

Hastings Local Plan  
Development Management Plan -  
Proposed Submission Version  
and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal  
Consultation 21 January – 15 April 2013

Copies of Representations made online, via email or in paper submission in accordance with Regulation 20 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

**Printed in three volumes in Plan order:**

Volume 1: Representations made in relation to Sections 1 – 5

Volume 2: Representations made in relation to Sections 6 – 7

Volume 3: Representations made in relation to the Appendices and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal

**THIS IS VOLUME 3 OF 3**

[www.hastings.gov.uk/localplan](http://www.hastings.gov.uk/localplan)

Follow Shaping Hastings on Facebook & Twitter

Tel: 01424 451098 Email: [fplanning@hastings.gov.uk](mailto:fplanning@hastings.gov.uk)



## **Appendix A - Site Design Briefs**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5443 - 467 - LRA7 and LRA8 - ii, iii

**5443**      **Object**      **(W/drawn 2014-04-22)**

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

LRA7 and LRA8

**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 Reps: 5436-5446.

**Summary:**            Rother District Council object to the identification of this land solely for employment purposes. The proposed sites are in conflict with Policy T2: Local Road Improvements within the Planning Strategy, which states that 'the Council will safeguard land required for highway improvements...' and paragraph 6.12 of the Proposed Submission Development Management Plan, which states that 'the Baldslow Link will also be an important part of improved road connections'.

These areas of land were previously identified by the Highways Agency as the location for one of the potential options for an offline improvement at Baldslow, hence their safeguarding in the Local Plan (2004).

Whilst some complementary measures associated with the construction of the Bexhill-Hastings Link Road have been identified, there is still a commitment in both the Rother and Hastings respective Core Strategies to look at transport/junction improvements to the A21 in this location. Whilst there may be other potential options for alternative solutions, this option should not be ruled out.

Rother District Council wishes to seek clarification with regards to whether HBC have received an express view from East Sussex County Council and/or the Highways Agency that an offline improvement at Baldslow need not be safeguarded pending the further examination of the options. Rother District Council wishes to make a firm objection to the inclusion of this site at this stage for employment purposes. It is important that any discussion about this site be carried out in liaison with East Sussex County Council, and due consideration is made to any future highway junction improvements in this area.

**Change to Plan**      Rother District Council wishes to seek clarification with regards to whether HBC have received an express view from East Sussex County Council and/or the Highways Agency that an offline improvement at Baldslow need not be safeguarded pending the further examination of the options. Rother District Council wishes to make a firm objection to the inclusion of this site at this stage for employment purposes. It is important that any discussion about this site be carried out in liaison with East Sussex County Council, and due consideration is made to any future highway junction improvements in this area.

<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	ii, iii

**Attachments:**  
RDC Representation form

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5302 - 272 - GH1 - i, iii

## 5302 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

GH1

**Respondent:** MRS PATRICIA STEPHENSON [272]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** For the past 5 years+ hundreds of local residents have protested against this proposal to build on this fragile, biodiverse site. In 1998 the borough ecologist produced a report where he outlined why NO development should take place. His report has been concealed from public view, his opinions discounted and every attempt has been made by planning officers to acquire ecological reports which suggest no harm will come to the woodlands and wildlife. This is a blatant attempt to procure planning consent at any price to the detriment of our woodlands and wildlife here in Hollington. It is a disgrace.

**Summary:** For the past 5 years+ hundreds of local residents have protested against this proposal to build on this fragile, biodiverse site. In 1998 the borough ecologist produced a report where he outlined why NO development should take place. His report has been concealed from public view, his opinions discounted and every attempt has been made by planning officers to acquire ecological reports which suggest no harm will come to the woodlands and wildlife. This is a blatant attempt to procure planning consent at any price to the detriment of our woodlands and wildlife here in Hollington. It is a disgrace.

**Change to Plan** Past experience has shown that Policies and "assurances" given in the 2004 local plan have been disregarded - some Policies referred to as "background text" - there is nothing within the CURRENT plan which suggests that the new Policies will be adhered to. In fact some Policies appear to have been created with the intention of making them easier to manipulate and manoeuvre to suit developers and the planning department. How many Policies in the new Plan will be brushed aside with the comment "they are only background text?". I have little confidence in the current proposals. You ask if residents consider the Dev. Management to be legally compliant - how would any man in the street be qualified to decide whether this Plan is legally compliant? No doubt it has been drawn up to ensure it is legally compliant but the proof of the pudding will only be revealed when planning decisions are implemented. I have no confidence that HBC will abide by the Policies. Policy DG1 has been replaced with a weaker policy which actually suggests that "innovative" design is to be welcomed - from any point of view this will give planning officers a free hand to recommend planning approval on anything and everything - under the banner of "innovation". This will no doubt please the developers. Come to Hastings - whatever crazy development plans you have, they will get passed because Hastings welcomes innovative design....and finally, you refuse to accept this submission unless I state whether I think the plan is legally compliant? Why isn't there a "don't know" box available, because as I have stated, how would the man in the street know the answer to this...so the only choice is to tick the "yes" box...otherwise we will be questioned as to why we consider it is not legally compliant and there is no answer to this. A very unfair question.

**Appear at exam?**

Yes

**Legal?**

Yes

**Sound?**

No

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

i, iii

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5312 - 272 - GH1 - i, ii, iii

## 5312 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

GH1

**Respondent:** MRS PATRICIA STEPHENSON [272]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** This map is not accurate and fails to illustrate the considerable area of Robsack wood which has been excluded from the local nature reserve in order to safeguard the requirement for vehicular transport. A very false indication is shown as the size of the proposed roadway and it is clear that inadequate buffer zones would be possible here. Yet again these planners have produced misleading plans to justify this development. It is clear that the major part of the wildlife corridor of connecting ancient woodland would be destroyed if this development were to proceed followed by the degradation of the remaining ancient woodlands.

**Summary:** This map is not accurate and fails to illustrate the considerable area of Robsack wood which has been excluded from the local nature reserve in order to safeguard the requirement for vehicular transport. A very false indication is shown as the size of the proposed roadway and it is clear that inadequate buffer zones would be possible here. Yet again these planners have produced misleading plans to justify this development. It is clear that the major part of the wildlife corridor of connecting ancient woodland would be destroyed if this development were to proceed followed by the degradation of the remaining ancient woodlands.

**Change to Plan** This site has never had an official site visit and assumptions are being made which are not backed up by site visits by planning officers or councillors. This site cannot be seen from the public highway and all requests for site visits have been ignored. This is a prime example of how the planning officers simply ignore and cast aside residents very valid concerns. Nobody has queried the statements that there are bungalows close to the perimeter of this site - why is this? Because nobody has bothered to ascertain the accuracy of reports. And this has to change. Residents' opinions are frequently ignored. They have no voice here.

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

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5313 - 272 - GH1 - i, ii, iii

## 5313 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

GH1

**Respondent:** MRS PATRICIA STEPHENSON [272]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Previous objection should read: there is no room for adequate buffer zones..."

**Summary:** Previous objection should read: there is no room for adequate buffer zones..."

**Change to Plan** see previous comments.

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

**Attachments:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5332 - 272 - GH1 - i, ii, iii, iv

## 5332 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

GH1

**Respondent:** MRS PATRICIA STEPHENSON [272]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** In 1999 a planning application was either refused or withdrawn by the council who own this land. At the time of writing there is no documentation within the archived files which defines the reason why this planning application did not proceed. I particularly requested sight of this paperwork as it is very relevant to the current objections to this proposal to build on this bio diverse site. It is a most unsatisfactory situation as all paperwork relating to planning applications must be available for public scrutiny. I am extremely concerned with the current situation.

**Summary:** In 1999 a planning application was either refused or withdrawn by the council who own this land. At the time of writing there is no documentation within the archived files which defines the reason why this planning application did not proceed. I particularly requested sight of this paperwork as it is very relevant to the current objections to this proposal to build on this bio diverse site. It is a most unsatisfactory situation as all paperwork relating to planning applications must be available for public scrutiny. I am extremely concerned with the current situation.

**Change to Plan** Council officers must be made aware of the public's legal right to have access to documents. This is not the first time I have experienced the "disappearance" of important documents within these archives. All archived documents should be transferred on to secure digital format because at the present time the officers admit that the paperwork can be removed from these files.

<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:**

# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5504 - 341 - GH1 - None

## 5504 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

GH1

**Respondent:** Mrs Pam Brown [341]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Object to development of Robsack A (GH1) which does not I believe conform to policy HN9 or UR8 Sustainability Appraisal p171/172 referring to 'greenfield nature' of site.  
It is not possible to develop this site without harm to habitats, natural environment, protected species and detriment to adjoining woodland (Church Wood).  
The Development management Plan is clearly being flouted by inclusion of Robsack A in sites for development the overall conclusion reached in para 6.65 site allocation p87 is not factual and unrealistic taking into account the description.  
Land adjacent to Sandrock Park should be deferred for development until the second part of the Local Plan period so as to evaluate the effect on traffic on The Ridge of the creation of the Bexhill/Hastings Link Road.

**Summary:** Object to development of Robsack A (GH1) which does not I believe conform to policy HN9 or UR8 Sustainability Appraisal p171/172 referring to 'greenfield nature' of site.  
It is not possible to develop this site without harm to habitats, natural environment, protected species and detriment to adjoining woodland (Church Wood).

**Change to Plan** The Development Management Plan is clearly being flouted by inclusion of Robsack A in sites for development the overall conclusion reached in para 6.65 site allocation p87 is not factual and unrealistic taking into account the description.

**Appear at exam?**

Yes

**Legal?**

Not Specified

**Sound?**

No

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Attachments:**



# Hastings Development Management Plan Proposed Submission Version

O - 5383 - 2106 - CLB2 - i, ii, iii

## 5383 Object

Appendix A - Site Design Briefs

CLB2

**Respondent:** Mr Ralph Atkinson [2106]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** St Leonards already has a very high population density with plenty of rental accomodation over. The site of CLB2 (And CLB1) is too close to the railway and will be too noisy for residents. The towerblock will overlook a childrens playground and cut off the afternoon light to it. It will also not be in keeping withthe 1930's Deco Alpha Cafe or the Victorian railway station. It is bad enough that Hastings Council has already imposed a brick monstrosity above St Leonards Kings Roads Victorian shops. The area does not require to be made even worse.

**Summary:** St Leonards already has a very high population density with plenty of rental accomodation over. The site of CLB2 (And CLB1) is too close to the railway and will be too noisy for residents. The towerblock will overlook a childrens playground and cut off the afternoon light to it. It will also not be in keeping withthe 1930's Deco Alpha Cafe or the Victorian railway station. It is bad enough that Hastings Council has already imposed a brick monstrosity above St Leonards Kings Roads Victorian shops. The area does not require to be made even worse.

**Change to Plan** I suggest the site be used instead as a much needed car park for St Leonards or a green area for local residents.

<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

**Attachments:**

## **Appendix B - Superseded Policies**

## **Appendix C - Indices of Policies**

# Sustainability Appraisal

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5352 - 2079 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5352 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

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

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Refer to [2079] Representations relevant to "sustainability" of DMP's rightly concerned and asserted low carbon interests, including;

Rep.5337 -Plan reliance on renewable energy MW wind-turbine/farms and contrary economic and/or ecological indicators, etc.

Rep.5338 -Plan inappropriate reliance on externally sourced reports that accepts at face value, HBC "plan is strong on green infrastructure" being a travesty of denuded Hastings, etc.

Rep.5339 -Plan ignores Hastings sea-energies, i.e. Tidal and Wave renewables, etc.

Other sustainability issues encompassed by wider documentation are being studied for submission within deadline (15 April 2013)

**Summary:** Refer to [2079] Representations relevant to "sustainability" of DMP's rightly concerned and asserted low carbon interests, including;

Rep.5337 -Plan reliance on renewable energy MW wind-turbine/farms and contrary economic and/or ecological indicators, etc.

Rep.5338 -Plan inappropriate reliance on externally sourced reports that accepts at face value, HBC "plan is strong on green infrastructure" being a travesty of denuded Hastings, etc.

Rep.5339 -Plan ignores Hastings sea-energies, i.e. Tidal and Wave renewables, etc.

Other sustainability issues encompassed by wider documentation are being studied for submission within deadline (15 April 2013)

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

**Attachments:**

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5390 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5390 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** I disagree with much that is written in this document. The use of so many words seems designed to send me to sleep but my analysis is that you are going to continue to destroy historic buildings, deny the community of open space, and reduce biodiversity. In short you don't care.  
I expand upon this if possible using this website.

**Summary:** I disagree with much that is written in this document. The use of so many words seems designed to send me to sleep but my analysis is that you are going to continue to destroy historic buildings, deny the community of open space, and reduce biodiversity. In short you don't care.  
I expand upon this if possible using this website.

### Change to Plan

**Appear at exam?**

Not Specified

**Legal?**

Not Specified

**Sound?**

Not Specified

**Duty to Cooperate?**

Not Specified

**Soundness Tests**

None

**Attachments:**

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5391 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5391 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Para: 7.3.19 Exceeding the target of new homes by 60% is all good but the definition of previously developed land is vague.  
Is it land developed in medieval times, or in the last 10-20 years? Focusing on a target that becomes more important than applying common sense.  
It is inappropriate to develop Speckled Wood and the land South (across the road from it) that was fenced off by SEEDA and Robsack Meadow.

**Summary:** Para: 7.3.19 Exceeding the target of new homes by 60% is all good but the definition of previously developed land is vague.  
Is it land developed in medieval times, or in the last 10-20 years? Focusing on a target that becomes more important than applying common sense.  
It is inappropriate to develop Speckled Wood and the land South (across the road from it) that was fenced off by SEEDA and Robsack Meadow.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

**Attachments:**

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5392 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5392 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** 8.1.3 If you care so much about it why did you allow the scout hut to be destroyed in one of the most deprived wards in the whole of Sussex. Near Linley Close. Oh, for profit so someone could build housing for a bit of profit.

**Summary:** 8.1.3 If you care so much about it why did you allow the scout hut to be destroyed in one of the most deprived wards in the whole of Sussex. Near Linley Close. Oh, for profit so someone could build housing for a bit of profit.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:



# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5393 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5393 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

Respondent: Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

Agent: N/A

### Full Text:

8.1.5

Which is why you need to protect Speckled Wood from development so that the community can run it as a Local Nature Reserve which is their request And the SEEDA area across the road. Also, Robsack Meadow. This paragraph is an admission that your policy is going to result in loss of green space and reduction in biodiversity and you don't care. The aim should be to prevent this.

### Summary:

8.1.5

Which is why you need to protect Speckled Wood from development so that the community can run it as a Local Nature Reserve which is their request And the SEEDA area across the road. Also, Robsack Meadow. This paragraph is an admission that your policy is going to result in loss of green space and reduction in biodiversity and you don't care. The aim should be to prevent this.

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5394 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5394 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

Respondent: Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

Agent: N/A

### Full Text:

14.10

There is no mention of monitoring programmes and has been little evidence of monitoring at any sites in Hastings. You do not have to build alongside SSSIs sites alongside these should be withdrawn from the plan.

None of the policies mention biodiversity monitoring. The same goes for those impacting local wildlife sites. You and I both know that as you build on areas of woodland and meadows biodiversity will decline. Your policies are weak and will not prevent this.

### Summary:

14.10

There is no mention of monitoring programmes and has been little evidence of monitoring at any sites in Hastings. You do not have to build alongside SSSIs sites alongside these should be withdrawn from the plan.

None of the policies mention biodiversity monitoring. The same goes for those impacting local wildlife sites. You and I both know that as you build on areas of woodland and meadows biodiversity will decline. Your policies are weak and will not prevent this.

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5395 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5395 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** 14.11  
In particular building in areas of woodland such as Speckled wood will increase the likelihood of flooding, it is ghyll woodland.

**Summary:** 14.11  
In particular building in areas of woodland such as Speckled wood will increase the likelihood of flooding, it is ghyll woodland.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5396 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5396 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** 14.14  
This is ridiculous since you want to knock down so many trees for the Link Road and splat other areas of woodland such as Speckled Wood.

**Summary:** 14.14  
This is ridiculous since you want to knock down so many trees for the Link Road and splat other areas of woodland such as Speckled Wood.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5397 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5397 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** 14.18  
A load of bollocks because cite the Llnk Road.

**Summary:** 14.18  
A load of XXX because cite the Llnk Road.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5398 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5398 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

### Full Text:

15.1.4

This is not true as you are going to build on so many of the green spaces and reduce biodiversity. These words will not protect biodiversity nor will the policies. Mitigation without monitoring is pointless. No one can ever access whetehr or not it has worked. Movign species

### Summary:

15.1.4

This is not true as you are going to build on so many of the green spaces and reduce biodiversity. These words will not protect biodiversity nor will the policies. Mitigation without monitoring is pointless. No one can ever access whetehr or not it has worked. Movign species

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5399 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5399 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

### Full Text:

15.1.6

Protecting heritage assets but you don't have a list of heritage assets, seem to want to knock down many of the historic buildings. Hold Victorian buildings in low regard. Never list anything that is Victorian. It is supposed to be an important town for its Victorian architecture and you are destroying it at a rapid rate.

You reward developers by giving them permission after their buildings have either burned down or been allowed to fall into disrepair. Nothing in this document addresses your general direction towards allowing people to make money by destroying the historical.

### Summary:

15.1.6

Protecting heritage assets but you don't have a list of heritage assets, seem to want to knock down many of the historic buildings. Hold Victorian buildings in low regard. Never list anything that is Victorian. It is supposed to be an important town for its Victorian architecture and you are destroying it at a rapid rate.

You reward developers by giving them permission after their buildings have either burned down or been allowed to fall into disrepair. Nothing in this document addresses your general direction towards allowing people to make money by destroying the historical.

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5400 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5400 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** 15.1.6  
In particular the site of the Former Convent of the Holy Child of Jesus should be protected.

**Summary:** 15.1.6  
In particular the site of the Former Convent of the Holy Child of Jesus should be protected.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:



# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5401 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5401 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

Respondent: Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

Agent: N/A

### Full Text:

Table 18.1

No mention of the value of the provision of ecosystem services by open and green spaces such as Robsack Meadow and Speckled Wood and idea of how destroying them will help.

No mention of how destroying buildings like the Former Convent of the Holy Child of Jesus will help achieve the protecting the historic environment.

### Summary:

Table 18.1

No mention of the value of the provision of ecosystem services by open and green spaces such as Robsack Meadow and Speckled Wood and idea of how destroying them will help.

No mention of how destroying buildings like the Former Convent of the Holy Child of Jesus will help achieve the protecting the historic environment.

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

S - 5402 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5402 Support

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

Respondent: Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

Agent: N/A

**Full Text:** Site B16 I agree with the adverse affects on biodiversity development should be avoided.

**Summary:** Site B16 I agree with the adverse affects on biodiversity development should be avoided.

**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:**

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5403 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5403 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** Site B24, considering that developing is more positive if it is located within the 20% most deprived areas nationwide is mistaken logic. This site is valuable and should be left alone.

**Summary:** Site B24, considering that developing is more positive if it is located within the 20% most deprived areas nationwide is mistaken logic. This site is valuable and should be left alone.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5404 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5404 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** B31 should be taken off of the site allocation list as Policy CLBx, does not make explicit reference to the English Heritage guidance on Enabling Development. Any application submitted with a Viability Appraisal for Enabling Development will only be recommended for approval if it is in accordance with the English Heritage Guidance as detailed in Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places (2008).

**Summary:** B31 should be taken off of the site allocation list as Policy CLBx, does not make explicit reference to the English Heritage guidance on Enabling Development. Any application submitted with a Viability Appraisal for Enabling Development will only be recommended for approval if it is in accordance with the English Heritage Guidance as detailed in Enabling Development and the Conservation of Significant Places (2008).

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5405 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5405 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan  
Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr  
Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

### Full Text:

b31

Any proposal for this site will only be acceptable if it secures the restoration and long term future of these heritage assets. As a last resort this could be achieved by means of enabling development in accordance with the English Heritage guidance.

### Summary:

b31

Any proposal for this site will only be acceptable if it secures the restoration and long term future of these heritage assets. As a last resort this could be achieved by means of enabling development in accordance with the English Heritage guidance.

### Change to Plan

#### Appear at exam?

Not Specified

#### Legal?

Not Specified

#### Sound?

Not Specified

#### Duty to Cooperate?

Not Specified

#### Soundness Tests

None

### Attachments:

# The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

O - 5406 - 311 - The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012 - None

## 5406 Object

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

The Hastings Development Management Plan Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report November 2012

**Respondent:** Hastings Planning and Heritage Watchdog (Mr Richard Price) [311]

**Agent:** N/A

**Full Text:** A18: should be taken off the plan the local community want use it as it provides ecosystem services and is valuable open space. They want it as a LNR.

**Summary:** A18: should be taken off the plan the local community want use it as it provides ecosystem services and is valuable open space. They want it as a LNR.

### Change to Plan

Appear at exam?	Legal?	Sound?	Duty to Cooperate?	Soundness Tests
Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	Not Specified	None

### Attachments: