

We have lived in this area for 55 years and seen all the farmers' fields gradually sold on for development. It is time to stop now.

A few points to note:

- Only a few weeks ago this field was under water. Inspectors never seem to come and test it out during periods of extreme rain.
- The fields are wild and beautiful to walk and exercise in with dogs – we do not want laid out paths – this was the countryside.
- Traffic going to the Boship from outside our house (A271) each morning is stacked up, increasing engine pollution; sometimes we have to allow at least 15 minutes to get to the Boship.
- Traffic going to the Boship from the A22 southbound at peak times often queuing back to Whitesmith and even further.
- Housing already approved in North Street, near the cemetery – greed has taken over and the number of houses here far exceed the initial application. It seems that the builders get planning permission and then take advantage and increase numbers knowing they can get away with it.
- Acceptance of the proposed Wealden sports complex opposite will create more traffic, noise and congestion on a minor road and possible traffic jam comparable to central London.
- If the sports complex goes ahead the chance of water and sewage build up for all existing houses will be dramatically increased as run off has to go somewhere.
- We do not need these houses in this area – Hellingly and Horsebridge have already had their fair share from Wealden allocation.
- We spent months developing a local development plan (approved) and what would be the point if this was not taken into consideration?
- If Wealden Council has already refused this then it really must go against common sense. They should be listened to in this case.
- The builders have been sitting on this land for years since the farmer died and frankly are being greedy and only after profit. If we downsized – we would want a bungalow with a decent garden. Or if [REDACTED] he would want an affordable 3-bedroom house that was solid and had a decent garden. No houses are ever built like this.

Our local Hellingly Parish council made a good and robust argument for refusal, as did Wealden District Council and I really hope that the Secretary of State inspector reads all documents thoroughly. The parish council know the area well and understand on a seasonal basis what happens to the community. They know about the knock-on consequences of building in the wrong place and where people are likely to get flooded and the congestion bottlenecks that will inevitably occur with hundreds of additional cars. They are aware of all other applications that have been approved and like us – know that enough is enough! It is time to stop in this area. PLEASE!

Do not automatically approve this because the builder has the money to go to appeal.

As a reminder I copy their comments below:

The application conflicts with several policies, recommendations and statements within the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan. including those on Flooding, Biodiversity Protection, and Protection of the rural Character of the area.

The Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan states:

Parts of the Parish surrounding the Cuckmere and Bull rivers that run through the parish are particularly susceptible to both fluvial and surface water flooding. Both the Bull rivers are flash rivers that are prone to significant and rapid rises in water levels following periods of heavy and prolonged rain. Both rivers are affected by tidal block when there is high tide at the coast.

The NPPF confirms that “inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from high risk”.

The Hellingly Development Plan also states, Flood risks assessments for Hellingly should also take particular account of local records, including those of surface water flooding and the flooding of agricultural land which have historically not been covered on the official records of East Sussex County Council as the responsible body in respect of flood risk. There is strong local evidence including photographs of recent flooding that show that the proposed SUDS attenuation ponds are within the area that floods so they will fail to provide any protection at exactly the times when it is most needed.

This application is therefore in conflict with Policy HNPD3 of the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Biodiversity Protection - A significant part of the application site lies within the River Cuckmere Habitat link defined in the Neighbourhood Plan.

<sup>1</sup> Policy HNPD4 -states that Green and Blue Infrastructure assets will be protected and enhanced by ensuring all development proposals within the areas identified: ii) Maintain and enhance the integrity of the green and blue infrastructure  
iii) On or immediately adjacent to green or blue infrastructure assets clearly demonstrate ... that proposals will not harm the integrity or function of that feature and the benefits it provides

iv) Clearly demonstrate how the overall function and integrity of the green or blue infrastructure will be enhanced to provide net gains. Proposals for major developments should include a management plan to ensure the effective long-term implementation and management of those green and or blue infrastructure assets. This application is therefore in conflict with Policy HNPD4 of the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan.

The Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan states that the plan evolved with two simple but widely supported aims;

a) To protect the rural character of the area.

b) To retain the separate character of the four main settlements in the Parish (Hellingly village, Lower Horsebridge, Lower Dicker and Roebuck Park).

This application by filling in the space between Lower Horsebridge and Lower Dicker is in direct conflict with the aims of the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. Policy LHB1 of the Neighbourhood Plan states, Where the principle of new development within Lower Horsebridge Character area is considered appropriate proposals will be required where appropriate to clearly demonstrate...

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

This application, by filling in the gap between the existing settlement and the Main A22 trunk road, is clearly in conflict with policy LHB1.

Notwithstanding the conflict with the statements and policies of the Hellingly Neighbourhood Development Plan, we also strongly object to the siting of houses close to the A22 on the grounds of pollution, due to both air quality and noise. We consider the proposed access from the A271 to be unsatisfactory and potentially unsafe. Traffic queuing for the Boship roundabout regularly extends beyond this proposed access and cars from 148 houses would make the problem much worse. The proposed access is also close to a bend in the A271 restricting drivers' view; accidents have occurred on this section of the A271 and the junction would increase the likelihood of such accidents.