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1 Introduction

Background and context

1.1 Hastings Borough Council is in the process of producing a series of documents that will guide the future planning of the town. Together, these documents will form the new Hastings Local Plan (formerly called the Local Development Framework).

1.2 We are already well on our way to completing the Hastings Planning Strategy (formerly called the Core Strategy), which provides a long-term plan to deliver regeneration and sustainable growth in the town over the next 15 years. Once adopted, the Planning Strategy will form a key part of the Local Plan.

1.3 This document is the Development Management Plan – consultation document. This is the second key document prepared as part of the Local Plan process. Its role is to set out clear policies to help shape the design of construction of new development, and to allocate sites to deliver the overarching policies in the Planning Strategy. It therefore shares the same strategic objectives:

Objective 1: Achieve and sustain a thriving economy

Objective 2: Ensure everyone has the opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, in a community in which they want to live

Objective 3: Safeguard and improve the town’s environment

Objective 4: Addressing the impacts of climate change

Objective 5: Supporting sustainable communities

Objective 6: Provision of an efficient and effective transport system

Objective 7: Making best use of the Seafront and promoting tourism

What stage are we at?

1.4 This is the first official consultation stage in the preparation of the Development Management Plan, as required by Regulation 25 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (as amended). This consultation document contains the basis or ‘rough draft’ of suggested policies and options to help facilitate debate, and will be developed further, into a final draft, following this consultation.

1.5 This consultation document has been prepared following earlier public consultation as part of the “Big Map” exercise in 2010. The Big Map consultation was an informal stage in the preparation of the Plan, which helped to identify issues and opportunities concerned with potential sites for development in the town. A report on how the consultation was undertaken and the comments received is available at www.hastings.gov.uk/dpd_report
Structure of this document

1.6 This document is set out in two distinct parts:

Part A - General guidance

1.7 The first part sets out options for general guidance policies to be used in the planning application process, to shape the design and construction of new developments. These include the following policy areas:

- **General guidance** - the issues that arise when assessing planning applications – covering design, access, ground conditions and more
- **Housing and the community** – covering issues like the conversion of houses
- **The historic and natural environment** – defining areas in the town for specific protection for things like nature conservation
- **The economy** – helping to identify and protect retail areas, employment sites and tourist areas

1.8 When completing your response form, you are encouraged to consider which of the options presented are the most appropriate, and to explain the reasons why.

Part B - Site allocations

1.9 The second part of the document sets out potential development sites that have been identified to meet our overall housing and employment needs. These are organised by planning focus area\(^1\), and consider allocations for housing, employment and mixed use sites only.

1.10 For each site, we have presented the following information

- A site location plan
- Suggested use
- Planning status
- Area
- Possible net capacity
- Assessment summary
- Analysis of previous comments
- Policies that apply

1.11 Various maps accompany the consultation document, showing the proposed sites on a town-wide basis and in their individual planning focus areas, as well the protective designations and allocations across the town as a whole. These will combine to form a Proposals Map in the final version of the Development Management Plan, once prepared.

1.12 When completing your response form, please let us know whether you support the allocation of any particular site, and the reasons why. If there is any information you think we may have missed, please let us

---

\(^1\) Planning focus areas were introduced by the Planning Strategy. They are areas where there is an identifiable community or where landscape or function means that they make a logical area for area-based planning.
The consultation – how you can get involved

1.13 Although a lot of work has already been carried out to prepare this consultation draft of the Development Management Plan, it is not the Council’s final view of what the Plan should contain. This is your opportunity to influence the sites that should be allocated or protected for different land uses, and shape the policies that should be used in the planning application process to manage this development.

1.14 This consultation is running for a period of 12 weeks, from 3 February – 27 April 2012. You can make your comments at any point during this period, using the following methods:

1.15 **Online** - The easiest way to make your comments is online. Visit our website at [www.hastings.gov.uk/consultations](http://www.hastings.gov.uk/consultations) and follow the links provided.

1.16 **Paper forms** – paper copies of our response form are available from our offices, or can be downloaded from the website using the address above.

1.17 Responses can also be submitted by letter or email, using the following contact details:

Development Management Plan consultation
Planning Policy
Upper Ground Floor, Aquila House
Hastings
East Sussex
TN34 3UY

Email: fplanning@hastings.gov.uk

1.18 You can also post comments on Facebook, or contact us through Twitter, although these comments will not be taken forward as formal representations. We will make sure we reply to any queries posted this way:

Twitter: [www.twitter.com/ShapingHastings](http://www.twitter.com/ShapingHastings)
Facebook: [www.facebook.com/shapinghastings](http://www.facebook.com/shapinghastings)

1.19 All comments must be submitted by **4pm on Friday 27 April 2012**.

The evidence base and supporting documents

1.20 In preparing the Development Management Plan, we have to prepare several supporting documents to demonstrate how the principles of sustainability and equality have been taken into account in the development of the final version of the Plan. This will include a Sustainability Appraisal Report and an Equalities Impact Assessment. It is also important that we have a substantial and robust evidence base to support the policies presented in the final plan.

1.21 Further information about the Sustainability Appraisal and Equalities Impact Assessment for the Development Management Plan will be posted on our
website when available. However, please keep an eye on our evidence base pages which are updated regularly – www.hastings.gov.uk/ldf/evidencebase

Next steps

1.22 Following this consultation, we will analyse all the comments received and where appropriate, incorporate them into the final draft of the Development Management Plan (known as the “Proposed Submission version). Feedback will be provided to all those who commented on this consultation draft, before the revised version is published.

1.23 The final draft, or Proposed Submission Development Management Plan will be subject to a further round of public consultation, where we will be inviting “formal” representations that will be submitted to an independent Planning Inspector, along with the Development Management Plan for Examination in Public. However, it may be necessary to undertake an additional more limited scale consultation before the Proposed Submission stage if entirely new issues or proposals arise from the current consultation.

1.24 The timetable for this is as follows:

- May to September – analysis of comments received and opportunity for further limited consultation if required
- October to December 2012 – public consultation on the final draft of the Development Management Plan
- March 2013 - Submission to the Secretary of State
- July 2013 - Examination in public
- December 2013 - Adoption.

1.25 Full details about the timetable we are working to in preparing the Local Plan as a whole, are available on our website at www.hastings.gov.uk/ldf/localdevelopmentscheme
Part A - General Guidance
2 Part A - General Guidance

Introduction

2.1 This section sets out a series of policy options for more detailed generic policies that will, if adopted through the Development Management Plan process, apply to most types of development. This includes the following:

General guidance:
- Development boundary
- Design
- Amenity
- Access
- Ground conditions
- Pollution
- Water resources

Housing and the community:
- Conversions of dwellings
- Change of use of a dwelling for business use
- Residential institutions

Historic and natural environment:
- Designated heritage assets
- Non designated heritage assets and local lists
- Defining the green infrastructure network

The economy:
- Town centre commercial and shopping areas
- Commercial centres
- Shops and services outside defined shopping areas
- Small businesses
- Tourist facilities
- Caravan and camping sites

2.2 For each topic area, we have set out different policy options, taking into account:

- Existing policies in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 - how effective they are in delivering our overall objectives
- Current legislation, best practice and guidance on development management issues
- Comments and issues raised through previous consultations on the Planning Strategy and the Big Map

2.3 Where “proposals” are mentioned in this section, this relates to any scheme or development that may require planning permission, from a new house, to an advertisement, to an extension or a whole employment area. This is something to consider when reading this document through, as some proposals may need more detailed guidance than others. Some could also be given further consideration during the plan making process, through the creation of Supplementary Planning Guidance.
Your comments

2.4 Please let us know which of the options presented you think is the right one. If there are options you don’t agree with please tell us why, or if we have missed any options, please tell us what they are using the comments box on the response form or the relevant section of the online system.
3 General Guidance - Policy Options

Development boundary

The first issue

3.1 It can be useful to define a boundary to the built up area of the town in order control its outward expansion and protect open land on the fringes. The Hastings Local Plan 2004 included a defined built up area boundary. Would you support this plan doing the same?

Option 1: A policy defining a development boundary

3.2 Under this option the following policy would be applied:

New development will be accommodated within the development boundary for Hastings as defined on the Proposals Map.

3.3 A suggested boundary is shown on the consultation plan in appendix B

Option 2: Not having a development boundary

3.4 A second option is not to define a development boundary and rely on other policies that protect certain areas from unsustainable development. The other policies would be National and international protection of delicate ecological sites, natural environment protection policies from the Planning Strategy.

The second issue

3.5 If you support a development boundary do you agree with the one we are proposing? Please have a look at the consultation plan in appendix B and see if you feel it should be amended in any way.

Relationship to other plans

3.6 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 3, 4 and 5
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from policy L3
Design

The issue

3.7 When development does occur, it is important that it is in keeping with local character and it achieves a good standard of design. The use of resources and impacts on the environment and the community should also be considered. Allowing some flexibility, however, in the form a development might take can sometimes result in more imaginative and innovative schemes being built.

3.8 In Hastings, it is important to consider:

- The selection of appropriate materials – these should reflect the area's character and objectives for sustainability and the re-use of materials. Use of appropriate native plant and tree species for landscaping and border treatments is also usually preferable.
- Views of a development – these should be considered both close by and from a wider area because there are many parts of the Borough that have prominent visual positions, but there are also those that have an unexpected prominence, that should be given the same consideration.
- Particular attention should be given to the 'gateways' into developments to reinforce a sense of character and distinctiveness.

Option 1: A single policy

3.9 This option includes a policy providing guidance on the various aspects of design for the ease of use by applicants. It is formed in a way that allows the designer a degree of flexibility in their approach.

Suggested wording:

All proposals must reach a good standard of design, which includes efficient use of resources, and takes into account:

a) Protecting and enhancing local character and showing appreciation of the surrounding neighbourhood's historic context, street patterns, plot boundaries, block sizes, height and materials.

b) The layout and siting of buildings making efficient use of land, the orientation of frontages to achieve attractive streetscapes and the maximisation of solar gain.

c) Assessment of visual impact, including the height, scale, and form of development that should be appropriate to the location, especially given the complex topography of the Borough and the need, in some instances, to consider the visual effect from key viewpoints.

d) The density of the development is compatible with the area's existing character.

e) Good performance against nationally recognised best practice guidance on sustainability, urban design and place-making, architectural quality and distinctiveness.
In the case of telecommunications prior approval for the siting and appearance of antennae will be given and full planning permission granted for telecommunications installations provided that the appropriate matters from the list above have been adequately considered in order to minimise the effect upon the character and appearance of the locality and taking account of technical constraints, there is no realistic prospect of a visually less intrusive site or mast, a building or other structure, being available.

Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

3.10 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of design is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering planning applications. The flexibility to respond to planning applications would remain if there were more policies that provided more detail but they might be less concise and less user friendly for applicants.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

3.11 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around design matters, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the Borough. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

3.12 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Relationship to other plans

3.13 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 2, 3, 4 & 5
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from a combination of Local Plan policies DG1, DG3, DG7, DG8, DG9, DG12, DG16, DG20, DG22, DG28, DG32 and E9
Amenity

The issue

3.14 Amenity is a broad term that can encompass protection from unacceptable impacts on the area or neighbouring occupants; avoiding loss of privacy, overshadowing, loss of daylight and disturbances.

3.15 Amenity also includes potential layout and proportions (internal and external) of buildings. Amenity is a term that is also used to describe the spaces between buildings; public spaces, that when well maintained, help to increase a person’s sense of wellbeing. Amenity, then, is an issue to consider with proposals and some guidance might be appropriate.

3.16 Hastings has a variety of housing types at different densities for different people. What constitutes a good standard of living might be different for a person living alone to that of a family; their needs are very likely to be different too. The management of the spaces between buildings can also help to contribute to objectives of environmental sustainability because green infrastructure is a crucial part of development proposals that can safeguard biodiversity, natural features and wildlife habitats.

Option 1: A single policy

3.17 This is a policy providing guidance on the various aspects of amenity for the ease of use by applicants. It is formed in a way that allows the designer a degree of flexibility in their approach.

Suggested wording:

In order to achieve a good living standard for future users of proposed development and its neighbours, permission will be given where it can be proven that the following have been carefully considered and can be demonstrated:

a) Careful use of the scale, form, height, mass, and density of any building and buildings.

b) Dwellings must be designed to allow residents to live comfortably and conveniently with sufficient internal space. The guidelines for minimum internal floor areas are: 1 bedroom/2 person 51m²; 2 bedroom/3 person 86m²; 3 bedroom/5 person 93m²; 4 bedroom/6 person 106m²

c) There is adequate storage for waste, and means of its removal (including recyclable materials) has been given careful attention

d) Means of landscaping and how this contributes to crime prevention; a permeable and legible network of routes and spaces to create a public realm that is attractive, overlooked and safe.

e) Arrangements being in place for the future maintenance of any public areas.
f) Considerate design solutions for the spaces between and around buildings, as well as respect to the character of the surroundings; a well-designed scheme in terms of private, semi-private and public open space

g) Appropriate levels of private external space, especially for larger homes designed to be marketed for family use. In terms of proposed family dwellings the council would expect to see the provision of private garden space of at least 30m$^2$

Development will not be accepted where there is:

h) Insufficient scope to accommodate necessary servicing areas, ancillary structures and landscaping

i) Significant impact upon the area's character or the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

3.18 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of amenity is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, could be confusing for applicants with the possibility that some might be missed when preparing a planning application. The flexibility to respond to planning applications would remain if there were more policies and they could maybe provide more detail but they might be less concise and less user friendly for applicants.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

3.19 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around design matters, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the Borough. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

3.20 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Relationship to other plans

3.21 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 2, 3, 4 and 5
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from a combination of policies: DG3, DG7, DG8, DG9, DG12, DG16, DG32
Access

The issue

3.22 When proposals are made, the ways that people move on and off and through them is important to consider and is also crucial for a successful scheme. The impact on existing transport networks from completed schemes is also part of this issue and might need guidance. Particular consideration might need to be given to roads in the town that are, as yet, un-metalled as further development that uses these roads as access could create a situation that would lead to their deterioration; therefore they are also likely to require policy guidance.

3.23 Design and access statements are a prerequisite of most planning applications and should explain how proposals are capable of successful integration onto a particular site. Consideration should go beyond the strict boundaries of the site in order to appreciate how people move between different places and how various uses connect together.

3.24 Whilst acknowledging its importance to modern life, designs that put further reliance on travel by private car should be discouraged. The provision of car parking into developments must not lead to vehicles having an overbearing effect on the streetscape.

3.25 Parking in connection with a specific development is the responsibility of the developer. East Sussex County Council has produced a Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance document (SPG) that sets out the thresholds for provision of parking spaces. The SPG also provides guidance on design, location servicing and drainage (amongst others) that should be adhered to, and is available at [http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/planning/applications/developmentcontrol/downloadparking.htm](http://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/planning/applications/developmentcontrol/downloadparking.htm)

Option 1: A single policy:

3.26 The option includes a policy providing guidance on the various aspects of access for the ease of use by applicants. It is formed in a way that allows the designer a degree of flexibility in their approach.

Suggested wording:

Attention must be paid, not only to the access onto the site, but also access into, and within all parts of any resultant development. This includes:

a) When considering the layout of a site, priority is to be given to non-car based modes

b) The enhancement and promotion of pedestrian and cycle access.

c) Good accessibility for all, especially for people with a physical or sensory impairment.

d) Good performance against nationally recognised best practice guidance on internal building design and layout.
e) Planning permission will only be granted for development which would generate additional traffic on an un-metalled carriageway, if an agreement is made that the road in question remains private.

Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

3.27 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of access is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering planning applications. The flexibility to respond to planning applications would remain if there were more policies and they could maybe provide more detail but they might be less concise and less user friendly for applicants.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

3.28 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around design matters, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the town. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon guidance from the County Council and the Planning Strategy

3.29 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy and the East Sussex County Council Parking SPG. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Relationship to other plans

3.30 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 4, 5 and 6
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from a combination of policies: DG2, DG9, DG10, DG32, CN1, CN2, CN3, TR5, TR7 and TR10
Ground conditions

The issue

3.31 The planning authority needs to be satisfied that, where it is necessary, ground conditions and contaminants have been fully taken into account in proposals for development. Guidance might be required to aid potential applicants.

Option 1: A single policy

3.32 This option includes a policy providing guidance on two aspects of ground conditions for the ease of use by applicants.

Suggested wording:

Assessments of existing ground conditions should be undertaken, and details submitted to the Local Planning Authority before any development takes place.

Planning permission will only be granted for development providing:

a) On land potentially subject to instability (such as steeply sloping sites or in areas with a history of land instability), the applicant supplies convincing supporting evidence that any actual or potential instability can be overcome through appropriate remedial, preventative or precautionary measures.

b) An assessment of ground conditions, particularly where there is presence of contaminative substances on the site, or surrounding area has been fully undertaken. It is the responsibility of the landowner and/or developer to provide this assessment. Applications for development within 250 metres of a landfill site or land suspected of contamination require investigation and demonstration that development is acceptable.

Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

3.33 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; there might be an argument that each aspect ground conditions should be dealt with separately. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering planning applications. The flexibility to respond to planning applications would remain if there were more policies and they could maybe provide more detail but they might be less concise and less user friendly for applicants.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

3.34 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the town. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be
argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

**Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy**

3.35 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Relationship to other plans**

3.36 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 2, 3 and 5  
**Local Plan (2004):** Adapted from a combination of policies: DG21 and DG34
Pollution

The issue

3.37 Where a development has the potential to create pollution, it is important to consider this at an early stage to keep its effects to a minimum. Sometimes pre-existing sources of pollution or specific hazards need to be taken into account when proposals are made. Guidance might be required to aid potential applicants.

Option 1: A single policy

3.38 This option includes a policy providing guidance on some aspects of pollution for the ease of use by applicants.

Suggested wording:

Planning permission will only be granted for development providing:

a) External lighting proposals avoid unnecessary light pollution beyond the specific area intended to be lit.

b) A level of air borne pollutants does not exceed statutory guidelines, unless appropriate mitigation measures are agreed.

c) Noise creation that is detrimental to neighbouring and/or local amenity is kept to a practical minimum; appropriate means of assessment may be required.

Where prudent, the Local Planning Authority will consult with the Health and Safety Executive on applications near 'notifiable installations' (examples include high pressure gas mains and overhead power cables). Determining factors are the distance, risks and nature of the proposals.

Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

3.39 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of pollution is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering planning applications. The flexibility to respond to planning applications would remain if there were more policies and they could maybe provide more detail but they might be less concise and less user friendly for applicants.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

3.40 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the town. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be
argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

**Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy**

3.41 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Relationship to other plans**

3.42 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 2, 3, 4 and 5  
**Local Plan (2004):** Adapted from a combination of polices: DG5, DG6, DG29, DG30, DG31 and DG33
**Water resources**

**The issue**

3.43 Water resources (rivers, lakes, wetlands, underground aquifers etc), in Hastings; their use, management and how developments might affect them are matters that require attention, in accordance with guidance from the Environment Agency. A plan including areas and sites that could impact upon water quality will be developed to feed into the final version of the Development Management Plan. Guidance providing more detail for potential applicants might also be required.

**Option 1: A suggested policy**

3.44 The availability of water resources and the impact of increased abstraction on environmental water needs (i.e. those of rivers, wetlands and estuaries, including the needs of navigation, fisheries, recreation and nature conservation) as advised by the Environment Agency will be taken into account in the determination of development proposals.

**Suggested wording:**

**Development will not be permitted within areas where there is significant risk to ground water resources.**

**Development may have impact upon water resources locally. As well as overall availability, considerations will also be given to possible environmental effects such as unacceptable low river flows or drying of wetlands; on site, immediately offsite and further away from the development. Where appropriate advice will be sought from the relevant body; the Environment Agency or Southern Water.**

**The protection of ground water sources and reserves is also of importance. Therefore development that would threaten the quality of ground water will be prevented, in accordance with advice from the Environment Agency.**

**Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy**

3.45 An alternative is to rely on national policy and objectives and policies in the Planning Strategy. This could lead to a situation where there is not enough guidance on the specific circumstances of Hastings and its ground water resources. The Environment Agency and Southern Water are statutory consultees, however, and will comment on those applications that might affect ground water.

**Option 3: To make the policy more or less stringent.**

3.46 A less stringent policy than that suggested in option 1 is possible. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations. Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more...
stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in an efficient manner.

3.47 Adjusting the prescriptive nature of a policy for this particular issue would need to be done in a careful way in order to remain compliant with the guidance from the Environment Agency.

Relationship to other plans

3.48 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 3, 4 and 5  
**Local Plan (2004):** Adapted from a combination of policies: DG25, DG26 and DG27
4 Housing and the Community – Policy Options

Conversions of dwellings

The issue

4.1 It is an aim of the Planning Strategy to promote a good and appropriate mix of dwellings across Hastings. To help achieve this, some guidance over the conversion of dwellings might be required, especially in terms retaining certain types of housing in some areas. The proposed use and how the loss of the existing use is managed may also be important considerations.

Option 1: A policy to guide conversions of dwellings

4.2 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the conversion of dwellings and highlights it as an important issue requiring specific detail, in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

To protect the character of established residential areas and to retain existing housing stock, converting all or part of a dwelling to flats or maisonettes will only be permitted provided that:

- The building can no longer be retained in its entirety for single family housing occupancy in accordance with modern standards;
- The proposals are in general conformity with other policies in this plan;
- It would not include significant extension(s) or significant changes to room layouts to achieve an adequate standard of accommodation;
- It would not involve the self-containment of basement areas or other parts of any property having inadequate light or low ceilings or which would result in a poor outlook from main windows; and
- It would make adequate provision for refuse storage.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it

4.3 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue.

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

4.4 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may
also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for
development to suit the town.

**Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent.**

4.5 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for
a more flexible approach to considering potential planning applications, but
might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased
investigations.

4.6 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could
stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being
made in a consistent manner.

**Relationship to other plans**

4.7 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 1, 2 and 5

**Local Plan (2004):** Policy H4
The change of use of a dwelling for a business use

The issue

4.8 With changing work patterns, particularly involving the use of Information Technology, home working or live-work spaces are becoming more important. Not all changes of this kind require planning permission but where they do they shall be generally encouraged, to help the local economy. Nevertheless, to retain the character of residential areas and to protect amenity it is important to consider the use of buildings and only allowing appropriate changes of use. Maintaining the number of dwellings in the district to meet the needs of the community is an important consideration. This issue, however, might not necessarily justify a policy in its own right; it could be included in a greater detailed version of potential policies from the general guidance from earlier in this document.

Option 1: A policy to guide the change of use of a dwelling for a business use

4.9 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the change of use of dwellings for business use and highlights it as an important issue requiring specific detail, in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

Permissions to allow a change of use to part of a dwelling or permission to erect a new building related to the dwelling in order to operate a business or work from home, will be granted provided the following criteria are met:

a) No significant detriment to the character of the building and surroundings would result, either from the activity on the site or collection/delivery of materials.

b) The business will employ no more than one person in addition to the owner. The business use must be ancillary to the overall use of the site for residential purposes.

c) Business activities will be contained within the non-residential part of the dwelling.

d) Adequate access and parking is available within the site to cater for both domestic and business needs.

e) Any sales (retail or wholesale) shall be ancillary or incidental to the employment activity on the site. No sales shall take place of goods which are not manufactured or processed on the site.

f) The curtilage is adequate to site any proposed building without significant detriment to surrounding residential area.
Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it

4.10 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue.

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

4.11 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent.

4.12 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

4.13 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

Relationship to other plans

4.14 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 1, 2 and 5
Local Plan (2004): Policy H5
Residential institutions

The issue

4.15 Where residential institutions are proposed a reasonable balanced has to be achieved between the needs of the prospective occupants and the local amenity of existing residents.

4.16 A mixture of housing types contributes to sustainable communities, but it is also important that types of development occur in appropriate locations. Proposed developments should be to meet identified local needs.

4.17 Any proposal for a residential institution must prove that it is reflective of local character and meets the specific requirements of prospective inhabitants; design, access and location in relation to services and facilities are of particular importance, but the weight of each criteria will depend upon the precise nature of the proposals.

Option 1: A policy to manage proposals involving residential institutions

4.18 This option introduces a policy basis for managing proposals involving residential institutions and would highlight it as an important issue requiring specific detail. This is specific detail, in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

Planning applications for residential institutions, and housing including for the elderly, infirm and physically and sensory impaired should comply with the following criteria:

a) The site is accessible by public transport, particularly at off-peak times when visitor trips are likely to be at their highest.

b) The site should be reasonably level and large enough to accommodate adequate parking, room for delivery vehicles and amenity space.

c) Changing the use of an existing building should not detrimentally affect its character or setting.

d) Account will be taken of existing accommodation in the locality to ensure an adequate stock of general housing remains for all sectors of the community.

e) Access and parking arrangements should take account of people with physical and sensory disabilities.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it

4.19 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue.
Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

4.20 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent

4.21 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

4.22 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

Relationship to other plans:

4.23 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 2 and 5
Local Plan (2004): CN9
5 Historic and Natural Environment

Designated heritage assets

5.1 Designated heritage assets are defined as: World heritage sites, scheduled ancient monuments, listed buildings, protected wreck sites registered historic parks and gardens, registered battlefields and conservation areas.

The issue

5.2 Retaining sites of heritage value and protecting them from loss or the adverse impacts of development is an issue highlighted in the Planning Strategy. Conservation areas have been designated across the town and more detailed consideration is given to any development that may affect them. When development does occur in, or close to, conservation areas, the potential impact on the special significance of these designated areas is considered.

5.3 The designation of heritage assets is defined in various ways – through legislation, a national planning policy, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) plan-making process, and by Council Resolution. In determining applications there will be a presumption in favour of preventing harm or loss to a heritage asset, in conformity with the Planning Strategy.

5.4 Appendix B at the end of this document shows the protective designations and allocations including conservation areas and scheduled ancient monuments.

5.5 Proposals that involve designated assets might require also further specific guidance.

5.6 The expectations of policies elsewhere in this plan or the Planning Strategy can be applied flexibly. For example in Conservation Areas, it may be necessary to permit development which does not meet these standards to enable a viable use to be found for a building without compromising environmental quality.

Option 1: A single policy

5.7 This option would allow an applicant to view a potentially more user friendly single piece of guidance around proposals specifically involving planning permission for designated heritage assets. To achieve this particular approach the existing policies would need to be reviewed and potentially grouped together and the likely changes in national guidance would also need careful consideration. There could be some issues that are not covered by the existing policies that also need to be included in the eventual Development Management Plan policy.

5.8 The current local plan policies relating to designated heritage assets broadly cover the following topics: (For more detailed information please see the Hastings Local Plan 2004, pages 171 – 179).

5.9 Development within Conservation Areas: this outlines (amongst other things) that proposals should enhance the character of the designated area, its buildings and surroundings, there should be a high standard of design, use of sensitively chosen materials in proposals, that green spaces should be
preserved and that the layout and arrangement of buildings should follow the existing patterns.

5.10 **Demolition in a Conservation Area:** This policy generally states that demolition is to be avoided unless it is to preserve or enhance the character of the area or there is not other viable use for the building(s) concerned.

5.11 **Replacement Doors and Windows in Conservation Areas:** this gives specific instruction around the materials and styles that should be appropriately selected for the area in question.

5.12 **Roof Materials in Conservation Areas:** Also specific guidance around replica treatments and appropriate material choices.

5.13 **Development Involving Listed Buildings:** this outlines (amongst other things) that proposals should be appropriate in scale, design, materials etc so as not to detract from the special architectural and historic character and appearance of listed buildings and their setting. Changes of use, external and internal alteration will only be permitted where they do not adversely affect the special architectural and historic character.

5.14 **Demolition of Listed Buildings:** this is also a policy to discourage demolition unless no other viable practical or suitable alternative can be found.

5.15 **Replacement Doors and Windows in Listed Buildings:** Specific guidance to the replacement of exact replicas or original features.

5.16 **Roof Materials for Listed Buildings:** Specific guidance to the replacement of exact replicas or original features.

5.17 **Archaeological Sites and Ancient Monuments:** assessments of implications of any proposals are required from any applicant and the protection of the setting of these assets is outlined in this policy.

5.18 Through the policies there is also the requirement for an applicant to demonstrate and provide evidence of assessments with most kinds of proposal involving these designated assets.

5.19 There is also some guidance towards specific proposals such as those for winch huts, advertisements and shop fronts.

**Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies**

5.20 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of designated heritage is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering applications. The flexibility to respond to applications would remain if there were more policies but their consistent use might be reduced.

**Option 3: Some more stringent guidance**

5.21 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around design matters in heritage terms, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards
across the town. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

**Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy, and the general guidance from this consultation**

5.22 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy. The sites identified on the eventual proposals map would relate to the Planning Strategy and the less detailed policies of that plan. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Relationship to other plans**

5.23 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 1, 2, 3 and 7  
**Local Plan (2004):** Reference policies C1 to C10
Non designated heritage assets and local lists

The issue

5.24 Some parts of the town's heritage are not formally designated heritage assets, but are considered as important. These include areas of archaeological interest, unregistered parks and gardens and buildings, monuments, sites, places or landscapes that are positively identified as having significance in terms of the historic environment. Guidance, therefore, could be important for the protection and management of locally valued places that are not nationally recognised.

5.25 We will welcome the creation and management of a Local List of non-designated heritage assets and this will help to inform the decisions for planning applications made in connection with those assets identified.

Option 1: A policy for non-designated heritage assets

5.26 This option introduces a policy basis for non-designated heritage assets and would alert potential applicants to the heritage value across the town that is not nationally recognised.

5.27 With any planning application is could be expected that proposers assess, in the same way as with designated assets, the potential impact that their scheme might have on the character and setting of a non-designated heritage asset. The assessment would likely need to take account of the reason for the identification of the asset, its local importance and what about it should be preserved. The level of protection that a non-designated heritage asset is given is likely to be proportionate the significance of that asset and the scale of any harm or loss proposed.

Suggested policy:

Non-designated heritage assets and their setting will be afforded protection that is proportionate to the scale of any harm or loss proposed and the significance of the asset in question.

Option 2: Some more stringent guidance

5.28 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards of protection across the Borough. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

5.29 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of
planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Relationship to other plans**

5.30 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 1, 2, 3 and 7

**Local Plan (2004):** No policies
Defining the green infrastructure network

The first issue

5.31 The protection of habitats and species are important subjects in their own right, and these are described in national policy and the Hastings Planning Strategy. The latter also outlines the principles of prevention, then mitigation and then as a last resort, compensation in terms of nature conservation.

5.32 Access to green infrastructure and open space has tremendous value in terms of people's quality of life, providing access to the natural environment and recreational uses. There are also indirect benefits in economic terms of having a good quality natural environment; opportunities are created for leisure and recreation, making the area more attractive to people and businesses alike.

5.33 The Proposals Map that will form part of the final Development Management Plan will define the boundaries of the various natural habitats and open spaces across the town which are to be protected.

Identifying existing green space for protection

5.34 The protective designations and allocations plan at the end of this document identifies a number of important areas of habitat for various indigenous and visiting species, including Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), national nature reserves, local nature reserves, Local Wildlife Sites, Ancient Woodland and more. In addition, there are other areas not identified that may be of importance.

5.35 Open/green space uses may include community woodland, marsh, public and private parks, burial grounds, and allotments, many of these will be identified on the proposals map. The space could be multi-functional, so suitable for play, recreation, walking and cycling, whilst supporting wildlife, and flood management.

5.36 Do you support the boundaries we have displayed in appendix B

5.37 Are there any other areas we should consider?

The second issue

5.38 Where new development takes place it often provides an opportunity for adding to or strengthening the green network. This could be by the provision of a new area, or especially in the more densely developed areas of Hastings, to aid in the management and enhancement of those that already exist. The type of space needs to be appropriate to the surrounding area, yet offer a suitable variety of environments, fulfilling amenity, recreational, visual and ecological purposes.

Option 1: A policy for the assessment and provision of green space with new development

Suggested policy:
The Council expects that proposals, where appropriate, include assessments of existing ecology. These assessments should be of habitats, including trees, hedges, shrubs and ponds. The specific species of new planting should be given particularly careful consideration to avoid ‘invasive species’ and the loss of neighbouring amenity. Measures for protection and management of the ecology will also be required where appropriate.

5.39 Certain development allocation sites will be more able to provide more green space than others. Through the consultation process and into the final document those allocations that should include particular contributions to the green infrastructure as outlined above will be identified.

5.40 Please comment on the site specific part of this document if you know of areas within proposed allocations that should be protected.

**Option 2: Some more stringent guidance**

5.41 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around the requirements for assessments, and this approach would have the advantage of assurance that every planning application was accompanied by a full ecological assessment. Some planning applications, however, especially in town centre locations, or for existing buildings, might not require the same level of assessment if there is not vegetation already in place. It could be argued that a way to identify those places most in need of the most detailed assessments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

**Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy**

5.42 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. The sites identified on the eventual proposals map would relate to the Planning Strategy and the less detailed policies of that plan. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Relationship to other plans**

5.43 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 3, 4 and 5
**Local Plan (2004):** Adapted from a combination of policies: NC7, NC8, NC9, OS2, OS3, OS4 and OS5
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6 The Economy

Town centre commercial and shopping areas

The first issue

6.1 The strategic objectives for the Town Centre and the broad commercial area are set out in the emerging Planning Strategy. The boundary for this is shown on the consultation map.

6.2 Do you support the boundary as shown?

The second issue

6.3 Increasing the range and quality of the town’s cultural offer is an important component of the Planning Strategy, helping to promote the image and increasing the vitality of Hastings town centre, particularly in the evenings.

Figure CQ1: Potential cultural quarters
6.4 New cultural facilities could act as a catalyst for the wider redevelopment of other areas. Encouraging new restaurants and cafés to establish in and around these quarters could create a complementary ‘café culture’ to support other cultural facilities, such as the theatre, the library, activities at the college and across the town, in art galleries and museums.

6.5 Two such potential areas have been identified on figure CQ1, above.

6.6 These facilities must provide ground floor uses with active frontages that are open to the public. These may include high quality specialist retail, cafés and restaurants, which would allow a complementary café culture to develop, with lively outside seating onto pedestrian areas that would help to support cultural facilities. To achieve this, Class A3 uses (hot food take-aways) that provide only take away facilities with no seating will be discouraged. This is an issue that could be considered further through Supplementary Planning Documents.

6.7 Do you support the concept of cultural quarters?

6.8 Do you support the choice of location for these quarters?

The third issue:

6.9 To protect the viability of commercial and shopping activities in the town centre and the mix of shops and services on offer, some guidance over the particular use of land and premises might be required.

6.10 The extent of these areas will also need to be defined in order to retain that viability and vitality.

Option 1: To create a shopping area boundary and policies to manage activities within it

6.11 In order to be able to undertake this option we would need to:

- Determine the extent of the shopping area boundary in the town centre.

- Identify what proportions of A1 uses (Shops) compared to other uses in the town centre should it be maintained. A healthy concentration of shops helps to increase the numbers of people visiting that area.

- Identify which areas (roads) were considered as primary and secondary frontages. Primary shopping frontages are the main shop fronts within a town centre as defined by high commercial rental values and usually a high proportion of retail uses.

6.11 Further guidance in the form of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), could also be produced that would be subject to periodic review.

Option 2: To create a shopping area boundary but have less stringent policies to manage activities within it

6.12 In order to undertake this option we would still need to determine the extent of the shopping area boundary in the town centre. This would help to retain the vitality and a concentration of all commercial uses. Having less stringent
policies, with less protection of proportions of retail uses or the identification of primary and secondary frontages could result in a dispersal of shops with perhaps a weakening of the core shopping frontages and a less healthy retail area.

Option 3: Not to have a shopping area boundary

6.13 This option would mean relying on the wider Town Centre boundary of the Planning Strategy. This option could allow for greater flexibility in the determination of applications, but might reduce the protection and promotion of a healthy concentration of retail premises.

Relationship to other plans

Local Plan (2004): Reference to policy S1
Commercial centres

The issue:

6.15 In order to protect the viability of commercial and shopping centres and to balance the aspirations and needs of local communities guidance might be required to set out what types of land use will remain suitable in these areas.

6.16 Such centres provide a range of facilities including not only shops and banks but also GP surgeries and dentists. They help reduce the need for people in the mentioned neighbourhood, to make long distance journeys. These centres are focal point and are also accessible to less mobile members of the community, both of which aid social inclusion.

6.17 The areas are of great importance for the provision of employment opportunities and services, there is potential to add to the number of people using the shops and services in the centres. It is, therefore, valuable to protect the land uses in these areas so they remain predominantly in retail and business uses.

6.18 The extent of these areas will also need to be defined in order to retain that viability and vitality. For the purposes of this consultation general areas will appear on the consultation maps, and they will eventually be defined through the process to the final proposals map. In the meantime suggestions on the extent of these boundaries for each individual centre are welcome.

Option 1: A policy to guide managing commercial centres

6.19 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the shops and services inside defined shopping areas and would highlight it as an important issue requiring specific detail. This is a level of detail over and above that contained in the earlier issues of this document.

Suggested policy:

In the commercial areas (The Old Town, Central St Leonards, Bohemia, Silverhill, Ore, West St Leonards, Battle Road, Mount Pleasant and Mount Road) uses within classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, and B1 (as defined in the Town and Country Planning Use Classes Order) will be encouraged. A change of use from Use Class A1 will only be permitted where at least 50% of the non-residential premises remain in class A1.

Certain types of retail activity have greater affect on their neighbours; this could be because of what they sell or the hours which they open. The particular nature of alcohol and take away sales means that people use the premises which sell them in a different way to other shops and restaurants.
Option 2: To define commercial centre boundaries but to make the policy more or less stringent

6.20 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow or a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

6.21 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

Option 3: To define commercial centre boundaries but not have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section

6.22 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue

Option 4: Not to define commercial area boundaries for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

6.23 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in he Planning Strategy. This option could allow for greater flexibility in the determination of applications, but might reduce the protection and promotion of a healthy concentration of retail premises.

Relationship to other plans:

6.24 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 1, 3 and 5
Local Plan (2004): Reference to policies: S2 and S3
Shops and services outside defined shopping areas

The first issue

6.25 Shops and services outside of the retail areas shown on the consultation map might require extra policy guidance. Some local shops and services provide a particularly important focal point for a community. The corner shop or doctors surgery that is outside of the main commercial areas is potentially more accessible, especially for those without private transport, and might need some protection.

6.26 Busy local shops are generally beneficial but they have the potential to increase the issues of littering or anti-social behaviour so the Council would expect to see ways to mitigate these included in any proposal and will also consult the local constabulary.

6.27 It is also acknowledged that where it can be demonstrated that the shop or service is not economically viable and has been tested through being marketed, it may be unreasonable to refuse a change of use.

Option 1: A policy to guide the retention of shops and services outside the commercial centres

6.28 This option introduces a policy basis for retaining the shops and services outside defined shopping areas and would highlight it as an important issue requiring specific detail. This is specific detail in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

Proposals for the change of use or redevelopment that would result in the loss of a shop or service outside the defined commercial areas will only be permitted when:

a) There is an alternative within reasonable walking distance; or
b) It is demonstrated that the existing use is no longer viable.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it

6.29 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

6.30 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in he Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. It might be the case that this is not, in fact, an issue that needs particular attention in any eventual plan for the town.
Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent

6.31 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

6.32 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

The second issue

6.33 There may be a need to manage the intensity of shops and services outside defined shopping areas, and the concentration of single types of outlet to reduce, for example, noise or litter production.

6.34 Certain types of retail activity have greater effect on their neighbours; this could be because of what they sell or the hours which they open. The particular nature of alcohol and take away sales means that people use the premises which sell them in a different way to other shops and restaurants.

6.35 Proposals that involve licensed premises and (hot food) take-aways should include careful consideration of the ways that people are going to use the premises; how they will get in and out and if there is enough parking and at what times customers are likely to use them, and how all these things will affect both direct neighbours and those in the local vicinity.

Option 1: A policy to guide managing certain types of premises

6.36 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the shops outside defined shopping areas and would highlight it as an important issue requiring specific detail. This is specific detail further to the general guidance and commercial areas already discussed in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

Planning permission for new shops and services outside the commercial area will be granted provided that:

a) The precise nature of the use proposed (which should be specified in the planning application) including opening hours is given;
b) The proposal would not adversely affect neighbours, for example, causing excess noise or smell
c) The proposal would not, on its own, or cumulatively with other such uses in the area, be likely to result in problems of disturbance or public disorder;
d) Suitable off-street parking can be provided, or there is sufficient on-street parking; and
e) It would not cause inconvenience or danger on the public highway as a result of the additional stopping and manoeuvring of vehicles.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it
6.37 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue.

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

6.38 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent

6.39 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

6.40 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent and cover more than just proposals outside the potentially defined commercial areas. This approach could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

Relationship to other plans

6.41 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 1, 3 and 5
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from a combination of policies: DG17, DG18, DG19, S4 and S5
Small businesses

The issue

6.42 In order to encourage new businesses and to support the viability of those that already exist (key objectives of the Planning Strategy) some policy guidance might be required to allow for appropriate conversion and extension of premises. The issues of traffic, noise and neighbours are likely to be important when considering the wording of this potential policy and balancing those with supporting the local economy and attracting new investment.

Option 1: A policy to guide small business enterprise

6.43 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the small business development and highlights it as an important issue requiring specific detail, in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

The intensification or replacement of existing employment uses and for the development of land for small workshops will be permitted where:

a) The proposals are in scale and character with the existing premises.

b) In can be demonstrated that there is reasonable access to the public transport network and an investigation into green travel options (cycling and walking to work) has been made;

c) any increase in traffic would not cause serious inconvenience and/or danger on the public highway; and

d) The development would not cause serious harm to the amenities of local residents as a result of, for example, noise or other disturbance.

Consideration will also be given to the length of time the business has been established on the site, the investment already made, and the contribution to employment in the locality.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it

6.44 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue.

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

6.45 It could be sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This
approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

**Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent.**

6.46 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential planning applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

6.47 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

**Relationship to other plans**

6.48 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 1, 3 and 5
   **Local Plan (2004):** Adapted from policies: E6, E8 and E9
Tourist facilities

The issue

6.49 Tourism is a major contributor to the economy and vibrancy of Hastings. It is important that whilst supporting appropriate tourism proposals, they are managed in a sustainable and suitable manner. It might be considered that the issues that surround tourist facilities and their proposed location are covered by earlier issues and potential policies, of this document. There might, however, be an argument that a separate policy is required to deal specifically with the issues that surround the location of certain types of tourist facility and the effects that all types have on their neighbours. The seasonal nature of tourism could also be of particular importance when considering this issue.

6.50 The Planning Strategy contains guidance towards visitor accommodation and language schools. Some more guidance for the management of attractions and amusements might be required.

Option 1: A single policy

6.51 This option would allow an applicant to view a potentially more user friendly single piece of guidance around proposals specifically involving planning permission for tourist facilities. To achieve this particular approach the existing policies would need to be reviewed and potentially grouped together and the likely changes in national guidance would also need careful consideration. There could be some issues that are not covered by the existing policies that also need to be included in the eventual Development Management Plan policy.

6.52 The current local plan policies relating to tourist facilities broadly cover the following topics: (For more detailed information please see the Hastings Local Plan 2004, pages 41 – 47).

New Tourist Attractions: provides guidance for proposals that should complement the existing built and natural environment of the town; not cause harm to amenity; the scale and appearance of the development is in keeping with the surroundings; protection of identified areas of open space; and that they should be reached by a frequent public transport service and are on convenient pedestrian and cycle route(s).

Amusements: Guidance for amusement arcades, scenic and novelty rides and other amusement facilities – discouraging them from the Town Centre and Old Town Conservation Areas. There is guidance for the ‘Stade area,’ and ‘other parts of the town,’ where generally the forms of amusement are generally acceptable as long as they would not cause harm to the living conditions of people residing in the area and/or its surroundings as a result of noise, other disturbance or the intended operating hours; they are designed in character with their surroundings and they would preserve or enhance the character or appearance of any conservation area.

6.53 There is also some guidance towards specific proposals such as those for conference facilities, water-based recreation and the Pier.
Option 2: Split the guidance into separate policies

6.54 Another option could be to split the guidance into separate policies; this might help to reinforce the view that each aspect of tourist facilities is important in its own right. A greater number of policies, however, covering one area could also have the consequence of reducing their impact when considering applications. The flexibility to respond to applications would remain if there were more policies but their consistent use might be reduced.

6.55 This option could allow for areas for the focus of tourism activities to be identified. Within these areas new facilities will be permitted as long as they adhere to the general guidance of this document.

Option 3: Some more stringent guidance

6.56 Some more stringent guidance is another way to view this policy. It is possible to be more prescriptive, especially around design matters in heritage terms, and this approach would have the advantage of achieving minimum standards across the town. Standards, however, can become outdated and setting them limits the chances of certain types of development occurring where it might be most needed. It could also be the case a standard for one area is different to the next, and what was intended to be a minimum standard could become an unintended maximum. It could be argued that a way to achieve specific standards for developments is through site specific negotiations or potential Neighbourhood Plans.

Option 4: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy, and the general guidance from this consultation

6.57 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. The sites identified on the eventual proposals map would relate to the Planning Strategy and the less detailed policies of that plan. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the town.

Relationship to other plans

6.58 **Planning Strategy (2012):** Objectives: 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7  
**Local Plan (2004):** Reference to policies: T1, T2, T10, T11 and T12
Caravan and camping sites

The issue

6.59 Caravan and camping sites contribute in an important way to tourism. The existing caravan and camping pitches in the district are close to vulnerable ecological and natural habitat areas and their expansion might require specific guidance that is not covered by other issues in this document. New proposals might also require close scrutiny if their location is likely to be on the fringe of the urban area and to encroach into the open countryside. What is an appropriate level of guidance for proposals of this nature?

Option 1: A policy to manage proposals involving caravan and camping sites

6.60 This option introduces a policy basis for managing the proposals involving caravan and camping sites and highlights it as an important issue requiring specific detail, in addition to that already provided in this consultation document.

Suggested policy:

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

a) Safe and convenient access to and from the public highway can be provided;

b) The proposal would not have an adverse impact on surrounding residential areas or the wider environment, and an assessment of potential the ecological and landscape impact is provided;

c) The use of the site is restricted to a seasonal basis (between the 28th February in any one year and the 14th January in the following year); and

d) A minimum of one third of the total number of pitches on new or extended static caravan sites is reserved for touring caravans or campers.

Development within Caravan Sites

Planning permission will be granted for development designed to enhance facilities within existing caravan sites, including accommodation and the replacement of static caravans by chalets, provided that the above criteria is adhered to and:

a) It would not be visually intrusive; and

b) It would not unacceptably affect the living conditions of nearby residents.

Option 2: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and add detail to the suggested policies of the general guidance section to deal with it
6.61 This guidance could be incorporate into a general policy on development guidance. This approach, however, might make it harder for potential applicant to appreciate the importance of this issue

Option 3: Not to have a specific policy for this issue and rely upon national guidance and the Planning Strategy

6.62 It could be deemed sufficient to rely upon national guidance and policies in the Planning Strategy. This option would allow greater flexibility in the consideration of planning applications, but could lead to less consistent decisions. This approach may also have the consequence of there not being enough specific guidance for development to suit the Borough

Option 4: To make the policy more or less stringent

6.63 There might be an option to make the policy less stringent. This could allow for a more flexible approach to considering potential applications, but might result in less efficient decisions through the need for increased investigations.

6.64 Or it could be argued that any guidance should be more stringent, this could stifle development however, and this could also lead to decisions not being made in a consistent manner.

Relationship to other plans:

6.65 Planning Strategy (2012): Objectives: 1, 3, 4, 5 and 7
Local Plan (2004): Adapted from policies T6 and T7
Part B – Site Allocations
7 Part B – Site Allocations

Introduction

7.1 This section sets out site details for potential development sites in each of the 13 Planning Focus Areas, which are:

1. Little Ridge & Ashdown
2. Greater Hollington
3. Filsham & Bulverhythe
4. St Helens
5. Silverhill & Alexandra Park
6. Maze Hill & Burtons’ St Leonards
7. Central St Leonards & Bohemia
8. Hastings Town Centre
9. Old Town
10. West Hill
11. Hillcrest & Ore Valley
12. Clive Vale & Ore Village
13. Hastings Country Park

7.2 Figure PFA, over page, gives a borough wide overview of these focus areas, a more detailed version can be found in appendix A.

7.3 Within each focus area, we have provided a summary each potential development site, which includes the possible net number of dwellings, site area and planning status and site boundary for both housing and employment locations.

7.4 Please note that some sites may propose mixed use development, rather than just a single use on its own.

7.5 Maps are provided at the end of this document (in the appendices), showing all of these sites in context across the town, as well as an additional map showing protective designations and allocations. Focus area maps are also provided to enable you to see the information at a slightly larger scale, specific to your area. These can be found at the beginning of each focus area section.

Your comments

7.6 We want to hear your views on any, or all of these sites. Do you support their allocation? Are there factors that must be taken into account before any development would be acceptable? If you think any details should be changed, please say why using the response form where possible or the relevant section of the online system.
Figure PFA: Full borough overview of the planning focus areas
**Little Ridge & Ashdown (Planning Focus Area 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D49</td>
<td>Former Workplace Health &amp; Fitness Centre, The Ridge West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C08</td>
<td>Land adjacent to 777 The Ridge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A31</td>
<td>Holmhurst St Mary</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03</td>
<td>Old Roar House, Old Roar Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Lapsed planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N01</td>
<td>Harrow Lane Playing Fields</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004 (playing field)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E01</td>
<td>Land in Whitworth Road, The Ridge West</td>
<td>8,085</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E02</td>
<td>Queensway North, Queensway</td>
<td>9,700</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E03</td>
<td>Marline Fields, Enviro21 Business Park, Land West of Queensway</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE01</td>
<td>Land at junction of The Ridge West and Queensway</td>
<td>To be determined</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Permission on part of site only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 1*
Figure PFA1: Map of Little Ridge and Ashdown focus area
Site reference: D49

Figure 1: Location plan for D49

**Site address:** Former Workplace health & fitness centre, The Ridge West

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Full planning permission subject to a legal agreement

**Area:** 0.47ha

**Possible net capacity:** 11

**Assessment summary:** The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 11 units.

**Previously your comments were:**
None
Site reference: C08

Site address: Land adjacent to 777 The Ridge

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 1.86ha

Possible net capacity: 10

Assessment summary: This is a greenfield site occupying an elevated position at the junction of Harrow Lane with The Ridge. Though physically suitable for development, the site is outside of the currently defined Built-up Area - at present this is a constraint to its development and revising the boundary here would need to be justified. The site does not fall within any landscape designation but the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) lies on the opposite side of The Ridge, there are long views to the north into and out of the AONB, this is likely to constrain the scale and form of development on this site. Planting on the northern boundary could enable part of the site to be developed but low profile development would be essential on this elevated site.

Previously your comments were:
- Landscape issues
- Should be developed as open space & allotments – there are no useable allotments sites in this part of Hastings
- Area is known to flood and be very water logged in bad weather
Site reference: A31

Figure 3: Location plan for A31

Site address: Holmhurst St Mary

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 6.98ha

Possible net capacity: 170

Assessment summary: This greenfield site is allocated as a reserve site for residential development in the existing Local Plan. In short, this meant the site was to be held in reserve whilst the much-needed redevelopment of brownfield land came first. Progress has been made in redeveloping brownfield around the town, and this site continues to remain suitable for residential development. Our preference is therefore to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 170 units. The form of any proposed development would need to take into account such matters as the established landscaping, ecology and position of a listed statue.

Previously your comments were:
- Traffic impact
- Burial area within site
- Needs more large family housing
- Needs to be safe for children to play
- Support family housing in this location
- Develop as open space
Site reference: C03

Site address: Old Roar House, Old Roar Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Lapsed planning permission

Area: 0.84ha

Possible net capacity: 14

Assessment summary: Although planning permission for residential development has recently lapsed on this site, the site’s suitability for residential development has been established. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 14 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: N01

Figure 5: Location plan for N01

Site address: Harrow Lane Playing Fields

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (playing field)

Area: 4.75 ha

Possible net capacity: 140

Assessment summary: Harrow Lane playing fields is an elevated site situated above the road, and office and residential area to the east. The boundary of the site is made-up of well treed hedgerows, except at the south west corner where there are long views to Beachy Head. It is currently not used for football fields/active recreation and could be surplus to open space provision requirement. This site could be suitable for residential development, incorporating measures to help maintain its current overall appearance of a wooded site and strengthening boundary planting. There are also public rights of way running and around the perimeter which would have to be accommodated within any development proposals. We also need to decide if the existing recreational uses (open space and playing fields) would need to be relocated. The site is currently outside of the built-up area boundary which normally means there is a presumption against residential development. The Development Management Plan offers an opportunity to reappraise the built-up area boundary at this location, however any amendment to the built-up boundary would need to be robustly justified. If a density of 30 dwellings per hectares is assumed the site is capable of delivering c.140 units. The site is put forward for comment and reaction. The Council is not making a recommendation at this time.
Site reference: E01

Site address: Land in Whitworth Road, The Ridge West

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 2.5ha

Possible net capacity: 8,085m²

Assessment summary: This site has been allocated for employment development for many years but until recently was affected by possible routes for the Baldslow Junction highway improvement scheme. That scheme was cancelled under the Government’s National Spending Review in 2010. With the scheme no longer affecting the site, it is now capable of being brought forward as a natural extension of the West Ridge employment area. The site is partly affected by a site of nature conservation importance and a wildlife corridor designated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004. A full ecological survey would be required to assess the extent to which that would constrain any development.

This site adjoins land to the north which is also included in this consultation for possible employment development. The two sites combined would have capacity to enable creation of a high quality employment estate with direct frontage onto The Ridge which would considerably enhance its commercial potential.
Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E02

Figure 7: Location plan for E02

Site address: Queensway North, Queensway

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 4.7ha

Possible net capacity: 9,700m²

Assessment summary: This site has been allocated for employment a considerable period. Its “partner” site, Queensway South, has been partially developed as part of the Enviro21 Business Park scheme and this could form a next phase. The site adjoins a Site of Special Scientific Interest and being mainly scrub and some woodland will need to be fully surveyed ecologically to assess what constraints to development these represent. Access would be directly off Queensway. It is seen as suitable for high quality business development.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E03

Figure 8: Location plan for E03

Site address: Marline Fields, Enviro21 Business Park, Land West of Queensway

Suggested use: Employment


Area: 1.5ha

Possible net capacity: 5,600m²

Assessment summary: This is part of a larger site. 4 high quality business units and the access spine road have already been constructed, under the Enviro21 Business Park scheme. The plots themselves are cleared and prepared. It is therefore effectively a serviced site ready for development.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: NE01

Site address: Land at junction of The Ridge West and Queensway

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Permission on part of site only

Area: 3.4ha

Possible net capacity: To be determined

Assessment summary: This is a greenfield site in the ownership of East Sussex County Council. Taken together with an adjoining existing employment allocation - to the south-east of this land, this location would offer the potential to create a significant new area for employment related development. However, planning permission already exists on the northern portion of this site for a close care residential scheme. If the County Council's plans in this respect were not to take place, and all of this land were to be available for development during the Plan period, our preference would be to see the land developed for employment purposes. The site is put forward for comment and reaction. The Council is not making a recommendation at this time.
### Greater Hollington (Focus Area 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A04</td>
<td>Mayfield E, Bodiam Drive</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A22</td>
<td>Mayfield Farm</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A26</td>
<td>Mayfield J, Mayfield Lane</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A27</td>
<td>Robsack A, Church Wood Drive</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D56</td>
<td>Land south of 12-17 Catsfield Close</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Outline planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A11</td>
<td>Land at Redgeland Rise (Wishing Tree Nursery)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B15</td>
<td>Spyways School, Gillsmans Hill</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E04</td>
<td>Plot M, Gresley Road, Castleham</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E05</td>
<td>Site RX2, Sidney Little Road, Churchfields</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E06</td>
<td>Sites PX and QX, Churchfields</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E07</td>
<td>Site NX3 Sidney Little Road, Churchfields</td>
<td>920</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E08</td>
<td>Site NX2 Sidney Little Road, Churchfields</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E09</td>
<td>Land at the rear of Drury Lane, Ponswood</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 2**
Figure PFA2: Map of Greater Hollington focus area
Site reference: A04

Figure 10: Location plan for A04

Site address: Mayfield E, Bodiam Drive

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)

Area: 1.10ha

Possible net capacity: 37

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. Though an earlier planning permission has now lapsed, the site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing with an indicative capacity of 37 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A22

Figure 11: Location plan for A22

Site address: Mayfield Farm

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)

Area: 0.54ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. Though an earlier planning permission has now lapsed, the site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing with an indicative capacity of 8 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A26

Figure 12: Location plan for A26

Site address: Mayfield J, Mayfield Lane

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.77ha

Possible net capacity: 36

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. A planning proposal involving the redevelopment of the site has been approved subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to continue to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 36 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A27

Figure 13: Location plan for A27

Site address: Robsack A, Church Wood Drive

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 1.24ha

Possible net capacity: 32

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The entrance to the site contains some trees covered by tree preservation orders and woodland designated as Ancient Woodland. Church Wood and Robsack Wood, also designated Ancient Woodland, abut the site. Providing the issue of ecology can be satisfactorily addressed, the site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing development with an indicative capacity of 32 units.

Previously your comments were:
• Too dense
• Nature conservation & Ancient Woodland protection of paramount importance
Site reference: D56

Figure 14: Location plan for D56

Site address: Land South of 12-17 Catsfield Close

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline Planning Permission

Area: 0.41ha

Possible net capacity: 10

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through a current outline planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 10 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A11

Site address: Land at Redgeland Rise (Wishing Tree Nursery)

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.71ha

Possible net capacity: 28

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 28 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B15

Figure 16: Location plan for B15

Site address: Spyways School, Gillsmans Hill

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission subject to legal agreement

Area: 1.09ha

Possible net capacity: 33

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 33 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E04

Site address: Plot M, Gresley Road, Castleham

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.3ha

Possible net capacity: 1,200m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Castleham Employment Area and is suitable for small/medium business units although its sloping nature is a constraint to development. It is a serviced site.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E05

Site address: Site RX2, Sidney Little Road, Churchfields

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.2ha

Possible net capacity: 910m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Churchfields Employment Area and is suitable for a medium size business unit or several smaller ones. It is a serviced site.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E06

Site address: Sites PX and QX, Churchfields

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 1.6ha

Possible net capacity: 6,900m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Churchfields Employment Area and is the largest plot remaining available for development. The site is suitable for a large single business occupier or several smaller ones. Its sloping nature is a constraint to the form of development. It is a serviced site.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E07

Figure 20: Location plan for E07

Site address: Site NX3, Sidney Little Road, Churchfields

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.2ha

Possible net capacity: 920m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Churchfields Employment Area and is suitable for a small/medium size business unit. Its sloping nature is a constraint to development. It is a serviced site.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E08

Site address: Site NX2, Sidney Little Road, Churchfields

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.3ha

Possible net capacity: 770m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Churchfields Employment Area and is suitable for a medium size business unit or several smaller ones. Its sloping nature is a constraint to development. It is a serviced site.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E09

Site address: Land at the rear of Drury Lane, Ponswood

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.3ha

Possible net capacity: 770m²

Assessment summary: This site forms part of the Ponswood Employment Area and is suitable for a medium size business unit or several smaller ones. It lacks direct access and may prove difficult to develop independently.

Previously your comments were:
None
Filsham & Bulverhythe (Planning Focus Area 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B03</td>
<td>Former Westerleigh School playing fields</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>Lapsed planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B04</td>
<td>Former Westerleigh School</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A16</td>
<td>Seaside Road, West St Leonards</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29</td>
<td>West St Leonards Primary School</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>residential area, 0.9 community centre area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D34</td>
<td>190 Bexhill Road</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D43</td>
<td>St Ethelburga’s Church Hall</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B01</td>
<td>Bulverhythe Development Area</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B13</td>
<td>Cinque Ports Way, former Stamco timber yard &amp; TA Centre</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B14</td>
<td>Former Hastings College, St Saviours Road</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N02</td>
<td>Land South of Crowhurst Road</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N03</td>
<td>The Grove School</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 3
Figure PFA3: Map of Filsham and Bulverhythe focus area
Site reference: B03

Site address: Former Westerleigh School, Playing Fields

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Lapsed planning permission

Area: 0.56ha

Possible net capacity: 7

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been demonstrated through an earlier granting of planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 7 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Hollington Park Road is already too busy
Site reference: B04

Site address: Former Westerleigh School

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 2.15ha

Possible net capacity: 68

Assessment summary: The closure of this private school means this site is now available for redevelopment. As a brownfield site in an established residential area, our preference is for the site to be redeveloped for residential use. The slope of the land, the existing mature trees within the site together with any nature conservation issues that will need to be explored are likely to influence the amount of development that can take place on the site. A capacity of 68 units is suggested

Previously your comments were:
- Suitable for low rise development
- Suitable for large ice-skating rink complex
- Keep as open or green space
- Hollington Park Road is already too busy
Site reference: A16

Figure 25: Location plan for A16

Site address: Seaside Road, West St Leonards

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 2.22ha

Possible net capacity: 120

Assessment summary: This site is identified for mixed development including housing in the existing Local Plan. This is a vacant brownfield site with and is part of the wider West Marina redevelopment area - which is an area of vacant and under used land the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The West Marina Masterplan indicated that this site could support 120 housing units as part of a mix of commercial and residential units. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for a mix of uses including residential development with an indicative capacity of 120 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Indicative capacity too dense
- Develop as seaside garden & open space
- Retain for leisure/recreation use
- Reallocate as part of South Saxon wetland
- Develop site as ice skating complex
- Community use
Site reference: A29

Site address: West St Leonards Primary School

Suggested use: Residential and community use

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 3.92ha gross area, 1.85ha residential area, 0.9ha community centre area

Possible net capacity: 70

Assessment summary: This site is identified for mixed development including housing in the existing Local Plan. This is a vacant site and is part of the wider West Marina redevelopment area - which is an area of vacant and under used land the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The West Marina Masterplan indicated that this site could support 120 housing units as part of a mix of commercial and residential units. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for a mix of uses including residential development with an indicative capacity of 70 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Reduce size of housing site & enlarge nature area
- Reallocate as part of South Saxon wetland
- Flood risk
- Traffic congestion
- Loss of green space/part of South Saxons wetlands
- Housing should be set back from the road
Site reference: D34

![Figure 27: Location plan for D34](image)

**Site address:** 190 Bexhill Road

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Full planning permission

**Area:** 0.19ha

**Possible net capacity:** 32

**Assessment summary:** This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 32 units

**Previously your comments were:** None
Site reference: D43

Figure 28: Location plan for D43

Site address: St Ethelburga’s Church Hall

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.08ha

Possible net capacity: 7

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 7 units

Previously your comments were: None
Site reference: B01

Site address: Bulverhythe Development Area

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 4.28ha

Possible net capacity: 100

Assessment summary: There are 2 parcels of land that may be available for redevelopment during the Plan period. Both parcels are low lying, relatively flat and protected from tidal flooding by a series of sea defences. Some land assembly and relocation of existing uses may be required. The 2 parcels of land may be suitable for a mixed use redevelopment, including commercial and residential uses. Together, both parcels could accommodate 100 dwellings units with commercial floorspace. Our preference would be to allocate both parcels for mixed development comprising residential and commercial development.

Previously your comments were:
- Not suitable for high density development
- Flood risk
- Could be considered for allotments
Site reference: B13

Site address: Cinque Ports Way, Stamco timber & TA Centre

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.89ha

Possible net capacity: 54

Assessment summary: This area has redevelopment potential for a mix of uses including residential. The site is potentially part of the West Marina redevelopment - an area of vacant and under used land the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The West Marina Masterplan indicated that this site could support 54 housing units as part of a mix of commercial and residential units

Previously your comments were:
- The site should be allocated for mixed use
- Primarily retail to form the commercial core of the West Marina regeneration area
- Flood risk?
- More suited to leisure/cultural uses to compliment surrounding uses
- Sea level rises need to be considered
- Traffic problems
- Indicative capacity too high
Site reference: B14

Site address: Former Hastings College, St Saviours Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full Planning permission

Area: 1.05ha

Possible net capacity: 44

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 44 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Suitable for low rise development, support the delivery of mix of housing in this sustainable location
- Indicative capacity too high
Site reference: N02

Site address: Land South of Crowhurst Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.84ha

Possible net capacity: 20

Assessment summary: This greenfield site is raised and mostly level, it could be suitable for development including residential development. The site is heavily screened by a strong hedge & tree boundary and lies above the B2092 (Queensway). This site is relatively isolated in terms of access to local facilities and higher density development would not therefore be appropriate. The site is currently outside of the built-up area boundary which normally means there is a presumption against residential development. The Development Management Plan offers an opportunity to reappraise the built-up area boundary at this location, however any amendment to the built-up would need to be robustly justified. Based on density of 25 dwellings per hectare this site has a potential capacity of c.20 units. The site is put forward for comment and reaction. The Council is not making a recommendation at this time.
Site reference: N03

Site address: The Grove School

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 9.4ha

Possible net capacity: 240

Assessment summary: Given the changes currently taking place in secondary education in Hastings, it is possible the site will become available for development during the Plan period to 2028. The site is included in the consultation for this reason. Should the school site become surplus to requirement, our preferred use would be for housing. However, this is a large site which would require a full planning assessment if it were to become available for development during the Local Plan period. The total site area included the woodland in the south-west corner of the site is 9.4Ha. It is assumed the wooded area would not form part of any redevelopment. If redevelop included the school playing fields the total site area available for development is 8.1Ha. If a density of 30 dwellings per hectare is assumed the site could be capable of delivering c.240 units. The capacity would be significantly less if the playing fields were retained and/or other constraints were identified. The site is put forward for comment and reaction. The Council is not making a recommendation at this time.
St Helen’s (Planning Focus Area 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A28</td>
<td>Land at Osborne House, The Ridge</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D40</td>
<td>191 The Ridge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D41</td>
<td>195 The Ridge</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C02</td>
<td>Mount Denys, Pinehill &amp; Ridgeway</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A47</td>
<td>Rear of Linley Drive</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A21</td>
<td>Hurst Court, The Ridge</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C03</td>
<td>Old Roar House, Old Roar Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>Outline planning permission – see proforma in Planning Focus Area 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N04</td>
<td>Land adjacent to Sandrock Park, The Ridge</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td>Part allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (playing field)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 4
Figure PFA4: Map of St Helen’s focus area
Site reference: A28

Figure 34: Location plan for A28

**Site address:** Land at Osborne House, The Ridge

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

**Area:** 2.95ha

**Possible net capacity:** 55

**Assessment summary:** This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. A planning proposal involving the redevelopment of the site has been approved subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to continue to allocate this site for mixed use including residential development with an indicative site capacity of 55 units.

**Previously your comments were:**
None
Site reference: D40

Figure 35: Location plan for D40

Site address: 191 The Ridge

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.15ha

Possible net capacity: 7

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 7 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D41

Figure 36: Location plan for D41

Site address: 195 The Ridge

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.26ha

Possible net capacity: 14

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through a current outline planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 14 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: C02

Figure 37: Location plan for C02

Site address: Mount Denys, Pinehill & Ridgeway

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.64ha

Possible net capacity: 31

Assessment summary: These buildings are currently used by East Sussex County Council Social Services, and may become vacant during the Plan period, when the services provided here are transferred to a new location and purpose built development further along The Ridge. Should this site be vacated, our preference would be for the site to be redeveloped for residential development. Given the existing character of the surrounding area, the site is suitable for a high density development with a suggested capacity of c.30 dwellings.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A47

Site address: Rear of Linley Drive

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.32ha

Possible net capacity: 15

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 15 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A21

Site address: Hurst Court, The Ridge

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 1.44ha

Possible net capacity: 40

Assessment summary: This site is allocated in the existing Local Plan for residential development. Wildlife and tree cover are likely to affect the developable area of the site. Providing these important issues can satisfactorily addressed, the site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing development with an indicative capacity of c.40 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: N04

Site address: Land adjacent to Sandrock Park, The Ridge

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Part allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (playing field)

Area: 2.74ha

Possible net capacity: 80

Assessment summary: This flat triangular site lies directly to the south of The Ridge. The western part of the site is unused and the eastern part is a playing field which is under used. There is a tree screen along the frontage with The Ridge. The existing boundary trees are the most significant landscape characteristic of the area, and would need to be managed as part of any development. Retention & management of the existing trees and hedges would be the primary means of mitigation. However, a new access would be required at the western end of the site which is likely to take all of the tree screening fronting The Ridge. The site is currently outside of the built-up area boundary which normally means there is a presumption against residential development. The Development Management Plan offers an opportunity to reappraise the built-up area boundary at this location, however any amendment to the built-up boundary would need to be robustly justified. Although it is on the edge of the urban area, the site is reasonably to close facilities. If a density of 30 dwellings per hectare is assumed the site is capable of delivering c.80 dwellings. The site is put forward for comment and reaction. The Council is not making a recommendation at this time.
Silverhill & Alexandra Park (Planning Focus Area 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C04</td>
<td>Horntye Park</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A19</td>
<td>12-19 Braybrooke Terrace</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Part allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A33</td>
<td>Hollingsworth Garage, Braybrooke Road</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D20</td>
<td>The Langham Hotel, 16 Elphinstone Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D30</td>
<td>Silver Springs Medical Practice, Beaufort Road</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Outline planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D32</td>
<td>347-349 London Road</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Lapsed planning permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 5
Figure PFA5: Map of Silverhill and Alexandra Park focus area
Site reference: C04

Site address: Horntye Park

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.87ha

Possible net capacity: 109

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 109 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Over development
- Grassy area around law courts is useless for biodiversity & could be allocated for new allotments or community gardening
Site reference: A19

Figure 42: Location plan for A19

Site address: 12-19 Braybrooke Terrace

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Part allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (lapsed planning permission)

Area: 0.23ha

Possible net capacity: 25

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. An earlier planning permission has now lapsed, and there is now the potential to increase the site area and it is likely to be able to accommodate more units than it was originally allocated for. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site plus the additional land for housing with an indicative capacity of 25 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Houses not flats
- Need a commitment to facilities for voluntary & community groups in the town centre
Site reference: A33

Figure 43: Location plan for A33

Site address: Hollingsworth Garage, Braybrooke Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.40ha

Possible net capacity: 56

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 56 units.

Previously your comments were:
• Not suitable for high density development
• Gross over development
Site reference: D20

Site address: The Langham Hotel, 16 Elphinstone Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.05ha

Possible net capacity: 9

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 9 units.

Previously your comments were: None
Site reference: D30

Figure 45: Location plan for D30

Site address: Silver Springs Medical Practice, Beaufort Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission

Area: 0.12ha

Possible net capacity: 9

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through a current outline planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 9 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D32

Site address: 347-349 London Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Lapsed planning permission

Area: 0.15ha

Possible net capacity: 22

Assessment summary: Although planning permission for residential development has recently lapsed on this site, the site's suitability for residential development has been established. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 22 units.

Previously your comments were: None
### Maze Hill & Burtons’ St Leonards (Planning Focus Area 6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D18</td>
<td>49-52 Caves Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Lapsed planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D51</td>
<td>36-40 Caves Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D21</td>
<td>27 Dane Road</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D53</td>
<td>37 Charles Road West, Filsham Nurseries</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A32</td>
<td>Gambier House, West Hill Road</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B24</td>
<td>West Hill Road Reservoir</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B02</td>
<td>Former Hastings College, Archery Road</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>Current application undetermined</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11:** Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 12:** Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 6
Figure PFA6: Map of Maze Hill and Burtons’ St Leonards focus area
Site reference: D18

![Location plan for D18](image)

**Figure 47: Location plan for D18**

**Site address:** 49-52 Caves Road

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Lapsed planning permission

**Area:** 0.06ha

**Possible net capacity:** 6

**Assessment summary:** Although planning permission for residential development has recently lapsed on this site, the site’s suitability for residential development has been established. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 6 units.

**Previously your comments were:** None
Site reference: D51

Figure 48: Location plan for D51

Site address: 36-40 Caves Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.04ha

Possible net capacity: 6

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 6 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D21

Site address: 27 Dane Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.14ha

Possible net capacity: 11

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 11 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D53

Site address: 37 Charles Road West (Filsham Nurseries)

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.26ha

Possible net capacity: 9

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 9 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A32

Site address: Gambier House, West Hill Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.23ha

Possible net capacity: 15

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The existing buildings are to be vacated by the current occupier - the NHS. Marketing as to the site's availability took place in July 2011. The site is located within a Conservation Area. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 15 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B24

Site address: West Hill Road Reservoir

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.19ha

Possible net capacity: 14

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 14 units.

Previously your comments were:
- James Burton history that should be preserved
Site reference: B02

Site address: Former Hastings College, Archery Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Planning application submitted – currently undetermined

Area: 2.22ha

Possible net capacity: 155

Assessment summary: Owing to the relocation of the former occupier, this site is now available for redevelopment. As a brownfield site in an established residential area, our preference is for the site to be redeveloped for residential use. Redevelopment will remove the existing redundant buildings and will provide the opportunity to convert the listed building and introduce a new use for the remainder of the site. In terms of the volume and form of future development, key factors that need to be taken into account in any redevelopment proposals is the relationship to the terrace of listed buildings within the site and the site's location within St Leonard's West Conservation Area. The current proposals for the site which are under consideration are for the development of 155 residential units.

Previously your comments were:
- Support delivery of a mix of housing
- Too dense, over development
- Within a conservation area
- Current proposals not in keeping with existing
- Needs sensitive development
• Developments should include provision of allotments or community gardening
• Flats not wanted
• Reallocate all or part as green/open space
### Central St Leonards & Bohemia (Planning Focus Area 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A20</td>
<td>Taxi office/B.R. Social Club, St Johns Road</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B06</td>
<td>Crystal Square</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B12</td>
<td>1-3 Chapel Park Road</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B31</td>
<td>College of Holy Child Jesus, Magdalen Road</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>Planning application undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D08</td>
<td>Sorting Office site, Kings Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D14</td>
<td>4-5 Stockleigh Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 7
Figure PFA7: Map of Central St Leonards and Bohemia focus area
Site reference: A20

![Location plan for A20](image)

**Site address:** Taxi Office/B.R. Social Club, St Johns Road

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

**Area:** 0.12ha

**Possible net capacity:** 30

**Assessment summary:** This site is allocated in the existing Local Plan for mixed use development, with commercial uses on the ground floor and residential above. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing with an indicative capacity of 30 units.

**Previously your comments were:** None
Site reference: B06

Site address: Crystal Square and Western Road

Suggested use: Mixed use

Planning status: None

Area: 0.47ha

Possible net capacity: 60

Assessment summary: This site, which is centred on Crystal Square car park, offers the largest potential regeneration opportunity in the locality and was included within the Central St Leonards Regeneration Framework. The site is capable of accommodating a mixed use development based on housing and retail with the possible inclusion of business and leisure uses. Amongst other factors, the volume and form of development will need to take into account the site's location with a Conservation Area. Because land acquisition would be involved in the development of this site, its development is likely to be in the later part of the Plan period. A capacity of 60 residential units is suggested as part of a mixed use scheme.

Previously your comments were:
• Area already densely developed
• Finance should be sought for multi-storey car park
• Question multi-storey flatted development – are flats needed here?
• Loss of car parking area
• The loss of the Adams & Jarrett warehouse – the shop could not operate without it
Site reference: B12

Site address: 1-3 Chapel Park Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.13ha

Possible net capacity: 27

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 27 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B31

Site address: College of Holy Child Jesus, Magdalen Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Planning application submitted currently undetermined

Area: 4.91ha

Possible net capacity:

Assessment summary: The current owner may vacate and dispose of this site, which over recent years has used as a summer language school. The site includes a number of listed buildings and allowing these buildings to become vacant and unused in the future represents a wasted resource and a concern to the Council. A viable use needs to be found for these buildings some of which are deteriorating. In an established residential area, our preference would be to see as many of the historically important buildings as possible converted and re-used. It is important that any development of the site will need to be linked to securing the restoration and long term future of the historic buildings potentially through an enabling development. Current proposals for the site are under consideration, they are for the restoration & conversion of the Gothic Building, 'Gate Lodge' & former 'Convent Building' to residential use comprising 32 dwellings & associated parking areas and the demolition of the west wing & laundry building. The proposals also include development of 165 new residential units with associated parking areas, giving a total net residential build 197, and also include the restoration of the Chapel, landscaping and the creation of new access. An amended scheme is likely to be submitted by
February 2012 which will be the subject of further public consultation before the application is determined.

Previously your comments were:
- Building blocks of flats with parking spaces neither preserves or enhances area
- Why is this no longer greenspace?
- Development will ruin the Conservation Area
- Mini university campus should be here
- This should all be greenspace
- Too many flats without gardens
- Some land should be given over to allotments
- Higher indicative capacity at public exhibition
- Question the delivery of 160 units here with listed building and Conservation Area constraints
- Breach of para 2.7 of HBC’s own designation
- Inappropriate use of site
- Take care not to destroy
- Over development must be avoided on this site
Site reference: D08

Site address: Sorting Office site, Kings Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.05ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 8 units.

Previously your comments were: None
Site reference: D14

Figure 59: Location plan for D14

**Site address:** 4-5 Stockleigh Road

**Suggested use:** Residential

**Planning status:** Full planning permission

**Area:** 0.03ha

**Possible net capacity:** 12

**Assessment summary:** This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 12 units.

**Previously your comments were:**
None
### Hastings Town Centre (Planning Focus Area 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A14</td>
<td>Hastings Station Yard (part)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A15</td>
<td>The Observer Building (part)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A43</td>
<td>Cornwallis Street Car Park</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C06</td>
<td>Braybrooke House, Holmesdale Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C07</td>
<td>Westwood House, Holmesdale Gardens</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D50</td>
<td>40 &amp; 41 Wellington Square</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D52</td>
<td>36 &amp; 37 Wellington Square</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 15: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E12</td>
<td>Priory Quarter, Havelock Road</td>
<td>21,700</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>New allocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 8**
Figure PFA8: Map of Hastings Town Centre focus area
Site reference: A14

Figure 60: Location plan for A14

**Site address:** Hastings Station Yard (part)

**Suggested use:** Mixed use

**Planning status:** Full planning permission

**Area:** 0.44ha

**Possible net capacity:** 103

**Assessment summary:** This site majority of this site has already been redevelopment educational and health care purposes and includes a small retail element. Part of the site is yet to be redeveloped and has planning permission for 103 units. This remaining part of the site continues to be suitable for residential use but may also be suited to mixed use scheme including residential. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for mixed development with an indicative capacity of 103 units for residential use.

**Previously your comments were:**
None
Site address: The Observer Building

Suggested use: Mixed use

Planning status: Full planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.07ha

Possible net capacity: 39

Assessment summary: This vacant multi-storey building is allocated for mixed use development including residential use in the existing Local Plan. A planning proposal involving the redevelopment of the site has been approved subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to continue to allocate this site for mixed use including residential development with an indicative site capacity of 39 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A43

Site address: Cornwallis Street car park

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.22ha

Possible net capacity: 10

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The site remains suitable for residential development. Our preference is to continue allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 10 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Incorporate green/open space/play area
- Over development
Site reference: C06

Figure 63: Location plan for C06

Site address: Braybrooke House, Holmesdale Gardens

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.09ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: Braybrooke House and the neighbouring property of Westwood House are to be vacated by the current occupier - the NHS. Both properties were marketed in July 2011. Both properties are located within a Conservation Area. Braybrooke House is in close proximity to Hastings town centre and our preference is that the site should become residential in the future. An estimated capacity of 8 residential units is based on the conversion of the current building.

Previously your comments were:
- This should be a conversion
Site reference: C07

Site address: Westwood House, Holmesdale Gardens

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.43ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: Westwood House and the neighbouring property of Braybrooke House are to be vacated by the current occupier - the NHS. Both properties were marketed in July 2011. Both properties are located within a Conservation Area. Westwood House is in close proximity to Hastings town centre and our preference is that the site should become residential in the future. An estimated capacity of 8 residential units is based on the conversion of the current building.

Previously your comments were:
• This should be a conversion
Site reference: D50

Site address: 40 & 41 Wellington Square

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.02ha

Possible net capacity: 12

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 12 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D52

Figure 66: Location plan for D52

Site address: 36 & 37 Wellington Square

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.02ha

Possible net capacity: 12

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 12 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E12

Site address: Priory Quarter, Havelock Road

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: New allocation.

Area: 2.6ha

Possible net capacity: 21,700m²

Assessment summary: Although this site is not currently allocated in the adopted Hastings Local Plan 2004, it forms the remainder of what is known as Priory Quarter. An informal masterplanning framework was prepared in 2004/5 and followed up with an outline planning application in 2006/7 which the Council’s Planning Committee resolved to grant consent for (although it was subject to a section 106 agreement which has not been completed). The outline consent was for a large scale mixed development of offices, education, retail and leisure. A significant part of the proposal was subsequently implemented through separate planning consents and now forms the core of the town centre’s business and higher education quarter. All this was done as part of the major regeneration initiative led by the Hastings and Bexhill Task Force.

The proposed allocation represents the remaining part of Priory Quarter available for redevelopment and is expected to be implemented during the period of the new Plan.

Previously your comments were:
None
### Old Town (Planning Focus Area 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 9
Figure PFA9: Map of Old Town focus area
### West Hill (Planning Focus Area 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 19: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 20: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 10**
Figure PFA10: Map of West Hill focus area
## Hillcrest & Ore Valley (Planning Focus Area 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A18</td>
<td>Ore Valley</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A23</td>
<td>Former Stills Factory (part)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B08</td>
<td>The Cheviots/Cotswold Close</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C05</td>
<td>2-20 (evens) Fellows Road</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26 (was C09)</td>
<td>5-15 (odds) Fellows Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>Outline planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B49 (was B34)</td>
<td>Upper Broomgrove Road</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D28</td>
<td>107 The Ridge (Simes &amp; Sons)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>Outline planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A02</td>
<td>Mount Pleasant Hospital, Frederick Road</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B09</td>
<td>87-221 (odds) Farley Bank</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D57</td>
<td>Ore Business Park, Farley Bank</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E10</td>
<td>Ivyhouse Lane, northern extension</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E11</td>
<td>Land east of Burgess Road, Ivyhouse</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>Allocated in Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 11
Figure PFA11: Map of Hillcrest and Ore Valley focus area
Site reference: A18

Figure 68: Location plan for A18

Site address: Ore Valley

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 2.35ha

Possible net capacity: 50

Assessment summary: This site is identified for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The site forms part of wider area of neglected and redundant land known as Ore Valley, the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The introduction of new housing to this area is see as being both beneficial the immediate locality and the town as a whole. Ore Valley was to be redeveloped as part of the millennium community programme, and the original outline planning permission included housing, together with commercial, retail and higher education facilities. The first phase of this scheme is now nearing completion. Nationally the millennium communities’ programme has now ended. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for residential development as part of the wider Ore Valley redevelopment area. The site has an indicative capacity of 50 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A23

Figure 69: Location plan for A23

Site address: Former Stills Factory, Ore Valley

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 2.71ha

Possible net capacity: 75

Assessment summary: This site is identified for mixed development in the existing Local Plan. The site forms part of wider area of neglected and redundant land known as Ore Valley, the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The introduction of new housing to this area is see as being both beneficial the immediate locality and the town as a whole. Ore Valley was to be redeveloped as part of the millennium community programme, and the original outline planning permission included housing, together with commercial, retail and higher education facilities. The first phase of this scheme is now nearing completion. Nationally the millennium communities’ programme has now ended. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for residential development as part of the wider Ore Valley redevelopment area. The site has an indicative capacity of 75 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B08

Figure 70: Location plan for B08

Site address: The Cheviots/Cotswold Close

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 1.23ha

Possible net capacity: 63

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 63 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: C05

Site address: 2-20 (evens) Fellows Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.27ha

Possible net capacity: 17

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 17 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: C26 (previously C09)

Site address: 5-15 (odds) Fellows Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.10ha

Possible net capacity: 12

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through a current outline planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 12 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B49 (formerly B34)

Site address: Upper Broomgrove Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.29ha

Possible net capacity: 12

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through a current outline planning permission. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 12 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D28

Site address: 107 The Ridge (Simes & Sons)

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Outline planning permission

Area: 0.22ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 8 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A02

Figure 75: Location plan for A02

Site address: Former Mount Pleasant Hospital, Frederick Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 1.84ha

Possible net capacity: 8

Assessment summary: This site is identified for residential development in the existing Local Plan. The site forms part of wider area of neglected and redundant land known as Ore Valley, the regeneration of which has been a long term objective of the Council. The introduction of new housing to this area is see as being both beneficial the immediate locality and the town as a whole. Ore Valley was to be redeveloped as part of the millennium community programme, and the original outline planning permission included housing, together with commercial, retail and higher education facilities. The first phase of this scheme is now nearing completion. Nationally the millennium communities’ programme has now ended. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for residential development as part of the wider Ore Valley redevelopment area. The site has an indicative capacity of 40 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: B09

Site address: 87-221 (odds) Farley Bank

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission subject to a legal agreement

Area: 0.73ha

Possible net capacity: 44

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 44 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D57

Figure 77: Location plan for D57

Site address: Ore Business Park, Farley Bank

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: None

Area: 0.70ha

Possible net capacity: 37

Assessment summary: This site has full planning permission for residential development. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 37 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E10

Site address: Ivyhouse Lane, northern extension

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 5.8ha

Possible net capacity: 10,000m²

Assessment summary: Located on the northern edge of the town, with views over the surrounding countryside. This site would form a natural extension to the Ivyhouse Employment Area. The site falls within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but this was taken into account in allocating the site for development in the 2004 Plan.

A green lane runs across the site and is a constraint that would need to be taken into account in any development. The site is suitable for a range of small and medium units. The access to the site through the older Ivyhouse industrial area means that the site is unlikely to be suited to a prestige development but other parts of the Ivyhouse area have been developed independently in recent years and provides medium quality business space that makes a useful contribution to the town's stock.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: E11

Figure 79: Location plan for E11

Site address: Land East of Burgess Road, Ivyhouse

Suggested use: Employment

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.4ha

Possible net capacity: 1,400m²

Assessment summary: This site would form an extension to the Ivyhouse Employment Area. The site falls within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty but this was taken into account in allocating the site for development in the 2004 Plan. The site is suitable for a range of small and medium units. The access to the site through the older Ivyhouse industrial area means that the site is unlikely to be suited to a prestige development but other parts of the Ivyhouse area have been developed independently in recent years and provides medium quality business space that makes a useful contribution to the town’s stock.

Previously your comments were: None
### Clive Vale & Ore Village (Planning Focus Area 12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D26</td>
<td>Hare &amp; Hounds, 391 Old London Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Lapsed planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D35</td>
<td>309-311 Harold Road</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Full planning permission subject to legal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A01</td>
<td>Upper Ore Valley</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3.17 area with permission for 0.96, remainder 2.20</td>
<td>Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004 (full planning permission on part of the site)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A24</td>
<td>Land west of Frederick Road</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>Full planning permission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A30</td>
<td>Rear of Old London Road</td>
<td>See A01</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 23: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 12**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 24: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 12**
Figure PFA12: Map of Clive Vale and Ore Village focus area
Site reference: D26

Site address: Hare & Hounds, 391 Old London Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Lapsed planning permission

Area: 0.04ha

Possible net capacity: 6

Assessment summary: Although planning permission for residential development has recently lapsed on this site, the site’s suitability for residential development has been established. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative capacity of 6 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: D35

Figure 81: Location plan for D35

Site address: 309-311 Harold Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission subject to legal agreement

Area: 0.09ha

Possible net capacity: 6

Assessment summary: The suitability of developing this site for housing has been established through an earlier resolution by the Planning Committee to approve a planning application subject to a legal agreement. Our preference would be to allocate this site for residential development with an indicative site capacity of 6 units.

Previously your comments were:
None
Site reference: A01

Site address: Upper Ore Valley

Suggested use: residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004, with full planning permission on part of the site

Area: 3.17ha

Possible net capacity: 151

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan and currently has planning permission for residential development on part of the site. Vehicular access to the southern portion of the site, which is expected to be from the northern portion of the site, will need to be resolved before development can go ahead. There has been developer interest in the whole site, including the southern portion including. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing, which could include the land indicated in A30, with an indicative capacity of 151 units.

Previously your comments were:
- Designate as green/open space
- Should be kept as green space
- Woodland should be protected & added to the greenspace strategy
- Environmental value shouldn’t be lost
- Too many owners
- Surface water capture
• Steeply sloping sides – too impractical to develop
• Conflicts with policy restrictions
• Not suitable for development
• The area behind Old London Road is not practically developable due to ESCC Highways restrictions
• Poor road links & infrastructure issues in this area
Site reference: A24

Site address: Land west of Frederick Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Full planning permission

Area: 0.60

Possible net capacity: 29

Assessment summary: This site is allocated for residential development in the existing Local Plan and currently has planning permission for residential development. Our preference is to continue to allocate this site for housing with an indicative net capacity of 29 units.

Previously your comments were: None
Site reference: A30

Site address: Rear of Old London Road

Suggested use: Residential

Planning status: Allocated in the Hastings Local Plan 2004

Area: 0.23

Possible net capacity: See A01

Assessment summary: See summary at A01

Previously your comments were:
- Retain as green space
- Traffic access difficulties
### Hastings Country Park (Planning Focus Area 13)

**Table 25: Possible net number of dwellings on sites in Focus Area 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Possible net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 26: Potential gross employment floorspace on sites in Focus Area 13**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Potential gross floorspace (m²)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure PFA13: Map of Hastings Country Park focus area
Sites under construction

A number of housing sites which aren’t shown in this consultation document are currently under construction. It is expected that these sites will be completed in the short term, although some schemes are far closer to completion than others. These schemes will count towards meeting the housing target figure of 3,400 new homes by 2028. Because the Plan period runs from 2011 to 2028, all schemes that have been completed since April 2011 count towards the target figure of 3,400.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site reference</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Net number of dwellings</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Planning status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Area 2: Greater Hollington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A10</td>
<td>Mayfield Heights, Mayfield Lane</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>Under construction, part completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D27</td>
<td>Land rear of 20 Wartling Close</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Area 3: Filsham &amp; Bulverhythe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A13</td>
<td>Land adjoining 73 Filsham Rd</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A05</td>
<td>Former Malmesbury House, West Hill Road</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>Certificate of lawfulness confirms a start has been made on this site. However not currently active.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B07</td>
<td>Land at Fern Road</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>Certificate of lawfulness confirms a start has been made on this site. More recently a new planning permission has been allowed on appeal but the site is also the subject of a town or village green application. A public inquiry was held which concluded on 26 January 2012 and the outcome is awaited. Currently there is no certainty that this site will be developed but it remains a possibility at this time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Focus Area 5: Silverhill &amp; Alexandra Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D29</td>
<td>Land off Robert Tressell close</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D37</td>
<td>land rear of 1-9 Amherst Rd</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site reference</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Net number of dwellings</td>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>Planning status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 6: Maze Hill &amp; Burton’s St Leonards</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D46</td>
<td>Land at Undercliffe</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>Start on site not currently active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 7: Central St Leonards &amp; Bohemia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D05</td>
<td>rear of 22-24 King’s Road</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 9: Old Town</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D10</td>
<td>The Tan House &amp; Ice House, 24 Rock-a-nore</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 10: West Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A03</td>
<td>101 Castle Hill Road</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Start on site not currently active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 11: Hillcrest &amp; Ore Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A06</td>
<td>land north of Priory Road</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>Under construction, part completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A17</td>
<td>land at the corner of Hughenden Rd &amp; Parker Rd, Ore Valley Phase 1A</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D38</td>
<td>141 The Ridge</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Area 12: Clive Vale &amp; Ore Valley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A25</td>
<td>Land at Hawthorn Rd</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>Under construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D47</td>
<td>Land at 2 Tilekiln Lane</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Start on site not currently active</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Sites under construction
Appendix A – Potential areas for allocations
Appendix B – Protective designations and allocations