

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

The Planning Inspectorate Address
3rd Floor, Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol, BS1 6PN

**Re: APP/C1435/W/23/3335625 Continued Objection to Planning Application
WD/2022/3222/MAO**

Dear Sir/Madam,

We write to express our continued objection to the planning application with reference number **WD/2022/3222/MAO** submitted for **Land to the South of the A271 and East of the A22, Lower Horsebridge**. We understand that the application is currently under review, and we appreciate the opportunity to provide additional comments.

We would like to reiterate our concerns regarding the proposed development and emphasize specific reasons for our objection:

1. **Location and Setting:** The proposed development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. It would be inappropriate to allow a high-density multi-storey housing estate in this location. It would create an island community surrounded by 70mph and 60mph roads to the north and west boundaries and at various times of the year deep water to the south and east boundaries. This new community would rely predominantly on travel via car as pedestrian walkways to the site from the direction of schools, doctors and services are substandard. There are also no dedicated cycleways to the site.
2. **Traffic and Dangerous Junction:** The proposed access / egress junction to the site sits just after a bend on a 60mph road. This proposed junction would foul the existing vehicle access to Brook House. The traffic jams already endured on the A271 leading up to the Boship Roundabout during peak times will be exacerbated by this new junction, leading to new traffic jams on the proposed housing development itself. The A271 would have to be widened extensively adjacent the site to cater for the additional centre turning lane as well as a new widened footpath. The proposed land is considerably lower than the roadway therefore extensive building up will be required to enable road widening. The proposals provided do not seem to take any of these issues into account. Just a plan layout, no levels or calculations regarding how this new junction would work.
3. **Flooding:** Flooding will have been highlighted by many throughout the previous objections and we are sure will do again in this appeal, hopefully you will have seen many images and videos of this flooding by the time you read this objection letter also. As we write this letter, the flood plain is full again, yet the proposals provided by the developer show multiple biodiversity features as well as play areas right where the

floods are present. The little grass area to the bottom right of the photo below is where the play area is proposed on the developer drawings.



The land is currently on short let to a local farmer, horses and sheep are kept on the land. These animals are removed from the land by the farmer and relocated elsewhere when the area floods, because of the risk to the livestock and horses both of which have had to be rescued from the water in recent years, I would assume the fire brigade have records of these rescues should they be required.

How can a developer propose that the land is safe for people to live on and children to play on when horses and livestock have to be removed from the land when the floods occur?

In addition to the concerns mentioned above, I would like to draw attention to the following points:

- **Tactics by the Developer with regard Community Consultation:** Directly after the planning permission for the housing development was submitted to planning, the developer advertised a date for community consultation regarding locating a discount foodstore on the same site and footprint. It felt that this was a tactic applied to stop local neighbours objecting to the housing proposal.
- **Non-Compliance with Local Policies:** Extracts from WDC Decision Notice of Refusal. *“The site lies outside any development boundary and within open countryside where the principle of residential development would be unacceptable having regard to local planning policy as it would be contrary to policies GD2, DC17 and EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998 and Policy WCS6 and WCS9 of the Wealden District Core Strategy Local Plan (2013) (CS). It is considered that the adverse harm caused by the development resulting in urbanisation of agricultural land and impact on the landscape and historic character would be contrary to local planning policies that seek to protect and complement the environment. The development does not therefore meet the definition of sustainable development within the National Planning Policy Framework and the adverse harm identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. The development would therefore be contrary to Policies GD2, DC17, EN1, EN2, EN8, EN14, EN27, EN29 and TR13 of the Wealden Local Plan; Spatial Planning Objective SPO13 and Policies WCS6, WCS9, WCS12, WCS13 and WCS14 of the Core*

Strategy, Policy LBH1 of the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan and National Planning Policy Framework policies relating to sustainable development including Paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, those requiring good design in particular Paragraphs 130, 131 and 134 and those that seek to ensure that development protects and enhances the natural and built environment in particular Paragraph 174 Page 3 of 59 in addition to advice in the Wealden Design Guide 2008, adopted Supplementary Planning Document, Chapter 2 Section 3, Chapter 5 Section 8 and Chapter 7. The development would undermine the character of the setting of Brook House and Boship Farm Hotel by virtue of divorcing them from their countryside setting, providing an alien and urbanising development which by virtue of the scale, form and quantum of development would cause unacceptable harm to the character and significance of the setting of the heritage assets, and that this harm would not be outweighed by the public benefits resulting from the proposal. As such the proposal would be contrary to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Area) Act 1990, Policy EN1 and EN27 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998, Policy SPO2 of the Core Strategy and paragraphs 130, 189, 197, 199, 200 and 206 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Chapter 5, 7 and 12 of the Wealden Design Guide. The proposal has failed to demonstrate that, the site is suitably accessible by noncar modes. The development would therefore be contrary to Saved Policies EN1, EN2, TR3, TR13 and CS1 of the Wealden Local Plan 1998, Spatial Planning Objectives SPO7 and SPO15 and Policies WCS7 and WSC14 of the Wealden Core Strategy Local Plan 2013 and the guidance within Chapter 9 of the NPPF in particular paragraphs 111 and 112.”

- **Local Infrastructure:** Access from the proposed site to Schools, Doctors, Dentists, Shops and other services is only possible via car. Extensive works should be proposed within the application so that future residents can access these services via footpaths and cycleways. It is unreasonable to propose a development that can only access services via motor vehicle.
- **Alternative Solutions:** The developer owns a huge area of land adjacent the proposed site, much of this land sits right in the flood plain but parts of it could have been utilised to provide better pedestrian access towards the town services as well as community and play space via safe routes around the flood plain including riverside walks. All of this work would be expensive to do but we believe that the developer has failed in not investigating these options but rather honing in on high-rise high-density development on a corner of the land they own that is cheapest for them to build on.

I urge the Planning Inspectorate to thoroughly consider all the objections raised by the community and undertake a comprehensive review of the planning application. I believe that a careful examination of the concerns presented will contribute to a fair and informed decision-making process.

Thank you for your attention to this matter. I trust that the Planning Inspectorate will give due consideration to the concerns raised by the community during the continued review of planning application WD/2022/3222/MAO.

Yours sincerely,

