

TIC0008 Representation comments

Site is outside the defined development boundary for Flimwell & contravenes policies (National Framework doc, Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan). No special circumstances here/at this location in which development in NL/green belt is appropriate. Proposal is inconsistent with the local & national plan to protect NLs & directly contradicts the objectives set out to protect NLs, in direct conflict with policy OSSB4 (iii).

No walkability to local amenities (doctors, schools, dentist etc). Poor public transport links, which would have to be accessed by walking next to extremely fast & dangerous road. Narrow & in some areas impassable pavements on the roadside. Recent pedestrian fatality on the road. Recent child cyclist knocked off by lorry adjacent to plot. Excessive speeds/speeding of over 50mph are reached by passing traffic. It is not suitable for vehicles to safely access/egress the plot. Additionally, fast travelling LGVs and HGVs would struggle or fail to stop in adequate time for vehicles pulling in/out onto the road from the site as the visibility is poor for both the site and the road users. Accessibility to amenities is required by car. Would cause increased traffic congestion on already struggling road network. Significant amount of traffic, which starts at the traffic lights & builds up past the plot daily during peak times (developing this site would only present more traffic). Inherently poor vehicular visibility egressing plot (esp. to the east) which is very dangerous & a precursor for a serious RTC.

Blanket tree preservation order in place, recent destruction of the ancient hedgerow, destruction of ancient trees & destruction of home to wildlife - without planning permission & with catastrophic consequence to the environment. Enforcement notice in place for occupants to vacate the plot & return it back to its woodland state. Breach of planning (ESCC) for carpark style ramp access from highway into the plot. Vast non permeable hardstanding created without planning, causing further flooding/drainage issues - significant increase in water run off and flooding to road, adjacent houses and Flimwell park. The water & sewage infrastructure issues along this road are constant. SE Water aware. Weekly pump outs in the wetter months to help stop road flooding & flooding at Flimwell park. Surrounding land is notoriously boggy. RDCs enforcement notice to vacate plot & return it back to its natural, woodland green gap habitat which it was before should be upheld. The precedent to buy up woodland, unlawfully clear it and then set up permanent residence without planning consent & against issued enforcement to leave is improper & unjust.

Development here is not in keeping with the character of the rural, scattered development style in which there are numerous green spaces along the road. These are important green gaps for wildlife, ecology, habitat, conservation, natural drainage and rural character. Developments should achieve biodiversity net gain as per 1.5.2024 NPPF directive. Plot is adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site & abuts ancient woodland, which made up the woodland on this plot before deforestation started. It contains Priority Habitat. Surrounding area is home to a varied collection of wildlife (some of which are protected under the wildlife and countryside Act 1981), inc. birds of prey, bats, slow worms, deer and great crested newts - all within 50m radius of the plot. Current works & occupation of this site has already seen biodiversity significantly threatened, further damage will occur if allowed. RDC enforcement notice to replant and reverse the unlawful destruction will be unable to be completed if development is allowed - it is

essential that ecology, environment & habitat is able to recover. NPPF section 15, paragraphs 180-186, which promotes conservation and enhancement of the natural environment is relevant.

Development will be visually uncharacteristic to adjacent historic grade two listed properties. Genuine concern for maintaining the character of these important properties, which have been nationally recognised. Buildings are listed under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 as amended for their special architectural and historic interest. Developing next door does not lend itself to protecting the visual interest of graded properties. Would result in an unacceptable visual & landscape impact. Dramatically & significantly affect the amenity of the adjoining properties.

Not suitable for safe or practical residential living. Has been refused residential development twice in recent years due to a number of safety and infrastructure concerns, as well as visually degrading the character of the historic grade two listed properties which stand adjacent. Again been refused residential development on appeal to Secretary of State this year, the report highlighting similar concerns & additional new concerns, deeming it inappropriate for residential status. Please review reasoning provided in these documents and apply same rationale to this proposal. This is clearly not a site for residential living or development of any kind.

Allowing such development would cause an urbanising effect & permanently destroy what should be & recently was dense woodland, which served as a green space and natural wooded habitat between scattered developments. It is better to have clearly allocated sites for development with good infrastructure rather than opening up any potential plot which conflicts with policy, already deemed unsuitable for housing, abuts historical buildings and is inherently unsafe. A site, as per the corresponding policies, should be selected which entirely fulfils the minimum criteria set out, is safe, practical & has a good local infrastructure to offer sustainability & support to its occupants. This site does not offer any of these things.