Wealden District (incorporating part of the South Downs National Parks) Local Development Framework

Core strategy DPD

Examination

Further Statement

MATTER NO: 8
Polegate, Willingdon & Stone Cross Area Strategy
CS Policies WCS 2, 3 & 4

A.	**Which part of the CS is unsound?**	**WCS 4 & Key Diagram**
B.	**Which criterion is failed?**	**Justified**
C.	**Why it fails?**	

We have argued in written representations that the broad area of search to the north of Polegate should be included under CS Policy WCS 4 as a Strategic Development Area. Some 1,350 new dwellings are proposed under WCS 2 for Polegate/Willingdon (700) and Stone Cross/Westham (650). Para 6.28 of the Core Strategy states that development within this area generally is constrained by the capacity of the waste water treatment works to discharge treated waste water. Thus "development will only be allowed if it can be accommodated by the existing works unless an alternative location for the treatment and discharge waste water is implemented". (Para 6.28). The Council's housing distribution is based upon a Scenario C which, it is stated, is infrastructure etc constrained. WDC has indicated that the CS proposals will take up all of the existing headroom of the waste water treatment works in terms of additional dwellings (Para 21, Inspectors Note, Exploratory Meeting – Summary of Concerns, 8 September 2011).

The scale and distribution of housing in the CS has been identified as a key issue in this Examination and, in particular, the extent to which this has been influenced by the European sites (Ashdown Forest and Pevensey Levels). This issue will have been explored in Matters preceding this session on Matter 8.

Our case is that:

1. The Core Strategy does not meet SEP housing levels district wide and within the Sussex coast sub-region.

2. The CS does not meet housing requirements up to 2030 – a significant short fall is revealed in the rest of the Wealden area, and no consideration appears to have been given to addressing this short fall.

D. How the CS can be made sound

Given the uncertainties that surround the strategy for this area, if north Polegate is not to be shown as an SDA in its own right in this round of plan making, we believe the area should be included as a contingency site (our evidence under Matter 2 refers). This could be in much the same terms as paragraph 6.31 of the CS which provides that there should be flexibility between the Stone Cross sites SD6 & SD7 (where the quantum of development on both will be subject to highway improvements).

Paragraph 8.34 in the Development of the Core Strategy Background Paper states that the north Polegate site is considered to be acceptable for an extension to the urban area. Including the site in this way will provide flexibility for the Plan.

E. Precise Change/Wording Sought

That north Polegate be included as a contingency site under WCS 4 with development subject to the extent to which other sites come forward within the Polegate/Willingdon and Stone Cross/Westham area.

NAI – 13 December 2011