31/07/2012 12:37:11
Isobel Moore
Re: Public Consultation Core Strategy

Dear Sir

Re. the proposed new policy in the core strategy regarding sustainable development.

I OPPOSE the adoption of the new policy wording on the basis that the phrase **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT** has not been defined.

In the absence of a clear definition of sustainable development, planning applications are far more likely to be approved **UNLESS** "any adverse impacts of granting permission would **significantly and demonstrably** outweigh the benefits, when assessed the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework taken as a whole" or "specific policies in that Framework indicate that development should be restricted".

It is much harder to prove a negative ie. that a proposed development will be harmful to the local environment - and if planning is automatically approved **UNLESS** it is proved beyond doubt that the development is harmful, then that is a carte-blanche for over-development in Wealden.

The problem is in the definition of **SUSTAINABLE**. In my eyes, sustainable means that there are still green fields and woodland for my daughter's generation and succeeding generations to enjoy and that Uckfield remains a pleasant place to live, a small town and not a dumping ground for cheap housing and industrial estates. I suspect your definition of sustainable would vary depending on the amount of money that potential developers were offering the Council "for infrastructure" in return for planning permission.

I also OBJECT to Wealden District Council applying for a development grant from the Government before the Core Strategy has been approved. I think is immoral and proves that the intention is for more development not less.

Yours sincerely

Isobel Moore