A Fothergill 10/6/205

Mr A Fothergill

07/05/12

Wealden Council Local Development Framework

Dear Ms Benton

I am contacting you in order to object, in the strongest possible terms, to a number of elements contained within the above development framework. Wealden Council has incorporated into this document 3 areas of greenfield land in the south of the District which a great many local residents consider wholly unsuitable for inclusion. These areas are land at Mornings Mill Farm, Hindslands and land to the north of Pennine Way (Friday Street Farm).

There are 2 main reasons for my objecting to these sites being included in the Council's plans.

Firstly all these sites constitute the green belt between Eastbourne and Wealden and I believe several local politicians, including Mr David Tutt the leader of Eastbourne Council, stated this emphatically at the recent examination in public. I am in complete agreement with their objections. The South Wealden area has seen an unprecedented housing programme in recent years. At least 500 new dwellings have been built in the Eastbourne, Polegate and Hailsham areas and what remains of the green lungs between these towns should not be squandered and lost to future generations simply for misguided and short term economic gain.

The Government's recently published 'National Planning Policy Framework' has much to say on the subject. Within Section 9 the following is stated.

The Government attaches great importance to green belts; the fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics are their openness and their permanence.

In paragraph 80 the following is clearly stated.

Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

1. *To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas*
2. *To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another*
3. *To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment*
4. *To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages.*
5. *To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict/urban land.*

Unfortunately the inclusion of three major green field sites by Wealden Council is in direct contravention of these 5 principles. In fact they clearly stated in their 2007 Local Development Framework, of which I have a copy that they are not in favour of a coalescing of towns and villages by allowing urban sprawl!

The second reason for my objecting to Council's framework is equally important to that of green belt destruction. It is that our infrastructure teeters towards overload. I am not

exaggerating when I say that the hospital is full up, the train service overcrowded and the schools struggling to cope with ever increasing the numbers of pupils. My wife is a nurse at the only hospital in the local area. I am an employee of the railway and we have a son at school so I do have considerable experience of local infrastructure deficiencies. The situation will hardly improve if even more extensive development is permitted on the green breathing spaces around the towns. In addition, I would seriously question whether there is sufficient water supply in the south east of England for all of this, as despite recent rainfall we are told that we are still in a drought situation and the use of hose pipes are banned. Is it also not folly to permit the concreting over of prime agricultural land when this country has such a high population?

In conclusion, and for the above reasons, I would ask you to rule that the inclusion of Mornings Mill Farm, Hindslands and land to the north of Pennine Way (Friday St Farm) in the Wealden Local Development Framework is not in keeping with the requirements and spirit of the NPPF or local opinion and is therefore unsound.

Please could you acknowledge receipt of this letter?

Yours faithfully

Anthony Fothergill