18/04/2012 11:09
Linda Grundy

Dear Councillors,

I feel that if the Wealden District Council think that people are not really interested or that they are happy for the development to go ahead they are mistaken.

Firstly, if they described the development differently i.e. NOT Core Strategy for..... and they called it what it is in plain language - Large housing development to be sited on edge of Uckfield, they would have had more response.

Secondly, being able to access this information as an online commentary would certainly allow people to respond easily and therefore the results would be very different. Why aren't these details made into a simple document which can be understood by ALL and accessed by ALL?
I realise that social networking might not be the answer necessarily BUT if people were directed EASILY onto Wealden's website i.e. titles of planning applications in simple and plain language, relating to area and size of development etc, more people would comment one way or another. Most people would not know planning application numbers etc. It is not an easy process for many.
Therefore I believe that information could be advertised, disseminated and understood in plain language for all to access.

. I do not understand how with all the restrictions on our water supply in this area that this is proposed at all, let alone the impact on this already substantial town such as traffic, police, fire brigade, schools, doctors, dentists, sewerage, parking at the hospital etc.

. Constructing a roundabout on the main A22 to access the development will be a hazard for motorists as it is already a very busy road.

. Also the impact on the environment will be considerable, for example the local Boothland Woods which would be seriously affected by the increase in population and wildlife killed off completely and I believe that this wood is Ancient Woodland and that a 15m buffer zone might be incorporated to 'soften' the effects but will the wildlife understand this????

. After reading the Background paper I was very confused by some of the comments, for example on one hand the paper states that there is already a deficit of open natural space and then it proposes the development which will TAKE AWAY such space. It also states that there will be better linkages

to existing open space. Surely that means MORE people using same space?

. In the list of constraints, it states that there is already a problem with the sewerage works and the odours which emanate from there. What will it be like with 1000 more houses with at least 3000 people adding to this??

. With regard to the development of more business it states that there are various options for where this should be sited so I hope that these businesses have already promised to invest in this area? Also later on in the paper it states that: The capacity to accept change for housing, is considered to be moderate, and suggests that there is NO capacity for business development, however, the reason for this conclusion is not clear.

. I believe that if this site had been 'Brown fields' it would be far more acceptable. As it is agricultural land and open space it does not make sense. It states that as the land is already near urban space and that the value of the land is diminished. Is that the monetary value or is it the value of having green open space?

. Basically it is such a large development that it appears to bring more problems to the area not to enhance. It would be more acceptable, after reading the constraints to develop on a MUCH smaller scale. I do realise though that government demands that a certain amount of housing is built but this is too large for the area.

Surely, this development should NOT even be contemplated!

Regards

Linda Grundy