Reasons for comment:
All new developments must include a provision for renewable energy sources, though solar and geothermal solutions may be more appropriate than bio fuel or wind turbines. In addition to this any new builds should be as energy efficient as possible.
Core Strategy Summary Guide to the Issues and Options Consultation 2007 - Summary of Consultation Responses

Person ID 104325
Mr George Potter RIBA Chartered Architect

Reasons for comment:

Dear Sirs, Core Strategy - Areas Ref: 11e & 11d I cannot use the internet, so am e-mailing my observations on the possibility of proposed developments in Walshes Road and Jarvis Brook. I am and have been a resident in Western Road, Crowborough, since August 1971, and fully understand the need to create more homes now and for the future for the benefit not just of families moving into the area, but for the whole of Crowborough - we cannot allow our town to stagnate. I note with alarm, however, the scale of the proposals to provide a large number of houses in Areas 11d (between Alderbrook and Jarvis Brook) and 11e (south of Whitehill and Alderbrook). My main concerns are: 1. Traffic - the ever-present traffic problem in Western Road - - This is a residential road, with a primary school at one end and an industrial estate at the other. Young children (with carers and prams) walk along this road twice a day to and from school, and usually the pavements are restricted because of cars parked on them. (The parking of cars on the pavement is a necessity in order to allow the passage of lorries and buses, therefore the police turn a blind eye.) There are a few large vehicles which serve the industrial estate which cannot use Crowborough Hill because of the height restriction on the railway bridge, so have to use Western Road, Walshes Road Fermor Road, etc. However, Western Road is used as a short cut by most commercial vehicles to avoid Crowborough Town centre. In case you did not know, parts of this road are at a higher level than many of the private gardens, and the road is held up by a single-skin brick wall and all too often very large vehicles mount and drive along the pavement for many yards. - I would like to insist that a full traffic survey is carried out and the results published before the completion of the consultation process and any decision which would become irrevocable. I was informed that such a survey was carried out approximately 10 years ago and, frankly, none of the local residents believed the reported figures. We witness major traffic problems daily from approximately 7.30 am to 9.00 am and from about 3.30 pm to 6.30 pm. Throughout the day there are commercial and domestic vehicles driving well in excess of the legal limit (which is too high) for this road and extra traffic movements per day can only exacerbate an existing problem. - Please give serious consideration to creating a road link between Walshes Road and Farningham Road adjacent to the refuse depot. This (provided car parking in Farningham Road were to be banned) could accommodate far more traffic than Western Road and, with a traffic light system at the junction of Crowborough Hill and the railway bridge, a single lane controlled traffic movement under the railway bridge would benefit all traffic. Commercial vehicles could then be banned from Western Road and so restore its original residential purpose. - Finally, on the subject of traffic, the increased number of cars used to drop off/pick children of the Jarvis Brook school, would create unimaginable chaos. 2. Sewerage and surface water - - Your records will show that the sewerage system in this area is already overloaded and has been known to flood. Similarly, the surface water system is overstretched. This relies entirely on Jarvis Brook stream as the only watercourse in the area to provide an outlet for surface water and the borne detritus which blocks the watercourse. This is highlighted by the recent flooding of Farningham Road which was caused by the blocked culvert. Again, records will show that the properties at the western end of Western Road have been flooded in times of heavy downpour and we had to protect our own property by building and raising permanent walls to contain the stream. The recent downpour caused the water level came above even these defences. The additional output, both in foul and surface water will create major crises in both systems and, if the Council or County intend to permit these developments, these issues must be addressed IN ADVANCE of any development, not as a result. 3. Schools, doctors, other necessities and amenities - - Presumably with a large increase in families, sufficient infrastructure and amenities will also need to be provided - at whose cost? - the developers or the tax payers? 4. Countryside - - We live in a very beautiful part of Sussex and the Council has achieved a very good best to retain the beauty, but Jarvis Brook does not appear to have been treated in the same way as other parts of Crowborough. "You want an industrial estate?" - "That's OK, put it in Jarvis Brook!" You might like to take into consideration an observation I heard from a local estate agent given to prospective purchasers in this area ".... there is a suitable property, BUT it's in Jarvis Brook." I expect you are Agree
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thinking this reply is from a NIMBY, but really, this "backyard" cannot sustain any further development without serious thought to the traffic and other problems - because THEY ARE problems for the present residents who live along those roads which would be devastated by a large development. Yours faithfully Sally Potter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Wells</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106036</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Davies-Gilbert</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106068</td>
<td>Beachy Head Tourism</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Lamb</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106072</td>
<td>Surrey County Council</td>
<td>PURPOSE OF THIS DOCUMENT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beachy Head Tourism

I have two points. 1. Does Affordable Housing maintain existing Community Communities change due to a number of reasons and not just because house prices are high. Organisational change occurs whenever new people are introduced (come in / born into) or old ones leave or die. The loss of agricultural / rural jobs has seen a far greater loss of community spirit than any change in housing policy or market prices. A focus on creating jobs in rural communities will provide a far better way of life than introducing affordable houses. Potential sites with good transport links tend to encourage people to work outside of the local area so they can get better pay in the town and come back to the rural "community" in the evening - a position which replicates existing problems with villages being used as dormitories. I believe affordable housing uses three phrases which are unquantifiable "affordable, community and local". A greater emphasis on improving Nurses and Teachers wages, creating rural jobs in rural villages (tourism, environmental enhancement, education) would go far further to resolving some of the problems of high rural house prices. What is the impact of the increase in Buy to Let Properties on affordability? The first impact is probably an increase in first time house prices, but market forces have a wonderful way of balancing out over time and rents are close to being below the average mortgage repayment on a property. This discrepancy is greater in 3-5 bedroom houses. These rental properties provide value for money and are affordable for many. The increase in Landlords must have increased the choice for many, though society still has a role to play in stepping in when people fall into hard times. When considering "affordable housing" density, consideration should be given to areas and villages which have high percentages of rental property available to the market.

Surrey County Council have no concerns or objections to the Welden Core Strategy Issues and Options paper. We accept that the Spatial Objectives are unlikely to affect strategic planning within Surrey. We note that the Housing Delivery Options are not likely to impact on Surrey. Therefore, we also note from Table 15 Potential Infrastructure Requirements, that it is unlikely that major impact on infrastructure will be required on the Surrey side of the border, including the A22(T).
Reasons for comment:

- The environmental costs of producing wind turbines negate the possible benefit, and the visual/noise impact is far too great. Biomass schemes add CO2 to the atmosphere, which is counterproductive. Also, burning woodchips requires you to cut down trees. Solar schemes are conspicuous by their absence; solar roof panels on private dwellings would be far more desirable.

- Try mending the roads first. The state of the districts roads is a disgrace. How can we be expected to cycle when even a short trip will end up with a puncture and buckled wheel?

- Let's do away with this constraint and allow for development on a site by site review.

- Look at new settlements; let's not be NIMBYs.

- This is wrong. Clearly we need to use land wisely. However, there are many sites which would be ideal for small-scale building schemes and that have no farming use that are excluded from construction due to this sort of small-minded development policy.

- Lets allow more rural building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106114</td>
<td>Mr Lester</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106114 Mr Lester**

**Reasons for comment:**
But will the DIMBYs stop this again

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106114</td>
<td>Mr Lester</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106114 Mr Lester**

**Reasons for comment:**
The Council needs to change its village envelope scheme and look at all land individually

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106114</td>
<td>Mr Lester</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106114 Mr Lester**

**Reasons for comment:**
It is all right to ask for land owners comments but unless you are able to take a more flexible approach to planning what’s the point. If the Council insists on its village envelope scheme then we will never see the additional housing we need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106114</td>
<td>Mr Lester</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106114 Mr Lester**

**Reasons for comment:**
This will only work if each planning app is looked at on its merits and not under some village envelope scheme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106162</td>
<td>Mrs Cave</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106162 Mrs Cave**

**Reasons for comment:**
But we need to retain the development boundaries. We also need to consider carefully the road infrastructure as well as other local amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Your Views</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106162</td>
<td>Mrs Cave</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Part of Document paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Person ID 106162 Mrs Cave**

**Reasons for comment:**
These development boundaries protect our rural environment and should be retained. Without them, the area will lose its character. I already live in a village which has seen growth. Vandalism has increased and the infrastructure is stretched.
Core Strategy Summary Guide to the Issues and Options Consultation 2007 - Summary of Consultation Responses

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✔ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
I think Wadhurst has only limited growth potential. It has already suffered from the additional housing that has been built. Vandalism has increased and it is losing its village atmosphere. Better to look at smaller villages to reassess capability there, rather than turning the larger villages into towns Agree that Groombridge, given its proximity to T Wells has potential.

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  ✔ Agree  □ No Opinion  □ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
but why restrict to landowners and developers? In my view, the latter will push for building in places where local residents know that it is not sustainable

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  ✔ Agree  □ No Opinion  □ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
this seems right - although I would urge that 80% plus of the new buildings are carried out in the urban areas

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✔ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
wind turbines are too noisy and will ruin the local beauty, as they have done in the West Country

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✔ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
those living in towns do so because they prefer the urban life. the majority of the new building should be in these more urban areas - wheer the provision of additional support facilities (education, Drs etc, will be easier to achieve).

Person ID  Mrs Cave  Part of Document
106162       paragraph

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✔ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
before agreeing with this statement, some clarity is needed about what defines a 'small' development. Before ANY development is carried out on a greenfield site, local views and the impact on the environment must be taken into account
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Greig</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106196</td>
<td></td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for comment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historically hamlets have grown into villages and towns due to natural resources and communications. Artificial planning restrictions like rigid percentages (although beloved of those that espouse 'methodologies') have resulted in many of our villages being too small to support basic services (even a local pub). More flexibility is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Greig</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106196</td>
<td></td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for comment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many useful building plots available within the area that could usefully increase housing without spoiling the beauty of the countryside. Too rigid planning guidelines are counterproductive.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Greig</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106196</td>
<td></td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for comment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Such rigid boundaries serve only to prevent sensible development to take account of increasing housing needs. Let local councils make decisions based upon local need and opinion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Greig</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106196</td>
<td></td>
<td>paragraph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for comment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the past the planning staff have been guided by far too rigid guidelines and I suggest that in future each case is dealt with on its merit, perhaps with a weighting depending upon whether a site is obviously within or right adjacent to existing or planned villages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Lownes</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106213</td>
<td></td>
<td>WEALDEN'S PLACES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reasons for comment:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road links key to this - especially the A27 if link to cophall roundabout is built then filling up the triangle it creates is logical. Otherwise 16d + 16e are coherent additions also town centre regeneration via 16g would be beneficially.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building at Wilmington or Berwick will further congest the roads and burden an already creaking infrastructure. The idea of affordable housing in rural areas is a misnomer. There are no jobs available and no cheap transport options so it makes sense for affordable housing to be built in towns where both transport (affordable) and jobs exist. Being born in an area is not an immediate right to buy in that area and most young people wish to travel before settling and again they will settle where the jobs exist e.g. in a town not in the rural countryside.

Reasons for comment:

Having read the Summary Guide to the Core Strategy Issues and Options Consultation Paper, I would like to voice my grave concern that Wadhurst has been identified as a Village with Growth Potential and is to be targeted for further development as a Local Service Centre. As a relatively new resident to Wadhurst, having moved here from Battersea in the last 6 months, I have been struck by how crowded and overstretched Wadhurst's existing services already are, and how more development in and around the village would further damage not just the character and sustainability of the village itself but the quality of life of Wadhurst's residents and those of villages and hamlets nearby who will inevitably lose out if development investment is focussed on ever-larger settlements. Parking in Wadhurst is frequently impossible during shop opening hours (I am lucky enough to be able to walk to the shops, but many elderly residents are not in a position to do so); and the lack of land available for more parking has been an ongoing issue for Wadhurst Parish council. Similarly, traffic through the village is already excessive (and not dissimilar to Battersea!), with the narrow high street already full to bursting with both trunk traffic passing through and shoppers trying to use the local amenities, leading to increased traffic pollution and the increased danger of accidents. It is not unusual for it to take 5-10 minutes to pass through the 500yds of High Street as a result of the heavy traffic. Any housing development outside the existing boundaries of the village will inevitably destroy for ever the beautiful and fragile rural landscape which is one of Wealden's and Wadhurst's treasures (as recognised by its AONB status). The urbanisation of Wadhurst through further development will rob future generations of the opportunity to benefit from the natural environment around us. At a recent Parish Council meeting I learned of the problems associated with the proposed development of Wadhurst College, not least in terms of sewage provision, increased traffic on roads unsuited for either the development traffic or a significantly increased population thereafter, and the knock-on effect such a development would have on further overstretching primary healthcare, schools, parking and other local services in the village. If sustainability is to be at the core of future planning for the Wealden District, then reducing the need for ever-longer car journeys in the region should be a priority. By spreading small-scale development out over a larger area with relatively less impact on each area, instead of focusing development on a small number of settlements spuriously designated 'local service centres', surely we can avoid the necrosis of shops and services threatened in other nearby villages and hamlets as villages like Wadhurst swell to become an ever stronger magnet for development and local spending. The self-sufficiency of smaller settlements is the key to reducing traffic jams, CO2 pollution and degeneration of the rural economy and this will not be achieved by the suburbanisation of Wadhurst. Thank you for your careful consideration of these points, and I hope you will protect the unique character and natural environment of the village of Wadhurst both for us and for our children's children.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Mackenzie</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106233</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for comment:**
Whilst not understanding 'other proportional splits', the transport infrastructure is totally inadequate in coping with less than (at least) 80% of dwellings being concentrated in towns - especially given the proportion of people admitted to be commuting to work outside the Wealden area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Mackenzie</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106233</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for comment:**
Without major investment in infrastructure - schools, doctors and particularly transport - distributing development is simply dispersing the problem. Without accessible public transport, the already overloaded road system would reach saturation at key times of the day - the rush hours and school drop-off/pick-up times

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Mackenzie</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106233</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for comment:**
A useful building plot to one person is a precedent for development to another. Planning policy would be left entirely subjective to individual opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Mackenzie</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106233</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for comment:**
There should be no abandonment of AONB protection whatsoever - this would represent the thin end of a very large wedge. What is small scale in one persons eyes may not be to another's - leaving any policy entirely subjective to individual opinion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Mr Mackenzie</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106233</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Reasons for comment:**
Essential - any development must respect the unique character of our landscape as well as recognising the high volume of people commuting to work outside the Wealden area.
Reasons for comment:

It is unclear where/why this arbitrary allocation has been adopted. Due to commuter working I would suggest that a higher proportion should be allocated to the area closer to London, thus reducing commuting times, energy expended in commuting and thus encourage people to work closer to their dwelling place. Brighton, Crawley/Gatwick and Tunbridge are the main areas for employment outside of the area, hence, development should focus on supporting these areas. Therefore I would suggest allocating 70% to the rest of Wealden and 30% to the coastal area. This will also have the benefit of retaining the unique coastal and downland areas of natural beauty - an area of beauty includes both its immediate local and the visible surrounding. From the top of the down the visible surrounding extends to approx the Heathfield area, hence development should be north of this line. The proposed developments at Polegate, Hailsham and Berwick are prime examples that will detrimentally interrupt and destroy the view from the top of the down as they will be visible across the entire length of the down within this region.

Overall I feel that this document is inadequate and should not be taken further without first addressing the economic, cultural and environmental goals of the region. As it currently stands, the document appears to suggest that development is good for its own sake, which I believe has been a driver behind much of the local government and planning approaches of the last few decades. More development = more expenditure = more power in the hands of local officials. More housing and especially affordable housing, is obviously required within the Wealden region. However, this should be driven by market need and not imposed by bureaucratic whim. Planning constraints and guidelines are important and must support a holistic vision. However, this document fails to address this requirement adequately. For example, it does not consider issues such as the appropriateness or lack of, for allowing economic monocultures to exist within the region. For example, St. Bedes school within Upper Dicker has swallowed up the existing village, is this 'good' or 'bad'. Obviously, if the school closed or changed location, the impact on the local cultural and economic environment would be substantion. Similar examples exist for many of our small rural and larger urban sites. Do we want to allow this type of dependency across the region? Should we develop contingencies? Should we be seeking to diversify from a service based economy to encourage manufacturing, call centres, scientific/research, back-office processing industries, all of which require focused concentrations of accommodation and not the distributed view outlined in the proposal. The report also does not appear to recognise the chain of infrastructure requirement needed and the wider environment impacts caused by development. Instead it focuses on the local requirements and specific opportunities (e.g. Polegate Parkways) which beg the questions 'Why' and 'What for'. My personal view of this proposal is that it is a purely administrative exercise seeking to conceal a more insidious attempt by both local and national government to remove local planning constraints that have protected the region for decades. If we are going to disturb the local environment and culture I for one want to know why these additional volume of people want to live here - no more retirement zones please - and what they will be doing. Lets not push up the level of unemployment or people with temporary jobs just so that we can say we have met government targets. Let us focus our effort instead on securing local, national and european funding to encourage a diverse range of appropriate industries to the area and then support these with well educated and talented local resources, encourage new people into the area only when they can demonstrate added value, be it economic, cultural or diversity. Therefore, please stop this bureaucratic nonsense. Do what you are being paid to do. Develop an economic, cultural and environmental vision for the region. Get the people living in the region behind this. Then ask us how we would like to support this through development of new dwelling. Anything else is a façade which I will not support.
Reasons for comment:
All of the areas identified for new settlements would require significant improvements both to the local infrastructure and to the infrastructure further afield (both within the region and outside). For example, the A22 between Uckfield and Hailsham and as a commuting route into London and surrounding areas, is inadequate for the current traffic load, therefore, development at any of the proposed sites along the A22 would require improvements (duelling) of the A22 for the entire length of this road if we are not going to see the same level of congestion currently experienced on unduelled sections of the A27 outside of Lewes. Likewise, development at Polegate or Berwick will require an upgrade to dual-carriageway for the A27 between Lewes and Eastbourne. Both of these involve substantial costs both in monetary terms and in environmental impact across the entire coastal region. Whilst, I agree in principal with the development of new settlements, priority should be made to site at the periphery of the region close to existing infrastructure hubs and not in the centre of the region which will have the greatest detrimental impact.

Reasons for comment:
I disagree with earlier comments about the impact on Surrey, broadening this to impact to other regions adjacent to the Weald. In order to support the proposed growth in population it will be necessary to improve infrastructure and access to and from of the Weald, which will thus require improvements to both road and rail networks outside of the region. Specifically, improvements to the A22 and A21 will be required in order to support greater volumes of road commuters to London and its surroundings. Likewise, rail improvements to the Brighton and Uckfield lines will be needed for the same reason.

Reasons for comment:
The current planning guidelines have already allowed development well in excess of the 'limited' viewed identified in this paragraph. The uncontrolled development of St. Bedes School in Upper Dicker is a prime example. Over the past 10 years a significant number of hectares of development have been undertaken (likely to have exceeded 30% of the overall village developed area) including building (both dormitory and educational) and sports fields. This has been allowed due to the 'on its own merit' guidelines that the planning department currently adopt. Each district in the region should be allocated a % development limit and all proposal should be judged against this. A prioritisation framework should be development for each district that favours developments that add to the local economy, environment and quality of life and discourage excess/uncontrolled travel, environmental damage and 'de-culturisation'.

Page 11 of 29
Reasons for comment:
Development is currently agreed on a piece-meal application by application basis. A prime example of this has been the uncontrolled expansion of St. Beades school in Upper Dicker. The lack of a guiding framework and holistic view has lead Wealden planning department to approve application after application regardless of the impact on the local community. Applications should never 'be viewed on their own merits' but must be in line with an overall approach and goal to ensure consistency, fairness and thus maintain the correct ballance of rural/urban lifestyles.

Reasons for comment:
The majority of infrastructure within the rural area is wholly inadequate for anything other than very limited development, likely not to exceed more than a maximum of 10 dwellings in each instance. Particularly the transportation network, plans for which must not encourage increased traffic on the network of minor roads within the region. Thus, development should focus on Urban areas at the perimeter of the region which are close to existing infrastructure hubs (e.g. the existing transporation networks, business hubs and commercial centres close to Lewes/Brighton, Tunbridge, Gatwick/Crawley), thus avoiding unnecessary and costly improvements to the regions infrastructure.

Reasons for comment:
I believe that this requirement to provide facilities for travellers is unbalance against the regions ability and councils willingness to monitor and control unauthorised and illegal activities of this group. The region already has an excessive volume and dependency on temporary accommodation (see the reports earlier comments on the economy being largely dependent upon service industries - e.g. holiday resort jobs). Sufficient provision is already available in the form of hotels, boarding houses, bed and breakfast and mobile home sites to accommodate any group that is willing to integrate into the local community.

Reasons for comment:
I would like to add to the list 'Avoiding a piece-meal and uncontrolled application by application approach to development'
Reasons for comment:
This list of infrastructure requirement should help to highlight the unsuitable nature of developing new settlement or substantial development within the region, instead of focusing it close to existing hubs that can be extended or upgraded. I would hope that the planning department considers very seriously the cost (both in money, disruption and environment, that are likely to be double if not magnitudes higher than any 'optimistic' estimates that developers are likely to suggest at this stage) before moving any further in the direction that this report current envisages.

Reasons for comment:
Building a Parkways station at Polegate is likely to be the same sort of white elephant as the cycle route along the A27. Speaking as a commuter of many years the issues that we face are: - a lack of suitable parking facilities at out existing train stations (Eastbourne, Polegate, Berwick, Glynde and Lewes) - congestion and over-crowding of the existing trains (which is due to the limiting volume of trains able to utilise the track between Haywards Heath and London and nothing to do with the regions provision of stations) - inadequate support by the rail companies for small stations, due to the pricing policy of National Rail which discourages trains from supporting small communities by imposing a charge for each stop. Again, I would suggest that we seek to improve the existing infrastructure and support before developing a new site which will suffer from the same problems as the existing ones.

Reasons for comment:
The lack of existing transportation infrastructure is part of the cultural heritage of this area and while it is sometimes frustrating (for example in Upper Dicker there is practically no public transportation whatsoever), this is no reason to introduce additional infrastructure unless it has a valid objective. For example, I believe that the development of a cycle route from Lewes along the A27 as far as Berwick was a complete and total waste of money, has added nothing to the local environment or economy and instead caused months of entirely unnecessary disruption to the existing traffic. I have never ever seen a cycling using it even though I drive along it almost every day. Improvement for its own sake is not an adequate excuse for destroying the environment (e.g. putting at least a couple of acres of our countryside under tarmac as in the example above).
Reasons for comment:
The selection of villages presented in this map appear arbitrary. There are significantly more villages in this area where small developments (up to 5 houses) could be absorbed with very limited impact. I believe that the focus of this whole planning process is mislead. Rather than defining where dwelling should be located, we should plan where and what employment opportunities will be supported and then focus on developing these. The type of employment opportunities will define the economic categories of residents and the transportation/infrastructure requires. This in turn will naturally prioritise where dwelling will/should be located. 'Build it and they will come!' For example if one of the goals is to increase economic activity within the region, then the higher educational provision within the region is dismal and wholly inadequate. If we planned to grow/develop a university in Eastbourne (based around the existing University of Brighton facilities) and built a science park around this then we would look to provide a substantial number of small/affordable dwelling both rural and urban within and around this conurbation. The science park would thus naturally feed other industries within the region, which in turn would help to identify where other areas of development should be located.

Reasons for comment:
Each parish within the region has the right and responsibility to define its own goals, constraints and limitations. The wishes of existing resident must be considered in an equal light to the overall regional goals. Plans must seek to provide a balance of local and regional considerations. While local plans/frameworks and guideline should not be unchallengeable, neither should they be dismissed without recourse to local community wished unless no alternatives are available. At this stage, I see no reason to consider amending the current wishes of any of our local communities, thus unless a specific opportunity has been identified I would suggest that we do not at this time reject or amend any existing local planning controls or constraints. In future and challenge to these guidelines should be considered in a holistic manner and no 'on its own merit' development should be permitted.

Reasons for comment:
I agree that the growth should be directly proportionate to the size of the existing village, therefore there is no room for 430 homes in Five Ash Down.

Reasons for comment:
I disagree that the actual village of Five Ash Down has any potential for growth, the extra vehicles at the traffic lights on the junction to the A272 would cause unpresidented congestion and a real accident balck spot with people regularly jumping the lights. Also a few hundreds yard up the road further into the village is another notorious blind corner which again with extra traffic on that road could be a death trap adn even more dangerous for myself and my fellow residents at The Walled Garden.
Core Strategy Summary Guide to the Issues and Options Consultation 2007 - Summary of Consultation Responses

Person ID  Dr Clarke
106265

Reasons for comment:
16A AND 16B border on land of outstanding natural beauty Lack of infrastructure, and social facilities Noise and air pollution increase Encroachment on local villages

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✓ Disagree

Person ID  Mr Lovatt-Smith
106267

Reasons for comment:
New housing is the single most important issue concerning the people who live in this area. We, the people of Wealden ought to decide on this issue, not have it forced on us by Central Government and their un-elected and non-accountable Regional Assembly. The process we are being asked to accept by Central Government goes against our basic rights in a democracy. All the local people I have talked to on this issue are strongly opposed to large housing developments. As a precursor to the adoption of this plan, the Council should therefore: 1. Conduct a referendum to ascertain how much new housing development is wanted by the people of Wealden. Provide as much information on the need for affordable housing as possible. 2. Construct the new policy according to the referendum results, regardless of Central Government policy.

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✓ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
New homes should be distributed equally across the entire District regardless of development status such as AONB's, National Parks and other development areas designated by the South East Regional Assembly.

Your Views  □ Agree  □ No Opinion  ✓ Disagree

Reasons for comment:
New homes should be sited adjacent to or within existing settlement boundaries. Numbers of homes should be in proportion to existing housing numbers.
NEW DEVELOPMENTS OF AGRICULTURAL SMALLHOLDINGS

New “Low Impact Agricultural Smallholdings” (LIAS) housing developments should be allowed on agricultural land. I believe there is a high level of demand for this type of property from would-be smallholders who cannot afford the high property prices of houses with agricultural land attached. The LIAS developments should have as low an impact as possible on the environment and be geared towards food production. Planning restrictions on the type of buildings allowed as well as the type of occupiers would aim to ensure that only bona-fide smallholders are permitted to develop, thus keeping the price of such properties within reach of many more people than is currently the case. The benefits from such a policy are significant, since it would help to: • Encourage social and economic regeneration in rural areas. • Encourage local food production. • Promote sustainable, low environmental impact developments by involving onsite electricity generation, water extraction and sewage disposal. • Open up a new source of capital to existing farmers, many of whom are struggling financially, from the proceeds of the sale of relatively small parcels of their land to new LIAS developers. • Take some of the pressure off housing elsewhere.

The policy should recognise that most of the smallholding activity will be part-time due to the low financial returns from agriculture and that therefore start-up times for food production will be relatively long. It should also recognise that some of the produce will be used for self-sufficiency. As far as possible, market forces should be allowed to operate and over-regulation should be avoided. The precise criteria for granting LIAS planning permission needs further discussion but since I am a smallholder myself I believe the following represents a workable basis: (1) Each LIAS must comprise a minimum total area of 5 acres of existing agricultural land (not including existing woodland). (2) No more than 0.75 acre to be converted to Domestic Curtilage, the classification of the remainder of the land remains as before. (3) Dwelling and Outbuilding(s) within the Domestic Curtilage can occupy no more than 250 square meters. (4) Electricity must be sourced on the property, preferably from sustainable sources (eg solar and wind). No grid electricity connection would be allowed. This could be policed under Building Regulations. (5) Water supply must be sourced from the property (eg from a borehole). No mains water connection would be allowed. This could be policed under Building Regulations. (6) Sewage should be disposed of on-site (reed beds, sceptic tank or compost toilet). (7) There could only be one dwelling per LIAS. (8) As far as possible, building materials should be locally-sourced. Normal criteria for appearance of buildings should apply. (9) The granting and continuation of a LIAS planning permission would be subject to the condition that the agricultural land is used for the production of food (specifically not for leisure use such as horses) and that the owners are actively involved in working their land, unless they become physically incapacitated. This could be similar to the current Agricultural Occupancy Condition. Periodic inspections by the Local Authority’s Agricultural Inspectors would be necessary to confirm this and the Council would have to power to require removal of LIAS buildings, including the dwelling, following a period of non-compliance. To allow new smallholding enterprises a sufficiently long start-up time this period should be 5 years duration from the original LIAS permission.

100% of all new urban housing should be affordable.
Reasons for comment:
Not sure with what I am agreeing or otherwise, but I feel that it is essential that areas must be set aside for the operation of small businesses. Any integrated vision of development however small the location must include a provision of space for economic activity. This is particularly important in the context of likely trends which we are only just beginning to comprehend of life after cheap oil, when transport and travel of every kind will become more expensive and limited. Economies everywhere will become inevitably more reliant on local talent and resources than previously; the global/local balance of our economies will shift in ways we cannot yet predict, but planning should take account of this. A most important aspect of economic activity is the production of food and although much farming has become highly intensive agribusiness, oil derived and international, the public desire for food to be obtained from local sources may be a symptom of a larger trend towards farming being a more diverse, local and labour hungry activity. The continuation of this trend would be good for the environment and for communities and would help society reconnect with the earth as the source of our nourishment and health.

Reasons for comment:
with strong reservations. We need to provide new housing. It must be affordable, not luxury, providing homes for local people and those on normal, (national average) incomes, and must be accompanied by a real growth in infrastructure provision, including schools, water, power, health etc. Very rigorous and open planning processes involving residents and businesses in the locality are an absolutely essential part of the process though, however lengthy, costly and tedious it may be. Consensus based on resolution of conflicting interests through this process is the best worst and only proper way to achieve changes which improve and don’t destroy communities.

Reasons for comment:
I feel that 10% is insufficient as a benchmark for renewable input in developments. It should be more. Concentration on energy efficient building is also crucial, with greater emphasis on really effective insulation. I like windmills, but obviously other sustainable technologies must form part of the solution too.

Reasons for comment:
Affordable housing means high density housing. In Forest Row the proposed greenfield sites for development are large enough to support the target housebuild figures but are also prime residential locations with spectacular views. Developers may find it more profitable to lose the affordability if they could acquire these sites. Affordable housing by all means but insist on it in small infill developments within the village. The PM’s recent pronouncements on (goodness me) Council Housing might help you here.
Reasons for comment:
'but within a decade I want every new home to be zero carbon.' Ruth Kelly 13th December 2006 This seems to suggest 100% renewable energy. Your 10% renewables target seems pathetic.

Reasons for comment:
Parkways are an eyesore, attract criminal activity and encourage continuing single-occupancy use of the motor car (which works against government climate change objectives). The longer term aim must be to increase and improve public transport including regular shuttle runs to railway stations combined with improved rail services to major centres. In this respect, the upgrading of the Uckfield line MUST be a top priority.

Reasons for comment:
We understand there are 71(?) villages in Wealden and support the view that the pain of future development should be spread as evenly as possible. On the number of dwellings to be shared among villages (on the basis of a 90:10 town:village split) around 5 dwellings per village would seem to be a tolerable number for existing residents to accept and would spread the impact of eg road traffic on the local environment (accepting that the downside could be an overall increase in school/commuter traffic across the district). Fewer incomers to each village could aid quicker absorption into the local community.

Reasons for comment:
The south east has a continuing problem with water supply. Even after the wettest summer on record, some ground water levels have still not reached their maximum limit.

Reasons for comment:
We believe a 90:10 split of new development between existing towns and villages is more appropriate. Uckfield and Crowborough already have, or could have extended, many of the social structures and amenities needed for an expanded population. They are also both on a railway line connecting to Croydon and London (also adding to the argument for re-opening the line to Lewes). Larger development centred on existing centres of population could attract bigger Section 106 “pay-backs” from developers, whereas smaller developments scattered around villages would not gain so much benefit.
Mr de Bolla  
106376  
resident of Wealden

Reasons for comment:
Also needs a re-examination of the decisions to close departments or reduce services in NHS hospitals in the region.

Francis  
106414

Reasons for comment:
Developers should be discouraged from demolishing perfectly sound dwellings in order to build a larger number of new houses on the site. This trend destroys the character of villages as well as the quieter parts of existing towns. New development should also be designed to be sympathetic with, although not necessarily replicant of, the existing architecture.

Mr Brittain  
106431

Reasons for comment:
But I thought it was government policy that consultations should run for 3 months. Why has Wealden decided to cut the consultation back to six weeks during the holiday season. My view is that the results of this consultation are invalid.

Reasons for comment:
However, the length of the document makes it difficult to handle easily. It is a little unfair on people who do not have access to the internet to be expected to pay £15 for a hard copy.
### Person ID 106488
**Mr Richardson**

- **Reasons for comment:**
  - **8 Wealden Communities**
    - **8.1 Affordable Housing:** I agree the requirement for 40% of all new housing on sites of 10 dwellings or more to be affordable and that a 50% requirement should apply to smaller settlements.
    - **8.2 Housing Types:** I agree there is a need for more smaller dwellings in the future.
    - **8.3 Housing Density, Car Parking and Design:** I agree with the need to increase dwelling density to 50 per hectare and higher in town centres.

### Person ID 106508
**Mrs Turner**

- **Reasons for comment:**
  - Planning decisions already made affecting Hailsham and Hellingly for example will change how local roads will be used. Planning for about 800 homes already agreed any occupants of these new houses wanting to travel north will have to do so via the A271, and then A22. It is not until the results of major planning decisions already made for this area are known, can any relevant comment be made on what may be a good plan in 20 years time.
  - We will also need someone to look into the decisions to close departments or reduce services in NHS hospitals in the region, as the population of the area increases.
  - A lot can happen in 20 years, and climate change may make things worse, but this local consultation needs to be an ongoing process. I hope there will be many more opportunities to comment when our environments change.. Planning decisions already made affecting Hailsham and Hellingly for example will change how local roads will be used, how many more doctors,schools etc will be needed than first thought, but no one will know until the houses are built and occupied.
  - The village of Lower Horsebridge is unsuitable for further development. The village of Lower Horsebridge is mainly on the A271, which is a very busy road it currently has traffic queues up to half a mile long from the Boship roundabout along the A271 towards Horsebridge at peak traffic times. Old housing without off road parking forces people to park their cars on the pavement making the pedestrians life hazardous. Much of the land in the village is liable to flood due to the river cuckmere flowing through it at different points.
Reasons for comment:
I only hope this happens, without central government taking over and reversing decisions of the local council.

Reasons for comment:
We should not discount new settlements, because wherever the building of new houses takes place the local infrastructure will need to be improved. Creating a new infrastructure for a new settlement, may be better than trying to improve the existing infrastructure of an existing town or village.

Reasons for comment:
I agree that the growth should be directly proportionate to the size of the existing village, therefore there is no room for 500 homes already agreed for Hellingly!

Reasons for comment:
The village of Lower Horsebridge is unsuitable for further development. The village of Lower Horsebridge is mainly on the A271, which is a very busy road it currently has traffic queues up to half a mile long from the Boship roundabout along the A271 towards Horsebridge at peak traffic times. Old housing without off road parking forces people to park their cars on the pavement making the pedestrians life hazardous. Much of the land in the village is liable to flood due to the river cuckmere flowing through it at different points.

Reasons for comment:
before agreeing with this statement, some clarity is needed about what defines a 'small' development. Before any development is carried out on a greenfield site, local views and the impact on the environment must be taken into account

Reasons for comment:
I agree more affordable public transport is needed, especially if more houses are to be built in villages without access to trains, or a reliable bus service. Perhaps reinstate the line from Polegate to Heathfield, and keep the cycle path next to it.
### Person ID 106508
**Mrs Turner**

**Reasons for comment:**
There is no such thing as affordable housing. Private property developers are there to make money. No one can force a property developer to sell under the current market value. It is all very well to say that there will be x number of people needing affordable housing in Hailsham for example, how would we make sure the affordable housing went to deserving local people? Of course we cannot, as it would look like discrimination. If there is cheaper housing in the Wealden area than say London, someone from London who can commute to work, will have an equal chance to buy it. The council or housing associations need to buy property for people to rent, it is the only way to have affordable housing. No further council houses should be sold off.

**Your Views**
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] No Opinion
- [x] Disagree

### Person ID 106508
**Mrs Turner**

**Reasons for comment:**
Before any major business park type development around Polegate and Hailsham can be built, there has to be interest from companies willing to invest in the area. Otherwise we will be left with empty industrial units, which there is no shortage of already! Some major companies, including central government departments have left the Wealden/Eastbourne area to move north, where property is cheaper, and is more central to the country as a whole.

**Your Views**
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] No Opinion
- [ ] Disagree

### Person ID 106557
**Mrs Rowlands**

**Reasons for comment:**
All new housing should be adopting renewable energy. I agree that 10% seems a little small but all the houses should also have the maximum insulation and use green materials.

**Your Views**
- [x] Agree
- [ ] No Opinion
- [ ] Disagree

### Person ID 106557
**Mrs Rowlands**

**Reasons for comment:**

### Person ID 106557
**Mrs Rowlands**

**Reasons for comment:**

### Person ID 106615
**Mr McCallum**

**Reasons for comment:**
The area around 16f is already congested and further development would be catastrophic to both existing householders and any future residents.

**Your Views**
- [ ] Agree
- [ ] No Opinion
- [x] Disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person ID</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Part of Document</th>
<th>Reasons for comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>106615</td>
<td>Mr McCallum</td>
<td>8.1 paragraph</td>
<td>As an ex ESCC manager involved in Section 38 Agreements I know only too well that most new developments are for substantial and costly housing which appeals to folk who move into the area and squeeze the existing young residents who cannot afford to entertain the developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106623</td>
<td>Miss Fox</td>
<td>7.1 paragraph</td>
<td>Developing villages on a large scale will irreversibly damage the community spirit which is already being threatened by lack of work and affordable housing. SMALL additions to each village of lower priced houses for locals would make more sense. Herstmonceux already suffers from vandalism and I feel that a development of more than 10 houses would only add to this problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106631</td>
<td>Miss Leonard</td>
<td>7.1 paragraph</td>
<td>i live in walshes road and to build more houses and take away the scenes and views would be wrong you are building houses on any available space you find what about nature, the views and the countrylife.i dont want to look out of my windows to a housing estate or a block of flats, you will be creating more accidents, more traffic and what about people who walk their dogs down by walshes manor you are taking all that away we like to see the horses in the morning and watch the sun set but if you build more houses there you will have more trouble because if there are children living there they have no where to play and with the amount of traffic flying up and down the road probably more accidents we live in a scenic and quiet area and we would like to live like that for a bit longer without having to look at flats or and estate first thing in morning so i object to 11d. Linda Leonard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for comment:
I object to the proposal to site a new settlement in Isfield (Lavendar Settlement) or on its outskirts of up to 2000 houses. To enlarge a small rural village into a small town makes no sense and to build it on a beautiful area of green field site is unbelievable. Any further growth in the area, if it has to be necessary, should in the majority be targeted at the small towns in Wealden where there has been continuous growth over the last twenty years and where if it was to continue for the next 20 years, then no one would be unduly surprised. Infill and brownfield sites in villages should also be selectively used to increase the numbers. To justify it to the residents of Isfield (planning meeting at village hall 24 Sept) by the benefits of increased services and infrastructure in the area and village is insulting. The reason most people live in a village or rural area is that they choose to trade off infrastructure/services for a village community life and fields. If we had wanted to live in a town, we would have done so in the first place. It is disappoiting to find that the 'government' of this country has the right to change your living circumstances and environment to such an extent. The proposal that the monies from the 2000 home settlement or an even bigger one is used to fund the reopening of the Uckfield to Lewes rail link is staggering, particularly when there never again will be station at Isfield and no benefit to the village or surrounding area. Please note that I also object to the reoppening of the rail link. The single track railway line will never provide a modern fast link to London to match the Brighton/London line, even if the number of stops was cut to a minimum. It was converted to a single line in the first place because of the size of its tunnels. Will it ever be quicker to catch a train from Uckfield to London rather than driving/busing to Lewes or Haywards Heath, I dont think so and will the level of service ever match these stations as well? To consider spending tens of millions of pounds reopening a small almost rural railway line where its increase in use is uncertain is surprising. To then have to finance this by building a town at Isfield is planning gone mad, though I assume it is convenient that the houses built also go to meet the government targets for the Wealden house growth. If the Railway line is alternatively being provided to link Tunbridge Wells, Crowborough, Uckfield, Lewes, then it will need to make a lot of stops and surely it would be far cheaper to improve the bus services. The last time I caught a bus from Uckfield to Tunbridge Wells in the morning rush hour, it was still half empty on arrival. How much demand is there for this type of rail link. Where are the employment opportunities in and around Uckfield/Isfield for the number of proposed houses and their occupiers? There just is not this much housing demand from local people. Whoever the occupiers are and wherever they come from, they will mostly have to commute to London, Eastbourne, Brighton, Haywards Heath, Crawley, Tunbridge Wells etc.for work and this then puts pressure on the infrastructure (roads/rail) that then demands its improvement. Surely it would be better to build the houses in the first place at or nearer the employment areas or major transport/rail hubs and even if these are outside of the Wealden District. I can't help thinking that these issues would be better addressed by looking at East Sussex as a whole rather than parceling out quantities of house growth to every District Council.

Reasons for comment:
Focus on New Settlement or Settlements in a Low Weald area are wholly inappropriate considering the already inadequate services. Plans mentioned in the strategy for improving services such as reservoirs and roads are needed now for existing population levels. Please consider the quality of life for those living in this area already in overcrowded and cramped conditions. The consultation should rather be concentrating on an equitable distribution of development over the whole of Wealden which is a very large area and not even considering such a catastrophic imposition in one of the most scenically beautiful parts of the county.
Reasons for comment:
In recent years I was informed by a local council officer that there would never be major development on Walshes Road. The main reason being that the railway bridge would not be able to support much more traffic. I do not understand how this can now be ignored in order to accommodate all the extra dwellings planned. I also object to being forced to live in a built-up area when my main reason for moving here was the rural character of the area.

Reasons for comment:
Main options Figure 6, Polegate area. If any development is to be considered then the area 16a should be prime, providing the main Polegate bypass is continued under the existing roundabout, as originally proposed and connected to the A27 west of Polegate. The number of houses limited to about 600 so not to cause severe problems to the already strained infrastructure, in particular fresh and waste water. Access to the area 16a from the existing roundabout would not be at all practical as the poorly designed road junction is already an accident black spot. Access to the area 16d, unless via 16 e would cause problems for the already congested School Lane area, plus a safety hazard at school times. The roads around these areas are dangerous at present, due to the number of cars and vans parked with no regard to child safety, although many are the parents causing the hazard. I really only know the local area to my address so this may seem a ‘NIMBY’ comment but I have tried to make constructive comments as I see the problems on a daily basis. I attended the council meeting at WDC Hailsham last year when the proposal for housing in the area above where cancelled. This was WD/2006/1415/MEA, WD/2006/1415/MEA. It seems that our views are disregarded.

Reasons for comment:
Any new development should surely give the individual access to effective public transport as a priority. Being dependent on the car to get to work/school/shops is a receipe for misery for everyone who lives in Wealden - not just those in new housing. Furthermore, how can more people come and live in Wealden before the strategy for recycling and sustainable rubbish disposal is effectively implemented for the current population?

Reasons for comment:
Does Wealden really know what the commuting patterns are for the residents of the district? There are trains between Eastbourne/Lewes/Brighton so why do people drive? There is a train between Uckfield and Tunbridge Wells so why do people drive? Why is there this is under/poorly managed rail infrastructure in place already which could offer a solution to at least some of the traffic issues which we are apparently not going to get unless we add another 1500-2000 households (I assume that equates to another 1500 to 4000 cars BEFORE the public transport issue is addressed seriously).
Person ID: Dart 106747

Reasons for comment:
We have all seen the volume of traffic at ever extending "rush hours" on the A22, A27, and many rural lanes increasingly being used as "rat runs" to avoid the queues elsewhere. Something needs to be done to improve the experience of using the existing train services - more frequency and reasonable fares and better car park facilities. The buses need to connect in better too to provide an integrated public transport service. I know it will cost - but if the local government doesn't push for it we'll all end up paying for more roads, pollution, time lost sitting in traffic jams.

Person ID: Dart 106747

Reasons for comment:
I am a little confused on this point. Are we building more houses so that then we create more employment in the area? Or is that we build more houses so that people who already work here have somewhere to live? Do the population of Wealden really want to encourage a higher population here given the issues of traffic, adequate public services-education and health in particular, lack of a viable public transport system, recycling, rubbish disposal which already seem to be stretched?

Person ID: Mrs Carden 106771

Reasons for comment:
Core planning strategy - issues and options Consultation paper I have lived in Litlington both as a child and an adult and know the parish and area very well. As this is a consultation paper based on Government policy to build thousands of houses in this part of England I suppose I should not be astonished at what is being proposed. However I am truly amazed at the general approach. Who would seriously make such [proposals recognizing that it appears we wish retain our areas of outstanding natural beauty when all these suggestions will destroy it? The southern half of Wealden with the south downs soon to be a National park and therefore not to be developed other than by true organic growth, and would seriously damaged by the proximity and extent of housing being proposed it would turn the area into a sprawling sub-urban type of environment, needing large areas of what is farmland and woodland to be concreted over. Also with little promise of employment being created in the new settlements it would require yet more commuting thus over loading our fragile transport system both public and private. Resulting in yet more cars on our underdeveloped infrastructure. So I am strongly against the prospect of large housing developments so close to the south downs, but i would support organic growth in villages of several new houses, which totaled up together would provide considerable additional future housing stoke without overloading the present infrastructure to the same degree. Maggie Carden
**Reasons for comment:**
Everyone should be looking at these questions VERY carefully. The question is should all housing be at LEAST 10% energy efficient - YES, but it should be more. And the question does not ask should it be wind turbines.

**Reasons for comment:**
Affordable housing as part of ANY development is a MUST - this will force developers to use creative architects to fulfill this requirement within a well proportioned and inclusive community.

**Reasons for comment:**
For all the above arguments that also disagree.

**Reasons for comment:**
Highway improvements should not just be made for cars. A much higher priority should be given to safe provision for cyclists both within towns and villages and also the countryside. Public transport needs to be provided and priced at a level that will encourage car drivers out of their cars and onto public transport.

**Reasons for comment:**
The number of open spaces in the area are a precious resource for the future, but the document assumes that energy will continue to be cheap and we will be able to continue leaving large tracts of land for no other purpose than recreation. The document needs to take into consideration the impact that climate change and the significant price increases of fossil fuels will have on our attitudes to the countryside. As energy prices rise, we will look differently at land such as Ashdown Forest and the potential for providing wood to heat homes for example.
Reasons for comment:
10% is much too small a target. New developments should be required to achieve at the very least 20% in the short term and an increase after an interim period to 40%. As well as renewable energy, new developments should also be required to have high levels on insulation reducing the need for heating in the first place and designed so that they are cool in summer and not requiring energy to cool. Developments such as BedZed have shown that by good design significant energy savings can be made. New domestic housing should be built to a minimum standard of 3 Star as defined by The Code for Sustainable Homes with immediate effect, and this standard be raised by one star grade each year, reaching the maximum standard of 6 Star by 2012. While some people seem to regard seeing the source of their energy production as unsightly, it is a lot less unsightly than the effects of global catastrophe that we face unless we radically alter the way we consume energy. Converting to renewables is not a nice to do option but a stark and urgent imperative. The document seems to assume that cheap energy is unlimited and has no impact - neither are true. Consuming fossil fuel energy has a significant impact on our environment and is becoming harder to extract from the ground and deliver and the costs of all types of fossil fuel will rise substantially in the near future. This applies to oil, gas and coal. The International Energy Agency (www.iea.org) has now admitted (July 2007) that the world will face an energy crunch within 5 years unless we substantially reduce our energy consumption - and there is no sign of this at present. Forward planning needs to take into serious consideration the significant changes to the affordability of energy that will occur in the next few years. It will have a major impact on domestic heating, employment patterns and indeed every aspect of society.

Reasons for comment:
The underlying assumption of this section is that oil will continue to be cheap and that people will continue to be able to afford long distance commutes. This document does not include scenarios other than an assumed continuation of constant availability of cheap oil and that we can continue consuming it without impact on the environment and our lives. For example, what will be the impact on business when staff can no longer afford long distance car commuting journeys? At what price point will farming not be able to afford to continue current methods of pesticides and fertilizers and long distance transport?

Reasons for comment:
10% is far too low - Wealden should be actively encouraging innovative developments like the BedZED development in Beddington, Surrey, making use of a wide variety of energy efficient measures in new developments. Only by ensuring new developments incorporate these technologies will economies of scale make them a realistic and affordable proposition for existing home owners.
Reasons for comment:
Even the smallest 3 bed house typically sells for approaching £250,000 - beyond the sensible reach of many first time buyers, even couples with a dual income on average pay. Young, locally employed people should be encouraged and supported in home ownership. More shared ownership schemes is the only sensible way forward. Encouraging private landlords will only benefit investors who already have an unfair tax advantage and do nothing to help first time buyers who are increasingly alienated by rising house prices.