decisions are being forced on Wealden District Council for the additional 9,000+ houses, it is intriguing that they have chosen Hailsham as the location as there is no railway, it is south of the Ashdown Forest which means that big vehicles would be going through the forest. There are virtually no factories or manufacturing therefore work in the area is generally in small specialised businesses and not enough to support mass housing. Every school is at capacity. I have already mentioned infrastructure but because of the lack of work in the area means that the area becomes a dormitory area.

We are going to get an increase in the number of older people but there are no facilities for them and this is not incorporated in the Wealden Local Plan. The responsibility is being placed on us to take housing without the appropriate back up to make it viable.
Answer:
WDC are not singled out by the Government, all authorities are required to show a 5-year land supply within their local plan otherwise any applications that are refused are likely to be granted at appeal by the Planning Inspectorate. The Government depends on the Office of National Statistics (ONS) for the population growth figures.

In terms of why Hailsham was chosen as the area for development WDC covers a large rural area, south of the A27 falls within the South Downs National Park where minimal housing is possible. North of Horam is the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, then there is the issue of Ashdown Forest and Pevensey Levels in the south. So therefore due to the geography of the area opportunities for large scale housing are limited.

There is still the opportunity to express concerns at the WDC Plan inspection where you would be able to suggest alternative locations, (some redistribution of housing numbers) such as Stone Cross and Polegate both of which are served with railway stations. There is also the point of better testing by Wealden of new settlements i.e. Berwick which is close to the A27 and also has a railway.

Behind the Local Plan document is an Infrastructure Delivery Plan and in the production of that the Education Authority, Water, Highways, County Council and the Health Authority would have been consulted as to what is required to support the level of growth in housing and how and when the necessary infrastructure would be funded.

The next step will be to look realistically at the sustainability of the Local Plan.

In terms of employment, whilst the Local Authority is focussed on housing delivery, there is a similar projection for the numbers of jobs that would be needed to support the housing. There are proposals within the Local Plan for employment space.

It was noted that it shows how important it is for us to ensure that the NDP fits with the Local Plan.

Question:
I am concerned that people are being moved in without proper population modelling being done. There are families that have found out this week that their child has not got into the local school and instead will have to travel by public transport across Hailsham to school. This is not ideal for 4 year olds as they will be too tired to work once they get to school. Is there the provision in Hellingly NDP to expand either Hawkes Farm or Hellingly schools? I work in Hove and they had the new schools in place before the housing was built.

The education infrastructure has already failed and it is only going to get worse.

Answer:
I couldn’t agree more about dragging young children across Town to school. I can confirm that for a significant number of years the County Council have been pressed about the need for additional provision of school places to the north of Hailsham. The County Council do not seem to have grasped this. Prior to this Local Plan the Planning Inspector had asked the County Council to attend the inspection as he was concerned about school provision.

The earlier proposal had been for a 2 form entry school to the north of Hailsham, this was thrown out when it was decided that they wanted to do something to the south instead. With growth to the north this is obviously where the school is needed.
We cannot allocate land for a school or write a policy but we can make recommendations to the County Council.

The need for a primary school was identified in the 2005 Local Plan, this was originally to be on the Roebuck Park estate but the County Council decided that there would not be enough children and that instead children would be brought in from elsewhere. There was also a query on the status of the Drive, so the location then moved on to be North Hailsham and then it became somewhere in Hailsham, therefore because the County Council had land in South Hailsham they decided that it should be there.

Within the 2013 Core Strategy Local Plan the development site on Park Road had an allocation for a 2 form entry school. The Parish Council have suggested that it should in fact be a 3 form entry. The building of schools is held back as if the schools are built before the houses then they would be filled with children from elsewhere. It has been suggested that children from the existing Hellingly School could be moved to the new school. It is likely that there will probably be a requirement for 3 or 4 more schools based on the amount of housing in the Issues, Options and Recommendations document.

The NDP can influence the decisions, so should we be supporting retaining the current school or relocation to a new site?

Question:
Parents want children in good schools not necessarily new schools.

Answer:
Broadly speaking we could support the location of the school, that they need to be built as soon as possible and we could give a view on whether the existing school should be enhanced or whether it should be combined into a new school.

Question:
What about Doctors? Even if new surgeries are built it is difficult to get GPs to work in them.

I am sceptical about the NDP as WDC have said that as they don’t have a Local Plan in place developers could have a field day. The land that is being developed west of Park Road is wet during the winter, builders are putting in manholes 3ft above the land and are then going to backfill so this will cause problems with flooding elsewhere.

Answer:
During the production of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan the Health Authority would have been consulted on the number of GPs that would be needed to support the increase in population and therefore about building a new surgery. I do know that it is difficult to find GPs. Again there is an opportunity to make comments about health care and where it needs to be located. If anyone has evidence about waiting times for appointments etc., then this would be valid to go in as back up in the NDP.

When a planning application comes in for WDC to be able to refuse on the basis of flooding issues they would need to have support from the appropriate bodies.

If WDC cannot show a 5-year land supply, then developers could have a field day. The Plan that they are trying to produce should be in place before the 9,000 houses arrive.
The NDP could look at density and design of developments.

In terms of heath, WDC are not the provision authority but the Plan is handed to the Health Authority. There is a site allocated but NHS England have not brought it forward and we are in danger of reaching the point where the developers can ask for their money back.

It is a worry as the structures within the Health Authorities in terms of provision have changed.

If we feel that there is a need for a new Doctors Surgery, then we could make a recommendation in the NDP.

**Question:**
Why is there a gap between the previous Local Plan and the new Plan?

**Answer:**
Most locals tend to be anti-building. The process of getting a Local Plan is long winded with most people objecting. They had legal challenges by developers, it is almost impossible to produce Plans quickly enough. The Government has now said that Plans can be for 15 years which then gives plenty of time to produce a new Plan before the old one runs out.

**Question:**
I am curious to know what provision has been made for future immigration?

**Answer:**
There is no provision in the WDC Local Plan. Wealden cannot guess how many people will arrive from the EU or an expanded EU, the Wealden Plan can and does account for past trends and numbers in respect of in migration and uses this in preparing its Plan.

The only talk is about inward migration not immigration. All statistics are provided to WDC by the ONS.

This corner of the UK is extremely popular for inward migration.

**Question:**
If the Local Education Authority are not going to build a school, there is the option of building a free school or an academy but how quickly could that be done?

**Answer:**
The County Council still have the ability to build a school on land it owns in Ingrams Way (south Hailsham) but with the move to the Academy system there is uncertainty as to what will happen.

**Question:**
It is important to recognise that WDC needs to work with the Health providers, why didn’t they talk to Quentins?

**Answer:**
In all the time that WDC have been producing the Plan they have had meetings with Health representatives. They are all saying the same thing if you look in the WDC Local Plan, they will not be able to cope with the extra housing unless something is done. We cannot build or deliver but can make enough noise and support WDC to try and get it delivered. People
would feel happier with the proposed growth if they were happy with the infrastructure provision.

**Question:**
Are the targets in the Plan achievable, there is the 9,000 houses but it is not concerned with infrastructure, Hailsham cannot absorb it.

**Answer:**
The ideal would be for all the infrastructure to be in place before the houses are built. In May, improvement works will start in Hailsham town centre, this is as a result of the developments that have taken place to date. We have not invested in infrastructure enough, developers can only be asked to contribute towards the stretch in services that is caused by their development.

WDC Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) process has been agreed and came into effect from 1 April 2016, this means that for every house built the developer would be required to make a contribution. If a Parish Council does not have a NDP then they would be entitled to receive 15% of this contribution up to a cap, if however, a Parish Council does have a NDP then they would receive 25% with no cap. We could get as much as a 7 figure sum. WDC are fortunate that this is quite an expensive area and they are able to show that profitability in housing is strong enough that it wouldn’t collapse if CIL is imposed. WDC would get 75% and this would be used towards the bigger infrastructure things such as roads, education and health. Our 25% could be used to enhance the contribution to the education authority for example, or it could be used for local infrastructure schemes e.g. traffic calming. There will still however, be a lag in provision of infrastructure.

**Response:**
Why can the numbers of houses not be brought down?

**Answer:**
I have explained where the numbers come from, the Parish Council have expressed concerns about how Hailsham would cope with the additional housing. If you have concerns, you are able to attend the Inspection of the WDC Local Plan and express them.

**Question:**
In terms of recent migration, is the WDC Plan deliverable. Can the NDP suggest the numbers of housing would make it (WDC Plan) non-deliverable?

**Answer:**
The Parish Council has already made its comments known to Wealden in response to the consultation on Issues and Options and suggested that these numbers are too high and potentially cannot be delivered. In terms of non-deliverability, the NDP itself however, needs to be deliverable and we would not be suggesting significant growth. What we can also do is make clear reference to the WDC Local Plan and make recommendations to Highways, Education and Health authorities if we are worried about delivery of infrastructure

**Comment from Project Lead:**
We have always felt that the NDP is not going to solve all the major problems we have talked about today but that it can make a difference for the good. Firstly, to retain the rural character of the Parish and secondly, to retain the identity of our villages within the Parish. In those areas the NDP can do good and achieve benefit.
On 12 May 2016, we will be holding the Annual Parish Meeting and at that we will be reporting on the consultation and it will be a further opportunity to comment on the findings and help take us forward onto the next stage, so please come along for support.

Questions put to those present:

- Should there be any form of separation between Roebuck Park and the northern extension of Hailsham and, if so, what form should it take?

- The current adopted Wealden Local Plan allocates the land to the west of the Drive for low density housing. That Plan will be superseded by the new Local Plan now in the course of preparation which is unlikely to repeat this policy. Should the NDP include this policy?

- The Chapel at Roebuck Park is one of the original buildings that remains. It is over 100 years old but is not statutorily listed, it is currently used for storage. Should the preferred use of the chapel be for community purposes (e.g. as a social or youth club)? Should it be included in the non-statutory Local List of buildings of architectural or historic interest.

- Should the northward expansion of the Hailsham urban area end at Roebuck Park or should it continue to the north of Park Wood?

Participants were asked to think about the above.

**Question**
Will the questionnaire give us an opportunity to answer these questions?

**Answer**
Yes

**Question:**
Can the questionnaire be broken down into the same areas as the Discussion Groups?

**Answer:**
It will probably be a generic questionnaire but we haven't discussed that yet.

Those present were urged to engage with any young persons living in the household when completing the questionnaire.

**Summary**
Participants were asked to think about 1 or 2 things that they thought they would want the NDP to contain/achieve and to email them to the Clerk.

The Chairman thanked all those in attendance for their contribution to the meeting.

**The main issues discussed were:**

- Where are the areas that flood and therefore where are the areas that housing should go?
- Why was Hailsham chosen as the location for the additional 9,000 houses?
• Lack of employment opportunities
• Infrastructure
• Schools – need for a new one and the location of that school
• Facilities for older people
• Requirement for a new Doctors Surgery and the availability of GPs to work in them
• Are the targets in the Local Plan deliverable i.e. the 9,000 houses?
• CIL

The meeting closed at 12.00

Suzanne Collins
Parish Clerk 26 April 2016
The settlement known as Roebuck Park – the former Hellingly Hospital site comprising the residential estate, Ashen Hill and the Country Park – is a recently completed development. As such it has yet to ‘bed down’ and is experiencing some teething problems. The Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) is unlikely to be an appropriate vehicle for addressing these. There are however a number of broader issues on which residents’ views would be welcomed, namely:

**Coalescence**

The Wealden Local Plan Issues, Options and Recommendations (IOR) proposes 4,000 new dwellings to the north and south of Hailsham (north being defined as to the east of the Cuckoo Trail). Sites for these have not yet been identified but it seems very likely that a significant proportion of them will be on land to the north of New Road.

**Question:** Should there be any form of separation between Roebuck Park and this northern extension of Hailsham and, if so, what form should it take?

**Land West of the Drive**

The current adopted Wealden Local Plan allocates the land to the west of the Drive for low density housing. That Plan will be superseded by the new Local Plan now in the course of preparation which is unlikely to repeat this policy.

**Question:** Should the NDP include this policy?

**The Chapel**

The Chapel is one of the few original buildings that remain. It is over 100 years old but is not statutorily listed. It is currently used for storage.

**Question:** Should the preferred use of the chapel be for community purposes (e.g. as a social or youth club)? Should it be included in the non-statutory Local List of buildings of architectural or historic interest?

**Land to North of Park Wood**

At present, land to the north of Park Wood is open countryside and it has been suggested that it be given a protected landscape designation. However, it has also been suggested that it might be used as a sports park or even for residential development.

**Question:** Should the northward expansion of the Hailsham urban area end at Roebuck Park or should it continue to the north of Park Wood?
Infrastructure

New developments place additional demands on existing infrastructure – roads, schools, medical services, public transport, recreational facilities etc. Resources for improving infrastructure for future new developments are likely to be limited.

Question: What infrastructure have Roebuck Park residents found to be inadequate? What should be the priorities for future investment?

John Blake
Notes of Businesses Discussion Group
at Boship Hotel on 1 April 2016 at 7.30

4 representatives from the business community were present.

Also present: Councillors Blake and White, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the morning.

Following the presentation, a general discussion was held and the following points were noted.

Hailsham and Hellingly seem to be converging. Does it make a difference to your business?

We can influence how building is delivered but we cannot stop it.

The A22 corridor is identified as an area for business. How do you feel this would impact businesses?

We need housing, where are they going to go?

It is not particularly sustainable to have housing without jobs nearby.

There are 40 businesses at Broad Farm, many of them just have storage containers as they are gardeners and carpet fitters for example. Don’t know what to think we know small units are popular but you are thinking of bigger.

Not necessarily it depends what is needed.

There is a shortage of small industrial units there is a waiting list for them.

The Local Plan comes down to what evidence is available to support the fact that something is needed.

It is not just workshops that are needed but storage units.

We can mitigate against the impact of growth of industrial units by putting in policies to say that they should be landscaped and away from residential property to reduce the impact of noise. We can also put in recommendations, for example one thing holding back businesses is the broadband provision.

What about the location of the smaller business units? Access would need to be a consideration for smaller units generally smaller vehicles are used and with the storage units it means less vehicular movements.

What about the spare land at Wellshurst Golf Club, could that be used for anything, for example possible equestrian facilities or a caravan site/"glamping"?

Is there anything that the NDP can do?
There is enough land for another golf course, but another course is not needed.

Junior membership is low; it was suggested that contact be made with the sports club at Hailsham. The golf club moved away from the gym facilities as they were not used and instead moved into conference facilities.

As a Parish we are keen to push recreational facilities and to use tourism to bring that in.

The Wealden District Council (WDC) Issues, Options and Recommendations document includes the need for sports facilities in the area. We could work towards a policy to promote sports and recreational facilities. Also to encourage more B&Bs.

As a definition there is no green belt in the area. The land at the golf club would be a green field site rather than a brown field site.

With the increase in housing, liveries are becoming more popular, these also fit with maintaining the rural character of the area.

Broadband is the thing holding businesses back for example we cannot have a website.

Should we be addressing previous applications that have not come forward, for example the brick works?

Main messages on NDP for Hellingly:
- Send ideas to us
- Rural small workshops replicated
- Edge of expanded town, support for rural leisure/tourism development
- Recommendations re broadband.

Would you want to see live/work developments or units near housing or a separation between the two? It was generally felt that the units should be away from housing.

Is there any need for retail in the Parish? The Co-op is very good but it is impossible to park so we don’t use it.

Planning applications are very expensive how can we find out whether there would be any chance of approval before putting in an application? You could have a pre-application meeting and apply for outline permission before going for full permission.

If there is an allocation in the Local Plan for land it is almost likely that it will be granted planning permission.
The main issues discussed were:

- Provision of small scale rural workshops but with decent landscaping/not too close to residential.
- Support for expansion of rural tourism/camping/glamping and equestrian – again subject to minimising any landscape impact.
- Upgrading of broadband provision

The meeting closed at 9.15

Suzanne Collins
Parish Clerk

7 April 2016
Notes of Environmental Discussion Group

at Village Hall on 7 April 2016 at 14.30


Also present: Councillors Blake and White, Nina Downes, Steering Group Member (Chair for the meeting), David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the meeting.

Following the presentation, a general discussion was held and the following points were noted.

It was commented that the corridors into Hailsham Town Centre were not good and asked whether there were plans to provide another shopping centre.

The Wealden District Council (WDC) Local Plan provides for a westerly extension to the town and an additional 4,000 plus houses to the north of Hailsham. It is likely some of these would be within Hellingly. The suggestion is to enhance the retail offer to the south of the town. The ability for the public to get into town without using cars should be improved, need to capture improvements 2 access to Hailsham from Hellingly.

It was commented that to keep the character of Hailsham another centre should be built elsewhere it would need to be to the north.

It was also commented that the bus service from Roebuck Park was very poorly used and therefore very likely that it would be lost in the future.

The Environment Agency (EA) had been monitoring Hellingly during the recent flooding. The Cuckmere had been walked north of the Mill to Shermans Bridge they had been monitoring for blockages. They will be removing trees and blockages but it is currently the nesting and spawning season.

During last year the EA desilted the Horsebridge Stream and reseeded the banks.

It was explained that the monitoring station alerts the EA to high water levels. There had been some issues at Michelham Priory which effected Hellingly, the structure of the lock at Tumblers Bay is unstable and a decision is to be made as to what to replace it with as it has become unreliable.

The EA were asked if there were any areas that we should be protecting.

It was explained that the Internal Drainage Boards were being removed from the EA and that they were trying to bring them up to standard before handover.
It was explained that the EA are able to remove trees to be able to access the rivers, they have casting rights of 40ft, therefore any future developments that may be near to rivers would need to take this into account as access to maintain watercourses is needed.

The EA were asked if they have a lot of mapped information and whether this would be helpful to us.

It was agreed that there was information from the monitoring stations. It was asked whether this could be shared with us.

The EA should automatically share this information for planning applications. They generally don’t encourage refusal due to flood risk but instead encourage putting measures in place to mitigate against the risk.

It was commented that from a Planning Policy point of view we were hoping to identify where not to encourage building.

It was noted that flood mapping does not show surface water and ground water levels.

A question was asked about Hurst Haven river which also floods.

It was confirmed by SE Water that most of the water for Hellingly is taken from Arlington Reservoir. They are currently character mapping the area and have been working with farmers to try and stop metaldehyde pollution in the water. They are currently looking at forecasts for population and properties and are producing a 25-year resource management plan. For them it is changes in population figures rather than property that impacts on them, they tend to find that the population figures do not change that much and that the population just moves around, it is the people that use the water and not the property.

In terms of the pipelines there should not be an issue and any reinforcements required would be made at the appropriate time.

It was commented that Clayhill had been considered as a new reservoir and that there had been some thoughts to increasing Arlington Reservoir, is was asked whether this was still the case.

This was the case and the water would come from the Ouse.

SE Water were asked whether we would be able to have the information from the work with the farmers.

It was commented that SE Water were very keen that any work was not just about the amount of water but the quality too.

It was noted that the team based at Arlington Reservoir were working on habitat creation.

The EA explained that they had carried out desilting in a number of other areas, this removes the nitrogen, which is a key factor in their attempts to remove pennywort, as it feeds on nitrogen. Pennywort is very invasive and has tap roots which grow into the river banks, they then break off and gradually move down the bank. Once it has been removed new growth can be sprayed.
SE Water and EA were asked whether they would support 2 policies requiring permitted development rights to be removed and permeable surfaces being put in, in sensitive areas.

SE Water and EA were asked to give some thought to a policy saying that there are issues for themselves as a result of increased development, it would carry more weight for us when the plan gets to the inspection stage.

It was commented that the flooding had receded quicker this time due to the work that the EA had carried out.

It was noted that there had been some issues in Park Wood with dirt bike riders and some people shooting high powered rifles. It was asked that if anyone sees this happening to contact the police.

The EA were asked whether there was any truth in the rumour that they were going to be relinquishing Park Wood.

It was confirmed that this was not the case, they had however, been told that they could not use money intended for flooding issues on running costs. A management plan has been created and a new management agency has been put in place, they cover their costs by making and selling products from the raw materials from the wood.

It was confirmed that the EA had still not received the s106 money from WDC, this money was to be used to repair a bridge and the remainder would be used for annual replanting.

**Wildlife Corridors**

It was noted that there were a number of wildlife corridors in or around Hellingly. The Cuckoo Trail being one. They are needed for the wildlife to get into and out of the area and are important as a route for migrating birds.

It was asked whether there would be any benefit in the NDP recommending a management plan for the Cuckoo Trail as there is currently none in place.

It was suggested that for the NDP we could look to identify corridors and include policies to protect them from development. This may require some contributions from developers. We could also make recommendations to other bodies. It was noted that at previous groups we talked about the contributions that would be due to the Parish from the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). We could use these funds to supplement and support what WDC might be trying to get from developers.

The connection from Park Wood to Hurst Haven should be protected. It was noted that evidence of flooding was needed to try and get the policies through.

**Coalescence**

The question was asked as to whether we should propose corridors between settlements. It was agreed that this should be the case, particularly between Hailsham. We should look to protect ancient woodland and SSSI sites.

It was noted that with more development there was more water run-off and that perhaps we should be looking to encourage water reuse and water recycling. It was however, noted
that this is covered by building regulations and therefore this should not really be included within our plan.

It was noted that the use of balancing ponds as a solution has difficulties as the responsibility of maintaining them falls on the landowner. Southern Water are obliged to provide solutions for foul water only.

SE Water were asked whether they were happy that the pipework locally would be able to cope with the additional housing proposed for Hailsham. It was commented that there had been a shortfall in the previously proposed figures locally and that new mains had been going in.

With the abolition of the regional strategy SE Water had a duty to cooperate and this means that they had been working more with the planning authorities. They are heat mapping sensitive areas.

SE Water were asked to send an email confirming that the pipework was sufficient. They were also asked if they could carry out mapping for Hellingly. It was commented that they could map potential sites and see which may be sensitive.

It was confirmed that any support that SE Water may be able to give to any of our policies would be helpful, it was agreed the catchment management work may be of use.

**Landscape Sensitivity**

Geology is important in terms of run-off, ground mapping is key and it is important that developments are not on high dry land or boggy land.

It was noted that WDC have a Dark Sky policy and that we may need to include something around this in the NDP.

It was noted that there is a national policy concerning air pollution but it may be that we could include recommendations around the stretch of the highly polluted A22, this could for example look at landscaping on developments. It was asked whether we need to include industrial developments in terms of air pollution.

At the end of the meeting the Chairman summarised the discussion and thanked everyone for attending.

**The main issues discussed were:**

- Surface water flooding – support and input from EA and SE Water as to a NDP Policy being developed.
- Ancient woodlands, SSSI and SNCl being mapped/protected
- Biodiversity corridors being mapped/protected – Cuckoo Trail, Hurst Haven, Cuckmere and Stunts Green (as it feeds into Hellingly)
- Geology – avoidance of best and the most waterlogged agricultural land. Mapping (with evidence from EA) of areas liable to surface water flooding due to high water levels.
- Locally important landscapes to be mapped – possible congruence with the landscaping/tree planting work that EA is supporting with farmers to provide greater support and evidence for a NDP Policy.
• Support in the NDP (with local evidence) for some of the emerging WDC policies e.g. Biodiversity (incl. developer contributions to enhance where development may affect them). Also support for the WDC emerging policy on air pollution – with specific reference to A22 in Lower Dicker area.
• EA and SE Water support removal of permitted development rights and use of permeable surfaces in new developments to reduce impact of surface water runoff and the adverse impacts it has on water quality in Pevensey Levels.

The meeting closed at 16.35

Suzanne Collins
Parish Clerk

8 April 2016
Notes of Community Discussion Group
at Village Hall on 9 April 2016 at 13.00

Present at the meeting were Barry Carpenter, Hellingly Lions Cycle Speedway Club and Stewart Brierley Hellingly Rugby Club and Hellingly Sports Trust.

Also present: Councillor Blake, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk also from the Guides and Playgroup.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the meeting.

Following the presentation, a general discussion was held and the following points were noted.

Questionnaires would be sent to all the groups who operated in the Parish as it was important to engage with them all. Questionnaires would therefore be sent to all the groups and organisations that had been invited to the Discussion Group.

It was however, noted that only those on the electoral register would be able to vote in the referendum.

The NDP would be consulted on before it went for inspection, this consultation would include non-residents as it was important to be able to demonstrate this.

Anyone would be able to attend the Inspection and talk about what they may have put in the questionnaire as responses. We would hope that by the time we develop the NDP it will include what people want and will be supported.

It was noted that in the District of Wealden the provision of sports grounds is poor and the question was asked whether there was any way of protecting what there currently is.

The Wealden District Council (WDC) Local Plan includes the protection and enhancing of sports grounds. The NDP could broadly support this and reaffirm the shortage of pitches. If evidence is available, then there would be strong grounds in having a policy but this could only look to Hellingly. We could put forward ideas for land for extension of existing grounds e.g. The Old Fairground Site.

The question was asked of those present where the lack or inadequacy of community facilities in the Parish was.

It was noted that the Rugby Club had, had an increase in interest since the World Cup, with new members and old members returning, but what they don’t have is an increase in facilities for the extra players. The car parking at the ground is very limited and causes a number of problems, vehicles park in the White Hart car park and on the roads and verges, if this could be looked at it would help the relationship with neighbours. It would also provide a better welcome to visiting teams. The car parking issue came up at the last Cricket Club meeting and at the last Sports Trust meeting as well, they are losing supporters as they can find nowhere to park so go away.
It was asked whether by expanding the recreation ground it would make the problem worse unless additional parking was provided.

Yes, the recent planning application for the White Hart included 2 houses on the current White Hart car park, there was no provision of parking so they would end up using the recreation ground car park and making matters worse.

Looking forward to the expanded growth in the Town would you be able to give an indication to what scale of additional spaces might help to alleviate the problems?

In the short term it would be good to have the use of the White Hart car park as an extension, in addition if the area up to the Bowls Club gate was tarmacked that would also help.

It was noted that by the time the NDP becomes a statutory document the White Hart issues would be likely to have been resolved. It was noted that both the Rugby Club and the Sports Trust together with some individuals had responded to the Planning Application.

It was further noted that 10 years ago WDC carried out a study on sports and recreation, it concluded that Hailsham was deficient in sports facilities but that Hellingly was less so. Since then Roebuck Park and Wellsbury Farm estates had been built, this means that there are now more houses and people but the sports facilities have not grown, so therefore the situation has not improved.

The Rugby Club were asked if they had sufficient space for what they wanted to do.

It was confirmed that the Rugby Club does have enough space but the ground and therefore the pitches are prone to flooding. The first home game since Christmas was able to be played last week. They have just agreed a new grounds maintenance regime with the Cricket Club who will be getting onto the ground sooner to repair it, the Rugby club will then get onto the ground earlier prior to next season so that they can verti drain it, it is hoped that these 2 things will help.

It was agreed that there was enough space for the teams and that the junior team would use the smaller pitch.

It was noted that in the WDC Local Plan there was an identified need, but that they would be looking at Town locations first. The NDP could give local support and evidence. It was suggested that those present may like to consider broad support for the facilities and to consider whether there were potential areas in Hellingly that may be suitable.

Hellingly Lions Cycle Speedway Club, would definitely support the recommendations. Cycling had seen 500% increase in recent years and cycle speedway a 120% growth as a result the club may have picked up 2 new members. It was noted that in areas of growth this had been due to the introduction of local leagues, where they could meet on 1 or 2 nights a week. Hellingly Lions currently have to travel very long distances to away games, they are the oldest club in the world but have limited facilities. If they had more local people coming in it would boost the use of the track. They have only been on the club ground twice in March for training. The lack of floodlighting is also an issue.

As with the Rugby Club car parking is their biggest problem, the location of the ground on the main road doesn’t help. They would like to update the facilities and get them used more.
Hellingly Lions would be behind the development of a sports club; they currently sit very much alone.

Hellingly Lions were asked whether they would still see the future of the club where it is or elsewhere. It was suggested that the site itself was perfect for juniors and that if something else came up elsewhere that could be used for the seniors that would be good, this would mean that they could then enter both the South West and South East leagues.

It was suggested that the new sports facilities mentioned in WDC Local Plan would be at least 10 years away and that therefore anything included in the NDP should look at short and long term aspirations. The Sports Trust had been looking at this and had developed a plan.

It was noted that some funding was likely to come from developers’ contributions.

It was commented that one of the big problems was that Hailsham, Hellingly and Wealden had been remiss in providing sports facilities and that there was a lot of work to be done. The developers should be putting in place facilities to cope with the increase in population, but need to catch up first before this becomes achievable.

In response it was suggested that nationally we had rested on our laurels, and that WDC had less money in order to catch up. It was noted that for large scale developments only a limited amount of recreation provision could be requested. What is actually needed is a more strategic facility and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) could be used towards this. A Parish Council with a NDP would be entitled to 25% of CIL collected by the Planning Authority.

It was recognised that Hellingly had a better ratio of sports facilities to the population than Hailsham, but that these could be improved. At the moment the extra space is not needed in Hellingly but as the population increases then more may be needed, this could be from the Sports Alliance or the Parish itself. More and more people are looking for exercise facilities. Sport reduces the need for health care, but the facilities to attract and then keep people are needed.

It was reiterated that any evidence of numbers that could be provided would be useful as this would help to build a picture.

It was agreed that short and long term plans were a good idea as the housing would not be appearing overnight and until that time the CIL resources would not be available for the larger scale developments.

The question was asked whether the Playgroup was at full capacity and whether there was a need for another one.

It was suggested that there was not a need for another playgroup but instead additional staff at the current one to be able to take additional children. It was noted that car parking was also an issue for the Playgroup.

It was noted that many of the guide units in the area are full, they use the facilities and try to get involved in events in the Parish.
It was noted that the car park at Lower Horsebridge recreation ground is open to the public for use.

The Sports Trust have a development plan for improving the facilities at the recreation ground and they then hope to be able to open up the Clubhouse to other organisations, but there would still be the parking issue, they would not be able to offer the facilities to the disabled as there is no disabled parking. They are hoping to be able to fill the gap for other clubs in the area who have no central facility.

The land that they have at the moment would be sufficient for these plans.

It was commented that all the groups represented had mentioned car parking as holding them back. In terms of car parking there is always land available and it may be worth testing this in the NDP.

The Rugby Club had thought about whether it would be possible to ask the Kings Head about using part of their car park on match days.

It was suggested that it may be possible to explore putting in a layby in front of the Lower Dicker recreation ground.

It was noted that the NDP would have limitations in terms of the bigger strategic issues but it could make recommendations to other organisations e.g. if there was evidence for the need of the layby on the Lower Dicker.

It was agreed that any comments and evidence should be provided by the end of May.

At the end of the meeting the Chairman summarised the discussion and thanked everyone for attending.

The main issues raised were:

- Lack of car parking
- Lack of sports facilities in Wealden district generally
- Flooding issues at the current sports facilities in Hellingly
- The need for short and long term plans
- That strategic sports facilities were needed and that this could not be dealt with in the NDP but recommendations could be included around this.

The meeting closed at 14.55

Suzanne Collins  
Parish Clerk  
11 April 2016
Notes of Farmers Discussion Group

at Boship Hotel on 22 April 2016 at 7.30

Present at the meeting were 13 Farmers or landowners.

Also present: Councillors Blake and White, David Phillips, Consultant, Suzanne Collins, Parish Clerk and Tracy Harper, Deputy Clerk.

The discussion group was opened with a presentation explaining the process for the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and the main aim for the meeting.

Following the presentation, a general discussion was held and the following points were noted.

That generally farmers in the area are ageing and that it is difficult for the young to get into farming as land has a high value for development and affordable housing is not available. It was also noted that the nature of farming is changing, there are not the opportunities now for a full time job and a tied house; most people are working for a number of farmers on a part time basis. Also, the older farmers have a number of part time workers, in order to keep the farm running. Food producers are making a loss.

It was agreed that it was important to find some way of retaining the younger workers or the rural ambiance that we are trying to preserve through the NDP would disappear.

It was also noted that the butchery trade has also changed, as in the past animals were presented ready for butchery, but now this is not the case. It was however, noted that with in-comers taking over farms it is more likely that their children might keep the farms going.

It was pointed out that in terms of the availability of affordable housing, that we could consider including a policy within the NDP about providing more affordable housing for people who need to work in the area. We would need to provide evidence that the housing is needed and it could be worded in terms of keeping the rural character of the area, as a result of the continuation of farming.

The question was put to those present as to whether we should look to encourage diversification. Government policies have now started to allow this. It was suggested that there were other things that farmers could be looking at to diversify and hence maintain their business. For example, other types of farming such as vineyards, should we look at trying to get a relaxation in the rules around farm shops so that shops could sell produce from other farmers. Could we also look at alternative use of the land? We should look at setting a framework to enable farmers to carry on as it is this that will keep the rural nature of the area.

It was suggested that one of the problems for the parish is that we don’t have enough farms that are big enough to employ staff.

It was agreed that entry into farming is more difficult now and it was difficult to know how we could encourage starter small holdings.

It was suggested that there are a lot of fields in the area that could be rented.
It was also suggested that Wealden District Council could do more to protect land, as in the past they had approved planning applications which had then rendered the remaining land useless from a farming perspective, it was thought that in some cases they are taking the wrong pieces of land for development.

It might therefore be something that could be included as a policy in the NDP as to farming land which should be avoided for development purposes.

However, it was noted that it is the big open fields which are the ones that are wanted for development. It was commented that if the land that is being developed was used to its full potential in terms of density, then less land would be needed elsewhere.

It was pointed out that from any local authority point of view, housing numbers are always key.

It was further suggested that it is a matter of finding a balance. For example, Roebuck Park is a high density development and the development now starting off Park Road, was originally a lower density than finally approved.

It was thought that it was important to get the urban design right including sufficient car parking provision and good bus services.

Insufficient Broadband was once again raised as an issue, it is not helpful when trying to develop the rural economy. It was recognised that this was not something for the NDP. However, it was suggested that if the NDP were to support the need for small business units then a policy could include the need for improved broadband in order for businesses to be able to operate efficiently.

It was also noted that mobile reception is bad too, the question was asked whether there was any chance of getting 5G as this would be an option for broadband. It was pointed out that this was a commercial activity, however, Wealden District Council are undertaking a survey on mobile and broadband coverage, so any bad areas should be reported there. The thought was raised that perhaps this could be something that we should be asking developers to look at.

It was confirmed that there is the need for additional smaller business units in the area.

The question was asked whether we should be encouraging farmers to convert outbuildings for business use. It was however, pointed out that this can cause issues with neighbours, so the location of the farms would be key in this.

Those present were asked whether we should be looking to include a policy in the NDP which would enable farmers to diversify their businesses. Any policy would need to help farmers to do what they feel is best for them.

It was suggested that we needed to be supporting those things that the farmers need, i.e. the farmers market.

It was also commented that we need to look at tourism and leisure pursuits.

It was thought that if there was evidence that tourism units i.e. holiday lets, were needed then this could lead to a policy to support tourism housing on farms.
One of the farmers present had first-hand experience of this, he had been given a 3-year temporary permission to open a campsite, he had been amazed at the take up.

It was recognised that there are some rural pursuits that cause problems e.g. clay pigeon shooting. However, it may be possible to include a policy that encourages more rural activities.

It was recognised that farming within a conservation area and listed building status bring restrictions. However, although it was agreed that it would be helpful if more flexibility were allowed in making improvements and extensions to listed buildings that this was a national policy and therefore we would be limited in what we could include.

It was pointed out that when the NDP goes to referendum it would be likely that people would opt to want to maintain historical buildings. The point was made that there is no lack of people wanting to buy listed buildings.

Those present were asked whether there was anything that would make their lives as a farmer easier.

The question was asked whether it would be possible to use some farm land for allotments. It was noted that there would be no reason why this idea shouldn’t be promoted in the NDP.

It was explained, that for new large developments we would be asking for the provision of an allotment garden.

A further question raised with those present was whether we should be encouraging liveries as Hellingly is a good area for riding.

All those present were encouraged to email in any further thoughts and particularly any items of evidence that they might have.

**The main issues raised were:**

- Ageing farmers
- The changing nature of farming
- Lack of affordable housing for farm workers
- Diversification of the farming business
- Small farms not large enough to employ staff
- Include a list of farming land that should be avoided for development purposes
- Density of housing, i.e. maximising the use of the land and requiring less use elsewhere.
- Urban design to include sufficient car parking
- Broadband/mobile coverage

There was broad support for:

- Equestrian facilities
- Camping facilities
- Tourism accommodation/holiday units.

The meeting closed at 9.20

**Suzanne Collins**  
**Parish Clerk**  
25 April 2016
Appendix C

Individual Responses

1. Establish a conservation area from The Old Sweet Shop to Back Lane, hopefully in time to retain The White Hart Public House

2. Although not in favour of large residential development think it is essential to have two or three small sites of say no more than 18/20 houses to enable the area to continue to thrive and maintain some sort of centre supporting the facilities such as school, church and recreational areas and sport activities.

3. In the long term consider the change of use of the fairground field to provide additional community recreational space/play areas.

4. Flooding is a major issue in this area and further development however small will only exacerbate the situation. Consider investigating the possibility of allowing the low lying ground that lies between the A22 and recreation ground to flood naturally thus alleviating flooding in Hellingly and create a community lake area for recreational activities such as fishing/boating.

5. Ensure the old Flour Mill site is converted and developed as proposed. In its present state it is an eyesore to visitors and residents and continues to deteriorate.

At a recent meeting we were asked to give our thoughts to the Parish Council about areas of Hellingly that we would like to see possibly protected from future development.

I will keep this very brief.

Please keep.

The field to the north of Station Road and East of Vicarage Lane to retain a very pleasant rural view.

An area around Horse Lunges Manor.

The view from New Road north across the fields to The Oast at Park Farm.

Regarding more large scale development in this section of the Parish please try and object to any applications north/east of New Road. The fields slope quite steeply and even without the area being concreted over we suffer flooding from surface water draining from the fields and Featherbed Lane which regularly results in a deep lake nearly quarter of a mile long. May I also add there are no `Danger Flood` signs here. Large scale development could result also in flooding of the A271 with devastating results.

A small parcel of houses where the nursery is/was could be managed. Has anyone seen the new development at Etchingham by a small local builder? It puts the big national builders to shame.
The parcel of farm land to the East of Park Farm where the Hurst Haven runs through should also be saved from large scale housing not only for the reason of flooding but also to retain a very rural view.

RP is unique for the area with the setting being round the park, a little set apart from other parts of the neighbourhood and on the hospital site which has a lot of local and county historical significance and local association. So if there is not some separation between it and any new development this will be lost as it will become just a part of the new mass. So little of the original building of the Hospital is left and listing the Chapel would see something is preserved. The Chapel was for the community here originally and with existing need and the expected growth whatever forms it takes, it seems appropriate it therefore is again used for the community.

Yes, the development should stop at RP as to continue would make it into large suburb so taking away the countryside feel that it has and creating a situation such as you have at Stone Cross where it has just grown into Eastbourne which no differential between the two and so losing its identify. Yet Hailsham/Hellingly have none of the same resources or infrastructure.

You know already the feedback regarding parking, road access, GPs, schools etc. and forever playing catch up on provision is unsustainable. Park Road would be the main access road to development in these areas which means a lot of the traffic would then come through the old village which will detract from it and its rural nature, besides which the road is not suitable for the traffic it gets at peak times already.

I am disappointed I couldn't make it to the meeting on Saturday. Would have been extremely interested to hear the conversation on schools.

From our point of view any further development in Hellingly whether it be north of New Road or to the west of The Drive should not go ahead without some key improvements to the infrastructure happening first. We have been happy with the doctors’ surgery in Herstmonceux and as such this hasn't concerned us. However, more housing would require more doctors’ facilities in the immediate area. Schooling is of real concern to us. My daughter has just been allocated a place at Marshlands school. A school that in my opinion and supported by all the most recent stats does not provide an adequate standard of education. She was allocated that place as it was the nearest school with places after being unable to be offered a place at any of our local schools. The Roebuck estate as it stands is too far away from its local schools for children in Roebuck Park to access places unless they have older siblings already in the schools. It is a ridiculous situation when parents will be going past 4 primary schools before they get to the one they've been allocated!

I have emailed Nus Ghani on this subject as well. No parent should be in the position we are and yet there are several on the estate! Without schooling provision in place no further housing should be built in north Hailsham or Hellingly.

I hope to be able to attend the agm but it will depend on my husband shifts.
Some comments in the potential developments:

- primary school
- secondary school
- health services
- traffic congestion in town
- traffic congestion around town
- sports facilities
- loss of countryside and rural feel
- loss of current environment being enjoyed, being reason for moving etc

All of which are already under pressure and in some cases already overburdened! Significant investment in infrastructure is needed, especially if all these houses are allowed, although this would result in a further loss of habitat. Ideally, don't build them!

The discussion that took place on Saturday I feel covered all the areas raised as far as Roebuck Park was concerned.

I would, however, like to emphasis a couple of points John raised in his Briefing Note:

1. The Village and Roebuck Park are presently clearly a unit: removing the green belt between the new developments and Roebuck Park will simply turn Hellingly into North Hailsham (and, no doubt, ultimately the request that Hailsham incorporates Hellingly into its jurisdiction). The green belt does more than provide a pleasant ‘breath of the countryside’ it psychologically separates the urban from the rural.

2. The NDP should re-emphasise the low density housing on the land to the west of The Drive AND the 2m green strip that separates the road from the housing as that is the special character of that area between Park Wood and Roebuck Park. By the same token, existing ancient forest should be preserved in that area west of The Drive, if necessary allocating the woods to the Parish Council for preservation.

3. I don’t think it will be possible to retain the area north of Park Wood for ever as open countryside: the pressure on housing development is just too great, however, to even contemplate such development without substantial improvement in the road access to the area from the Horam side will completely destroy the village atmosphere of Hellingly.