



























































































































# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5600 - 144 - Policy DM5 - Ground Conditions - None

## 5600 Object

Section Two - Development Management

Policy DM5 - Ground Conditions

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Mark Luker) [144]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Environment Agency  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5600-5605

**Summary:** We support the inclusion of policy DM5 which requires developers to submit adequate assessments of ground conditions, in the interests of protecting water quality and human health. The NPPF (para.121) clearly states that developers must provide sufficient information as part of a planning application in order to inform the decision.

**Change to Plan** To strengthen policy DM5 we would recommend referencing the reasons for the policy which is to protect human health and water quality.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	None

**Attachments:**

Representation doc



# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5347 - 2079 - Policy DM5 - Ground Conditions, Land instability a) - i, ii, iii, iv

## 5347 Object

Section Two - Development Management

Policy DM5 - Ground Conditions, Land instability a)

**Respondent:** mr Keith Piggott [2079]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Policy DM5 Development Management Plan, Focus Area 2: Site reference GH3 - Spyways School: (LR Title HT9032). Further to my 5335

Planning Permission HS/FA/07/00486 does not allay genuine fears expressed by residents under steep terraced woodland GH3. No suitably qualified geologist has reported.

Walking the GHS site reveals steep wooded slopes on treacherous sand-clay mix liable to rain-water induced landslides.

Topographical site map on HBC website was accepted in HS/FA/07/00486 without reservation, so it is attached here with full acknowledgment of owner's copyright licensed to HBC for purpose of planning consultation only. Consult at leisure!

**Summary:** Policy DM5 Development Management Plan, Focus Area 2: Site reference GH3 - Spyways School: (LR Title HT9032). Further to my 5335

Planning Permission HS/FA/07/00486 does not allay genuine fears expressed by residents under steep terraced woodland GH3. No suitably qualified geologist has reported.

Walking the GHS site reveals steep wooded slopes on treacherous sand-clay mix liable to rain-water induced landslides.

Topographical site map on HBC website was accepted in HS/FA/07/00486 without reservation, so it is attached here with full acknowledgment of owner's copyright licensed to HBC for purpose of planning consultation only. Consult at leisure!

### Change to Plan

- 1) HBC has ignored, avoided, or evaded, the full geological survey requirements of Policy DM5 when giving planning permission HS/FA/07/00486 to owner; ignoring or without satisfying downslope residents' justified express objections to risk of soakaways and water causing landslides into Celandine Drive to West and Arbourvale to N/W.
- 2) HBC need not change any SOUND Policies, it simply ignores what is inconvenient to its preferred client-developers of contentious sites.
- 3) Planning Inspector should ensure a mechanism of control over HBC breaches of DM5 (and other policies).
- 4) Landslide in Burton St. Leonards several years ago has been left boarded up, without enforcement action against owner-developer whose application was opposed for very reason of risk of landslides but supported by HBC Planning Officer/s. Was any geological report obtained before that "development" site was undermined? Planning Inspector might apply his touchstone of Soundness.

**Appear at exam?**

No

**Legal?**

No

**Sound?**

No

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

i, ii, iii, iv

### Attachments:

Spyway\_Site Drawing-4493414.pdf

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5601 - 144 - Policy DM6 - Pollution and Hazards - None

## 5601 Support

Section Two - Development Management

Policy DM6 - Pollution and Hazards

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Mark Luker) [144]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Environment Agency  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5600-5605

**Summary:** We support the inclusion of policy DM6 and particularly part (d) which specifically mentions the protection of ground and surface waters.

**Change to Plan** N/A

**Appear at exam?**

Not Specified

**Legal?**

Yes

**Sound?**

Yes

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

N/A

**Attachments:**

Representation doc

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5603 - 144 - 2.33 - None

## 5603 Support

Section Two - Development Management 2.33

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Mark Luker) [144] **Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Environment Agency  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5600-5605

**Summary:** We also support the inclusion of the reference (para.2.33) to Policy SC7 on Flood Risk contained in your Planning Strategy document.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**  
Representation doc

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5602 - 144 - Policy DM7 - Water Resources - None

## 5602 Support

Section Two - Development Management

Policy DM7 - Water Resources

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Mark Luker) [144]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Environment Agency  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5600-5605

**Summary:** This policy seeks to address both water quality and water quality issues. We feel that the policy wording could be clarified in this regard which will help with meeting the objectives of the policy which we support.

**Change to Plan** N/A

**Appear at exam?**

Not Specified

**Legal?**

Yes

**Sound?**

Yes

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

N/A

**Attachments:**

Representation doc

## **Section Three – Housing and the Community**

**Conversions of Dwellings**

**Residential institutions and Student Accommodation**

**Community Facilities**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5652 - 938 - b) - i, ii, iii, iv

## 5652 Object

Section Three - Housing and the Community b)

**Respondent:** Town and Country Planning Solutions (Mr Mike Pickup) [938] **Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** The Council has not made it clear what evidence the applicant would need to provide to demonstrate that the building can no longer be retained as a single family dwelling. The policy would discriminate against the conversion of houses into flats, which traditionally has been an important source of supply of relatively low cost private and rented accommodation in the Town.

**Summary:** The Council has not made it clear what evidence the applicant would need to provide to demonstrate that the building can no longer be retained as a single family dwelling. The policy would discriminate against the conversion of houses into flats, which traditionally has been an important source of supply of relatively low cost private and rented accommodation in the Town.

**Change to Plan** Part b) of policy HC1 is contrary to the spirit of intention of the National Planning Policy Framework, which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing. This part of the draft policy has not been justified and should therefore be deleted.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Yes	Yes	No	Not Specified	i, ii, iii, iv

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 6053 - 182 - Policy HC2 - Residential Institutions and Student Accommodation - iv

**6053 Object (W/drawn 2014-06-04)**

Section Three - Housing and the Community

Policy HC2 - Residential Institutions and Student Accommodation

**Respondent: Laing/Gladedale (Hastings) Ltd [182]**

**Agent: Indigo Planning Ltd (Mr Philip Villars) [3207]**

**Full Text:** See attached -  
Name: Indigo Planning on behalf of Laing/Gladedale  
Submission dated 15.04.13 covering Reps 6043-6044 & 6049-6054 inclusive.

**Summary:** The policy should contain a fourth criterion which relates to need and demand for student accommodation. In appropriate locations, where there is a shortfall of purpose-built student accommodation, such uses should be encouraged.

The inclusion of a 4th criterion will ensure that need factors are a consideration in the determination of applications for student accommodation. If there is a need for such accommodation, (i.e. demand is outstripping supply) it is appropriate, in planning and economic development terms, that this is a material consideration.

**Change to Plan** This policy identifies three criteria for the assessment of planning applications involving student accommodation. These criteria relate to a) accessibility, b) character and setting and c) existing housing stock.

The policy should contain a fourth criterion which relates to need and demand for student accommodation. In appropriate locations, where there is a shortfall of purpose-built student accommodation, such uses should be encouraged.

An additional criterion should be included within the draft policy wording as follows:

d) For proposals involving student accommodation, account should be taken of the existing dedicated provision within the area (or lack of provision) and the need/demand for such accommodation.

The inclusion of the above will ensure that need factors are a consideration in the determination of applications for student accommodation. If there is a need for such accommodation, (i.e. demand is outstripping supply) it is appropriate, in planning and economic development terms, that this is a material consideration.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	No	Not Specified	iv

**Attachments:**

Rep text

## **Section Four – Historic and Natural Environment**

**Heritage assets**

**Changing doors and windows**

**Demolition involving heritage assets**

**Protecting heritage assets with archaeological and historic interest or potential interest**

**Non-designated heritage assets and local lists**

**The green infrastructure network (Private Open Space, Allotments, Local Green Spaces, Green Infrastructure in New Developments)**











# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5418 - 309 - 4.13 - i, ii, iii, iv

## 5418 Object

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment 4.13

**Respondent:** Lee Wilson [309]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** The following wording is not compliant with the objectives of the Policy:

"Permission will be given for windows that reflect the traditional proportions, appearance and opening arrangements of those that were originally fitted."

**Summary:** The following wording is not compliant with the objectives of the Policy:

"Permission will be given for windows that reflect the traditional proportions, appearance and opening arrangements of those that were originally fitted."

**Change to Plan** Suggest the following re-wording:

Permission will NOT be given for windows that FAIL to reflect the traditional proportions, appearance and opening arrangements of those that were originally fitted.

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Yes	No	No	Not Specified	i, ii, iii, iv

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5314 - 2082 - Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets - ii, iii, iv

## 5314 Object

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets

**Respondent:** Dr Carol Cragoe [2082]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** This policy is fine as far as it goes, but it seems overly strong for simple alterations that might not include actual demolition, while at the same time not covering alterations. What about internal alterations, for instance, that don't involve a replacement building? HN2 doesn't cover these issues as it is only about conservation areas.

**Summary:** This policy is fine as far as it goes, but it seems overly strong for simple alterations that might not include actual demolition, while at the same time not covering alterations. What about internal alterations, for instance, that don't involve a replacement building? HN2 doesn't cover these issues as it is only about conservation areas.

**Change to Plan** As above - either change the language, or introduce a new paragraph about alteration that is not demolition.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	No	No	Not Specified	ii, iii, iv

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5355 - 2079 - Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets - None

## 5355 Support

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets

**Respondent:** mr Keith Piggott [2079]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:**

Support Policy HN3 - BUT, in direct conflict with HBC action at TN38-OSP &quot;ICEHOUSE&quot;, (my Rep.5345).  
HBC ignored &quot;land-owner developer's &quot;EFFECTIVE DEMOLITION OF RARE ICEHOUSE (2002-2005) filled by building spoil.  
HBC issued Enforcement Notice (ENF/314/05); made toothless without penlty of forced restitution.  
ICEHOUSE has disappeared; unmentioned in planning applications within 40-meters.  
My archive used to refresh 'sanitised' Planning files (no Indexes/action-logs);  
FIRST planning citation of rare ICEHOUSE, Agenda 5(b), p.5; to HS/FA/13/00114. Miscreant rewarded!  
FILLING COLLAPSED ICE-HOUSE TANTAMOUNT TO WILFUL DEMOLITION OF RARE ARCHEOLOGICAL FEATURE IN BOROUGH.  
HBC TOOK NO EFFECTIVE ACTION NOR PENALTY!  
POLICY HN3 ALREADY AN ORPHAN, IF NOT STILL-BORN!

**Summary:**

Support Policy HN3 - BUT, in direct conflict with HBC action at TN38-OSP &quot;ICEHOUSE&quot;, (my Rep.5345).  
HBC ignored &quot;land-owner developer's &quot;EFFECTIVE DEMOLITION OF RARE ICEHOUSE (2002-2005) filled by building spoil.  
HBC issued Enforcement Notice (ENF/314/05); made toothless without penlty of forced restitution.  
ICEHOUSE has disappeared; unmentioned in planning applications within 40-meters.  
My archive used to refresh 'sanitised' Planning files (no Indexes/action-logs);  
FIRST planning citation of rare ICEHOUSE, Agenda 5(b), p.5; to HS/FA/13/00114. Miscreant rewarded!  
FILLING COLLAPSED ICE-HOUSE TANTAMOUNT TO WILFUL DEMOLITION OF RARE ARCHEOLOGICAL FEATURE IN BOROUGH.  
HBC TOOK NO EFFECTIVE ACTION NOR PENALTY!  
POLICY HN3 ALREADY AN ORPHAN, IF NOT STILL-BORN!

**Change to Plan** N/A

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

ICEHOUSE\_RIP.pdf  
EH-HBC Listing.JPG  
Icehouse xListing EH>HBC 08-05-2006.pdf  
Icehouse ASA ESCC>HBC 09\_03\_2006.pdf

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 6050 - 182 - Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets - iv

**6050 Object (W/drawn 2014-06-04)**

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN3 - Demolition involving heritage assets

**Respondent:** Laing/Gladedale (Hastings) Ltd [182]

**Agent:** Indigo Planning Ltd (Mr Philip Villars) [3207]

**Full Text:** See attached -  
Name: Indigo Planning on behalf of Laing/Gladedale  
Submission dated 15.04.13 covering Repts 6043-6044 & 6049-6054 inclusive.

**Summary:** This policy is unsound as misinterprets the desirability to preserve and enhance test set out in Paragraph 126 of the NPPF and the statutory tests set out Sections 66(1) and 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

As drafted the policy requires all schemes to preserve and enhance a conservation area which is contrary to the relevant statutory test/national policy.

The emphasis in statute and national policy is that attention should be given to preserving conservation areas - this is no requirement to enhance.

The current wording of the policy is likely to stifle appropriate development.

**Change to Plan** An extract of the policy and the proposed changes are shown below:  
'The Council will encourage schemes that involve the demolition of these negative buildings if it can be demonstrated that their removal and the proposed replacement development preserves and/or enhances the conservation area in question'.

This change is required because as drafted the policy requires all schemes to preserve and enhance a conservation area which is contrary to the relevant statutory test and national policy, as outlined below:

\* Paragraph 126 of the NPPF requires plan-making to take account of:

'the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation.' [emphasis added]

\* Section 72(1) of the 1990 Act which relates to conservation areas states:

'In the exercise, with respect to any buildings or other land in a conservation area, of any functions under or by virtue of any of the provisions mentioned in subsection (2), special attention shall be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area.' [emphasis added]

As shown above, the emphasis in statute and national policy is that special attention should be given to preserving conservation areas - there is no requirement for proposals to enhance (but this is of course a desirable outcome which should be encouraged and strived towards).

A consequence of the current wording of the policy is that it is likely to stifle appropriate development. Making the proposed change will ensure that the policy is consistent with Paragraph 126 of the NPPF and Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (the 1990 Act).

**Appear at exam?**

No

**Legal?**

Yes

**Sound?**

No

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

iv

**Attachments:**

Rep text



# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5309 - 2082 - 4.16 - iv

## 5309 Object

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment 4.16

**Respondent:** Dr Carol Cragoe [2082]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** I find the use of the wording "archaeological and historic interest" extremely confusing. I am a historic environment professional, and even I don't know what you mean. As I read it, this section/policy is only about below ground remains (ie archaeology) and SAMs. History/historic can be anything, whether above or below ground. It would be preferable to keep this part about below ground archaeology and SAMs, and have another section that deals with non-designated but nonetheless historically significant assets. Historic does not mean archaeological.

**Summary:** I find the use of the wording "archaeological and historic interest" extremely confusing. I am a historic environment professional, and even I don't know what you mean. As I read it, this section/policy is only about below ground remains (ie archaeology) and SAMs. History/historic can be anything, whether above or below ground. It would be preferable to keep this part about below ground archaeology and SAMs, and have another section that deals with non-designated but nonetheless historically significant assets. Historic does not mean archaeological.

**Change to Plan** Delete "and historic".

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	No	No	Not Specified	iv

**Attachments:**

























































# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5619 - 2012 - Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces - None

## 5619 Support

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces

**Respondent:** Ore Community Land Trust (Evelyn Voller) [2012]    **Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** I support the keeping of Speckled Wood in the Upper Ore Valley as a local green space as this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included in the local green space area. I understand over 1,300 people signed the petition last year to save Speckled Wood.

Speckled Wood is a piece of countryside in a built up area. Its loss would be a tragedy for both humans and wild creatures. I have memories of blackberrying there with my grandfather and also using the adjacent play area - long gone. The footpaths are well used and it is a joy to be away from traffic noise. Also a section of the proposed Hastings Greenway route is planned to pass through the wood.

**Summary:** I support the keeping of Speckled Wood in the Upper Ore Valley as a local green space as this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included in the local green space area. I understand over 1,300 people signed the petition last year to save Speckled Wood.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5625 - 2031 - Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces - ii

## 5625 Support

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces

**Respondent:** Deborah Gray [2031]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** This piece of land is the only green space in this already over-populated area (Upper Ore Valley). OCLT has worked tirelessly for over a decade to make this a pleasant space for the community of Ore. It has the potential to become a beautiful sanctuary, play area, and walkway, and is already home to a host of beautiful wildlife including badgers, foxes, owls ad bats. I would like to keep the whole of the valley preserved and not to have pockets eroded by building development.

**Summary:** This piece of land is the only green space in this already over-populated area (Upper Ore Valley). OCLT has worked tirelessly for over a decade to make this a pleasant space for the community of Ore. It has the potential to become a beautiful sanctuary, play area, and walkway, and is already home to a host of beautiful wildlife including badgers, foxes, owls ad bats. I would like to keep the whole of the valley preserved and not to have pockets eroded by building development.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5669 - 2147 - Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces - None

**5669 Support**

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces

**Respondent:** Mr Neale Rainer [2147]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** I support the proposal to designate the area of land in the Upper Ore Valley (Speckled Wood) as Local Green Space and this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included as Local Green Space. Over 130 people signed a petition to protect Speckled Wood in July 2012.

**Summary:** I support the proposal to designate the area of land in the Upper Ore Valley (Speckled Wood) as Local Green Space and this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included as Local Green Space. Over 130 people signed a petition to protect Speckled Wood in July 2012.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5679 - 440 - Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces - None

## 5679 Support

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN8 - Local Green Spaces

**Respondent:** Mrs Valerie J Tritton [440]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** I support the proposal to designate the area of land in the Upper Ore Valley (Speckled Wood) as Local Green Space and this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included as Local Green Space. Over 130 people signed a petition to protect Speckled Wood in July 2012.

The wood is already being used by local people who use the footpaths and enjoy the peace of the woodland and the stream that runs through it. It would be marvellous to be able to provide a village green for Ore Village together with a children's play space, and a section of the route for the planned Hastings Greenway from the town centre to Ore.

**Summary:** I support the proposal to designate the area of land in the Upper Ore Valley (Speckled Wood) as Local Green Space and this is a welcome step towards the campaign to protect the whole of Speckled Wood. I would prefer to see the three areas identified for development also included as Local Green Space. Over 130 people signed a petition to protect Speckled Wood in July 2012.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5434 - 2123 - Policy HN9 - Green Infrastructure in New Developments - i, ii, iii, iv

## 5434 Object

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN9 - Green Infrastructure in New Developments

**Respondent:** ECE Planning (Mr Chris Barker) [2123]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** ECE Planning are agents representing Mrs V Valliamai, land owner at the Upper Ore Valley. They object to: paragraph 1.3; Policy HN8; Policy HN9 and Site Allocation CVO3

**Summary:** Please Refer to Accompanying Report

**Change to Plan** Please Refer to Accompanying Report

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Yes	No	No	Not Specified	i, ii, iii, iv

**Attachments:**

ECE Representation Form

ECE Report

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5604 - 144 - Policy HN9 - Green Infrastructure in New Developments - None

## 5604 Object

Section Four - Historic and Natural Environment

Policy HN9 - Green Infrastructure in New Developments

**Respondent:** Environment Agency (Mr Mark Luker) [144]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Environment Agency  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5600-5605

**Summary:** We support the inclusion of this policy but suggest one amendment to strengthen the policy and ensure that an important Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) habitat is specifically identified.

**Change to Plan** We recommend that 'watercourses' are specifically mentioned in the list of habitats in this policy.

**Appear at exam?**

Not Specified

**Legal?**

Yes

**Sound?**

Yes

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Attachments:**

Representation doc



## **Section Five – The Economy**

### **Shopping Areas**

#### **Hastings Town Centre Shopping Area**

#### **District Centre, Local Centre and Neighbourhood Centre Shopping Areas**

#### **Shops and Services outside defined shopping areas**

#### **Managing certain types of premises**

#### **Caravan, camping and chalet sites**

#### **Cultural Quarters**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5458 - 2131 - Policy SA1 - Hastings Town Centre Shopping - i, iii

## 5458 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Policy SA1 - Hastings Town Centre Shopping

**Respondent:** Mr Roger Etchells [2131]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** The policy refers to a maximum non-A1 content calculated by reference to "total floorspace". This is unsound because:  
1) It is inconsistent with paragraph 5.11 which refers to "ground level floorspace".  
2) Without knowing the floorspace of every premises (or ground floor space) neither an applicant nor the LPA can make a judgement on an application's likelihood of being compliant with policy.  
3) The Local Plan - Retail Area Study purports to support the approach but it is based on numbers of units not floorspace and is therefore a different calculation.

**Summary:** The policy refers to a maximum non-A1 content calculated by reference to "total floorspace". This is unsound because:  
1) It is inconsistent with paragraph 5.11 which refers to "ground level floorspace".  
2) Without knowing the floorspace of every premises (or ground floor space) neither an applicant nor the LPA can make a judgement on an application's likelihood of being compliant with policy.  
3) The Local Plan - Retail Area Study purports to support the approach but it is based on numbers of units not floorspace and is therefore a different calculation.

**Change to Plan** The calculation must be capable of being done by an applicant and therefore I suggest it be done by reference to frontage length; a more reliable/ representative method than number of units.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	No	Not Specified	i, iii

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5615 - 292 - 5.30 - None

## 5615 Support

Section Five - The Economy

5.30

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Support the first sentence of para.5.30 which states that "caravan and camping sites contribute in an important way to tourism."

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5616 - 292 - 5.30 - iii

## 5616 Object

Section Five - The Economy

5.30

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Policy and supporting text should take account not only of environmental but also economic and social objectives, such as promoting tourism, and carefully balance environmental matters (e.g. the protection/scope for enhancement of sites of nature conservation/landscape value) with the economic and social benefits of specific development proposals. NPPF para.113 is relevant here as it states there is a need to distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national and locally designated sites. Bourne Leisure would therefore emphasise that there may be scope for the extension of existing facilities, on sites within or adjacent to sensitive areas, provided appropriate mitigation is provided.

**Change to Plan** Bourne Leisure considers that in order to be effective, and take account of other objectives for Hastings such as promoting tourism, it will be important for Policy CC1 and its supporting text to recognise the need to carefully balance environmental matters, and the protection of sites of nature conservation value, with the economic and social benefits of development proposals. Specifically, in relation to tourism-related development, para.5.30 should allow for the expansion of existing caravan and camping sites, including on sites within areas adjacent to sensitive areas, provided commensurate mitigation measures (such as the inclusion of a buffer zone and appropriate landscaping) can be implemented to mitigate both direct and indirect impacts. This revised paragraph would then ensure an appropriate balance between protecting the environment and allowing development that will benefit the Hastings economy.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**  
Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5438 - 467 - Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites - iii

**5438 Object (W/drawn 2014-04-22)**

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites

**Respondent: Rother District Council (Mrs Nichola Watters) [467] Agent: N/A**

**Full Text:** See attached Representation Form

Name: Rother District Council  
Submission dated 24.04.13 covering Reprs: 5436-5446.

**Summary:** Whilst generally the policy for new caravan, camping and chalet sites is supported, the associated supporting text refers to existing caravan and camping facilities in the Borough are close to vulnerable ecological and natural habitat areas and therefore their expansion requires specific policy consideration. Some existing sites abut areas of accessible greenspace on their boundaries and therefore it is considered necessary to make a minor amendment to the proposed policy to refer to proposals not having an adverse impact on accessible greenspaces within the Borough.

**Change to Plan** This could be achieved by an amendment to criterion a) of Policy CC1, such as:

"Planning permission will be granted for additional caravan and camping sites or the expansion of existing sites provided the proposal:

a) would not, either on its own or cumulatively in combination with other established or proposed sites in the vicinity, have an adverse impact on accessible greenspaces, harm the landscape character or rural amenity of the countryside and the resident population, and an assessment of the potential ecological and landscape impact is provided.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Yes	Yes	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**

RDC Representation form

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5606 - 292 - Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites - None

## 5606 Support

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Bourne Leisure supports as a matter of principle the inclusion of a specific development management policy on caravan, camping and chalet sites, as this recognises the importance of tourism and of caravan, camping and chalet sites in particular, to the Hastings economy.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**  
Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5608 - 292 - Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites - None

## 5608 Support

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CC1 - Caravan, camping and chalet sites

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** The policy's criteria b) and c) regarding accessibility are well-worded and supported.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5607 - 292 - a) - iii

## 5607 Object

Section Five - The Economy

a)

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Bourne Leisure considers criterion a) should be reworded in order to balance the economic and social objectives for the area, such as promoting tourism, with environmental matters (for example, the protection/scope for enhancement of sites of nature conservation value or landscape value). Moreover, consideration needs to be given to the significance of the site/adjoining area in terms of landscape and ecological value, to reflect NPPF para.113.

**Change to Plan** In order for the DMP to meet the test of soundness (effective), Bourne Leisure considers that reference should be made in criterion a) in relation to Policy CC1, ie. the expansion and intensification of existing sites, to the need to balance social and economic considerations with environmental matters, as detailed in the submission. Recognition should also be added that there will be scope for development on/near to existing sensitive sites, provided appropriate mitigation measures are provided.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs



# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5609 - 292 - d) - iii

## 5609 Object

Section Five - The Economy

d)

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** In regard to criterion d) which restricts the use of sites to a seasonal basis, Bourne Leisure notes the proposal that the use of caravan and camping sites should be restricted to include a period for closure for six weeks in order to allow for maintenance works. It is also important to have this type of criterion to ensure that these sites are only used for holiday purposes and not as a sole place of residence. However, the criteria is overly restrictive, in stipulating the exact dates as these may require slight revision on a site by site basis.

**Change to Plan** It is considered that criterion d) of the first part of Policy CC1 should be revised to refer to a requirement for a 6 week winter closure period, falling between say January and March in any one year.

**Appear at exam?**

Not Specified

**Legal?**

Not Specified

**Sound?**

No

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

iii

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5610 - 292 - e) - iii

## 5610 Object

Section Five - The Economy e)

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** With regard to criterion e), the Company considers that any policy reference to a specific ratio of static or tourer pitches is far too prescriptive and restrictive. The design, layout and use of individual holiday parks, including the number of pitches, should reflect a site's characteristics (including location, setting and access) and the needs and demands of this sector in the visitor economy. In any event, detail of bases, pitches, density, landscaping and facilities and the number of pitches allocated to static or tourers is already controlled through site licences and conditions attached to planning permission.

**Change to Plan** The Company considers that criterion e) of the first part of Policy CC1, which sets out the specific ratio of pitches to be reserved for touring caravans or campers for sites due to be expanded, should be deleted, and any requirement controlled through the planning permission or site licence. Similarly, criterion e) in relation to proposals for intensification should be deleted, as this is considered too prescriptive.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5611 - 292 - Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites - None

## 5611 Support

Section Five - The Economy

Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Bourne Leisure supports the principle of the opening statement of the 2nd part of the policy "Proposals for intensification (increase in pitch number within the existing permitted area).. etc." This positive approach to intensification and reorganisation accord with Policy E4: Tourism and Visitors in the Planning Strategy.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**  
Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5613 - 292 - Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites - None

## 5613 Support

Section Five - The Economy

Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Criteria b) to d) relating to the site's location and accessibility (including public transport), and the requirement that the proposed development should incorporate landscape improvements, are acceptably worded.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5612 - 292 - Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites, a) - iii

## 5612 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites, a)

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Criterion a) relating to impact on the landscape and rural amenity, Bourne Leisure would again emphasise the need to balance economic, social and environmental considerations in relation to expansion of existing sites.

**Change to Plan** In order for the DMP to meet the test of soundness (effective), Bourne Leisure considers that reference should be made in criterion a) in relation to Policy CC1, ie. the expansion and intensification of existing sites, to the need to balance social and economic considerations with environmental matters. Recognition should also be added that there will be scope for development on/near to existing sensitive sites, provided appropriate mitigation measures are provided.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**

Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5614 - 292 - Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites, e) - iii

## 5614 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Development within Caravan camping and chalet sites, e)

**Respondent:** Bourne Leisure Ltd. [292]

**Agent:** Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Mrs Margaret Baddeley) [2146]

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners for Bourne Leisure Ltd  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5606-5618

**Summary:** Bourne Leisure objects to criterion e) which refers to the range and choice of accommodation, as each site should be considered on its own merits and the range and mix of accommodation is likely to be dependent on the site's characteristics and other factors, such as market demand.

**Change to Plan** Proposals for intensification should be deleted, as it is considered too prescriptive.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	No	Not Specified	iii

**Attachments:**  
Rep Part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5431 - 126 - 5.39 - None

## 5431 Support

Section Five - The Economy

5.39

**Respondent:** Timothy Jemison (Mr Timothy Jemison) [126]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:**

**A WHOLISTIC APPROACH**

The proposal on this site for Brighton University halls of residence is a key opportunity to develop a wholistic approach to the town centre's public realm and the greenway town centre link.

Although the Greenway route is protected, a fit for purpose layout (route) is currently difficult to achieve because of several unresolved issues

1 An edge of site approach to the location of residential blocks has left very little room to develop a combined Greenway boulevard and cyclway.

2 Potentially attractive leafy views of the rail corridor may be obscured from the college by over development, on this tight site.

3 Current plans propose a very unsafe Greenway crossing over South Terrace, a very busy road with a very steep incline.

4 Current land use proposals around the college threaten to "box-in" the college, leaving very little scope for an attractive leafy campus setting or an enhanced public realm

5 A halls of residence building could be the catalyst for a leafy pocket park setting , shared by the University, the College students, the local community, and the general public.

6 If HBC are serious about creating an academic and cultural quarter, a rethink is urgently required to try and recover the original station (campus) plaza concept.

7 The Borough wish for a City

**Summary:**

**AN ENHANCED PUBLIC REALM**

Because of its proximity to the Rail corridor the proposed Academic and Cultural Quarter can benefit from the Greenway Concept.

A key Greenway concept is to create an alternative public realm that is less dominated by traffic, and is more supportive of walking and cycling

The Greenway aims to extend the town centres existing pedestrianization system in a greener and more elegant setting.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5305 - 2081 - Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters - ii

## 5305 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters

**Respondent:** Tobie Kerridge [2081]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Cultural Quarter 2: White Rock and the America Ground Cultural Quarter

**Summary:** Cultural Quarter 2: White Rock and the America Ground Cultural Quarter

**Change to Plan** The basis of the objection is that the area designated "Cultural Quarter 2" is limited, and should be extended north from the pier and white rock to include the recreation area east of Falaise road and Hastings Museum and Art Gallery. The open space, which is spatially and historically linked to White Rock and the Pier, and the museum which is remote and unlinked, will benefit from planning decisions which recognise these sites a part of Cultural Quarter 2.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
No	Yes	No	Not Specified	ii

**Attachments:**



# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5543 - 338 - Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters - None

## 5543 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters

**Respondent:** Ms Maureen Jarvis [338]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Maureen Jarvis  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5540-5549

**Summary:** Unsound - where is the Convent? Why is it off the map? This does not bring in the Hastings Museum, Bohemia Road.

**Change to Plan** The Convent and its story are at the heart of the biggest Roman Catholic scandle in victorian times. The buildings are virtually unspoilt, but its always airbrushed or just not on the map - Extend cultural quarter to include the Convent and Bohemia Road including Hastings Museum & Art Gallery.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Yes	Not Specified	No	Not Specified	None

**Attachments:**

Rep part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5546 - 338 - Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters - None

## 5546 Object

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters

**Respondent:** Ms Maureen Jarvis [338]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** See attached.

Name: Maureen Jarvis  
Submission received 15.04.13 covering Reps: 5540-5549

**Summary:** This is unsound because it assumes there is a cultureless void anywhere that isn't the seafront. The HBC and planning need to go on a few cultural awareness courses if they are to do their jobs properly.

**Change to Plan** Please can maps of Central St Leonards go to the Bohemia Road. A lot of cultural assets are ignored.

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Yes	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

**Attachments:**

Rep part Bs

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

S - 5982 - 176 - Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters - None

## 5982 Support

Section Five - The Economy

Policy CQ1 - Cultural Quarters

**Respondent:** Theatres Trust (Rose Freeman) [176]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Support for Policy CQ1.

**Summary:** Support CQ1.

**Change to Plan** N/A

<b>Appear at exam?</b>	<b>Legal?</b>	<b>Sound?</b>	<b>Duty to Cooperate?</b>	<b>Soundness Tests</b>
Not Specified	Yes	Yes	Not Specified	N/A

**Attachments:**