LDF

From: Isobel Moore [redacted]
Sent: 13 October 2014 19:26
To: LDF
Subject: Consultation - modifications to Sustainability Appraisal Report

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

I was recently invited to take part in a consultation by ldf@wealden.gov.uk. I dutifully visited my local library, found what I thought to be the relevant documents, and proceeded to take notes.

However, now I've come to respond to the consultation on line, I can find no reference to the large planning document that I consulted at the library. I do not recall, when reading the documents available, that the consultation related solely to the "Affordable Housing Delivery" local plan, but included consultation on modifications to the Sustainability Appraisal Report - this was the document made available to me, but was one of a huge stack of documents, with no indication as to which was the relevant information for this current consultation.

I therefore wish to make the following points in relation to the proposed modifications to the Sustainability Appraisal Report, as that is the document I spent time the time reading in detail, and I refer in particular to table 45, 9.22 regarding land at Ridgewood/West Uckfield:

1. The document is full of acronyms with no glossary (or if so, not easy to find). For example, where is it explained what is meant by SANG? This sort of thing makes it virtually impossible for the lay person with no prior knowledge of the planning consultation to take any meaningful part in any debate.

2. 5.10 table 45. There should be no NET gain of allocated green space, the wording should stay as "**should** be accommodated on site" not "**could"**

3. 5.11 Do NOT delete the reference to Natural England guidance to take account the Ashdown Forest visitor findings.

4. SUC1 - the change in housing density is good, from 30 to 25 dph, BUT there should still be 1, 2 and 3 bed dwellings and fewer, rather than greater, than 7% 4 and 5 bed dwellings.

5. SUC2 - SANGS should be agreed **before** not "as appropriate"

6. There should be no deletion of specific size requirements for SANGS and no deletion of location specific requirements for SANGS within the site - do NOT replace with a requirement for provision off-site - it **must** be on-site.

7. 5.14 - do NOT delete the reference to on-site SANGS

8. SUC3(e) do NOT insert "if practicable" in reference to tree planting - trees are essential for mental health and well-being of residents, the ecosystem, as natural flood defences, and for the preservation of the habitat of Ridgewood Stream.

9. SUC3(h) do NOT insert "where practicable" regarding the protection of existing wildlife corridors - this is essential as you are planning to build on a green field site and the destruction of habitat is irreversible.

10. SUC3(i) Do not do this - you need to have wetlands for natural drainage into the flood plain. River "rehabilitation" is a bulldozer approach, ultimately leading to more flooding - as witnessed in the Somerset Levels earlier this year where the artificially raised banks prevented the flow of water away from the flooded areas.

11. The wording "greater flexibility for developers" would allow less certainty and control for existing residents to have a say in how the land is developed

12. SUC1 - the reasoning here implies that making the site "viable" actually means "profitable" - this has absolutely nothing to do with local requirements or wishes, merely the amount of money a developer can make from the site and as such is totally unfair and biased.

Yours faithfully,

Isobel Moore
[redacted]