

Proposed 30 dwellings land south west of Strand Meadow/Watercress Field

Summary of comments

Following a presentation by the developer's new architects to the Parish Council planning committee in December 2019 a public consultation was held in the Burwash Parish Rooms on January 8 2020. The architects were present to answer questions.

The presentation consisted of 4 boards with images and their pre-application enquiry supporting statement. A computer presentation shown at the planning committee that allowed a more rounded view of the proposal was only shown to Councillor and Mrs Barnes. A number of people commented that the boards did not represent accurately the slope on the site.

46 people attended the session.

With the architects permission the boards were retained to facilitate three further public consultation sessions including on Saturday morning to allow all those interested to attend.

A further 32 people attended, 78 in total.

No one directly from the developer attended any of these meetings. Therefore some issues raised were not dealt with.

Both the parish council and the architects had drafted feedback forms. The parish council and the architects agreed to share all consultation forms. 68 scanned forms have been received and forwarded by Burwash Parish Council to the architects.

Three of the forms held the same response on different forms. So the comments have been measured out of 65. Where percentages have been used they have been rounded up or down to the nearest whole number.

Notes on consultation response

The largest single issue noted by 45 people - 69% was that there was no affordable or social housing in the draft proposals. The Housing research and extensive consultations completed for the neighbourhood development plan clearly showed that local housing need is for affordable family homes for young families working locally and retired and older people wishing to downsize.

Access concerns were raised 30 by people– 46%. This included the steepness of the proposed footpath up to the village services particularly for older disabled and families with prams or young children. The pre- application enquiry supporting statement implies that the footpath will link to the recreation ground but to date there has been no agreement on this (the exact opposite if anything). Despite the addition of a longer less steep path accessibility to village services by any method other than car would be extremely challenging and unlikely for many people.

28 people – 43% were concerned that there were too many units on the site. Many referred back to the original number of 17 as a more suitable density for the site.

While 18 responses - 28% thought the housing design had improved since the previous application, there was concern about the overly urban design (16 people – 25%) and that it didn't meet High Weald Unit design guide. 10 people raised the impact on AONB – 15%

34 people – 52% thought the site unsuitable. This was mainly due to its steepness and wetness. The various springs that appear in different locations was mentioned as a distinct feature of this site.

29 people -45% raised concern about traffic issues. The largest concern was the impact on Strand Meadow where currently dustcarts and emergency vehicles already have trouble gaining access. 2 people raised concerns about access to the site in particular.

21 people – 32% were concerned about the traffic impact on Shrub Lane and the junction with A 265 which is problematic already. The bus which is important to sustainability sometimes cannot come down to the Stand Meadow bus stop.

15 people – 23% raised concerns about parking. Parking both on the development and the impact of extra vehicles on parts of the village was a concern. 4 people also raised the increased traffic and pollution the development would produce. One person questioned why there was no traffic assessment.

19 people – 29% were concerned about the pressure on the local infrastructure, the school and the surgery.

2 people liked the retained trees on the site. 2 people just said they were against the proposal. 2 people were concerned about insufficient light. 3 said there should be more use of alternative energy. 1 said there was Japanese knotweed on the site 1 person thought there was scope for a children's play area.

2 people were for the proposal. 63 raised significant concerns to be addressed.

Nick Moore
17/2/2020