BARCOMBE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT EVENT, SUNDAY 14 JANUARY 2018, 2PM & 3PM

Comment Cards - Information and analysis

Comment Cards were made available on the tables in the Hall carrying the invitation: "Please leave your comments relating to the evidence we have presented and your thoughts on the neighbourhood plan." A "post box" was situated at the exit to receive completed cards.

Comment Card Returns: 44 cards were collected at the end of the event. The comments in the cards are categorised into the 16 topic groups given in Table 1. Within each group the individual points raised in each comment are considered in Tables 2-10. 65% of the points raised were highly individualistic and were grouped under the general headings of Proposed Housing (Table 2), Infrastructure (Table 3), Objections to proposed development (Table 7), Support for proposed development (Table 8) and Other Issues (Table 9). Points made more than twice were Buildings to be in sympathy with surroundings (Table 2), Traffic management (Table 3) and High St./Hillside junction unsatisfactory. The remaining 35% of the points were more focused and are grouped under Comments on PEE (Table 4), Affordable/social housing (Table 5) and Housing for elderly (Table 6).

The points raised deal almost exclusively with the proposed developments at Bridgelands/Hillside with virtually no reference to the papers produced by the SG. This may be a reflection of the Barcombe public being able to view for the first time the relevant information from the 2017 SHELAA together with that in the Draft Part 2 of the JCS.

Table 1

| Comment topic | Number of | Table |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Comments | |
| Proposed housing | 20 | 2 |
| Infrastructure | 18 | 3 |
| Comments on Public Engagement Event | 12 | 4 |
| Affordable/Social Housing | 10 | 5 |
| Housing for elderly | 9 | 6 |
| Object to proposed development | 6 | 7 |
| Support proposed development | 5 | 8 |
| Biodiversity issues | 2 | 9 |
| Improve public transport | 2 | 9 |
| Environmental impact | 2 | 9 |
| Recycling point | 1 | 9 |
| Walkways | 1 | 9 |
| Development good for business | 1 | 9 |
| Alternative development sites | 1 | 9 |
| Offer help | 1 | 9 |

| Email address | 19 | 9 |
|---------------|----|---|
|---------------|----|---|

Table 2: Proposed Housing

| Table 2: Proposed Housing | D-: : | Donor and Anti /D |
|--|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Topic | Points raised | Proposed Action/Response |
| Buildings to be in sympathy with | 5 | Included in NP Housing |
| surroundings | | Policies |
| Bungalows at top, 3-5 bed houses further | 1 | Noted |
| down slope | | |
| Can developers change amount of housing | 1 | Through planning applications |
| and materials? | | |
| Recommend no rows of houses | 1 | Noted |
| New houses to reflect existing | 1 | In NP housing policies |
| No green roofs | 1 | Noted |
| 3-5 bed houses | 1 | Noted |
| no Eco-builds | 1 | Noted |
| Retain green look of pony field | 1 | Noted |
| Set houses back from road | 1 | Recommendation made in |
| | | Draft JCS Part 2 |
| No grass roofs! | 1 | Noted |
| 2015 Housing Survey- preference for 3 | 1 | 24% of Survey respondents |
| bed houses, not 1 bed or flats | | replied to question. But LDC |
| | | Housing Register shows that of |
| | | applicants applying for rented |
| | | accommodation some 70% |
| | | require 1-2 bed houses. |
| | | Responses from different |
| | | sections of community? |
| | | Proposed housing could |
| | | provide mix of housing sizes. |
| Green build a priority | 1 | Noted |
| Houses to be sustainable/low impact | 1 | Houses to be developed |
| | | according to current building |
| | | standards |
| Green roofs can be OK | 1 | Noted |
| Follow Eco regulations | 1 | Houses to be developed |
| | | according to current building |
| | | |
| | 20 | standards |

Table 3: Infrastructure

| Topic | Points | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|--------|---------------------------------|
| | raised | |
| Traffic management required | 4 | Refer to ESCC |
| Present/proposed access High St. to | 3 | Recognised in 2017 SHELAA |
| Hillside unsatisfactory | | and Draft JCS Part 2. On-going |
| | | discussions to solve issues. |
| Additions to play area required | 2 | On-going local project re |
| | | additional play facilities |
| Separate access to Bridgelands required | 1 | Present evidence is that |
| | | improvements to present |
| | | access entrance can be to |
| | | satisfaction of ESCC. |
| Effect of development on roads/parking | 1 | Noted |
| Suitable parking arrangements required | 1 | Included in NP General |
| | | Housing Policies |
| Implications of development for roads, | 1 | Noted |
| schools, medical care | | |
| Site unsuitable for small, affordable | 1 | 2017 SHELAA and Draft JCS |
| housing | | Part 2 state sites suitable for |
| | | housing. |
| Services required to support new | 1 | Considerations re sewerage |
| development | | supply given in Draft JCS Part |
| | | 2 |
| No plans for infrastructure/employment | 1 | Not within remit of NP |
| Prevent future extensions of some new | 1 | Not in NP Housing Policies |
| houses | | |
| "Hillside" – name confusing | 1 | Noted |
| Problem – bus stop outside "The Grange" | 1 | Refer to ESCC/BPC |
| | 19 | |

Table 4: Comments on PEE

| Topic | Points | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|--------|--------------------------|
| | raised | |
| Excellent | 1 | |
| Brilliant event | 1 | |
| Very well organised and informative | 1 | |
| Impressed. pleased with work done and | 1 | |
| level of clear communication with | | |
| residents | | |
| Many people; liked boards | 1 | |
| Excellent presentation | 1 | |
| Excellent start to complex process | 1 | |
| Excellent meeting and event | 1 | |
| Thanks! | 1 | |
| Great – good to have facts | 1 | |
| Very interesting – good presentation of | 1 | |
| subjects | | |
| It looks good | 1 | |
| | 12 | Include in Public |
| | | Consultation description |

Table 5: Affordable/Social Housing

| Table 5: Allol dable/ Social Housing | | | |
|---|--------|--------------------------|--|
| Topic | Points | Proposed Action/Response | |
| | raised | | |
| Affordable housing needed for young and | 3 | | |
| elderly | | | |
| Social housing required | 2 | | |
| Affordable housing needed | 2 | | |
| Affordable housing, not big houses | 1 | | |
| Cheap affordable housing, not of modern | 1 | | |
| design | | | |
| All housing to be Council, shared | 1 | | |
| ownership or low cost 1-3 bed | | | |
| | 10 | Include in NP Housing | |
| | | Policies | |

Table 6: Housing for elderly

| Topic | Points raised | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|---------------|-----------------------------------|
| Housing for down-sizing elderly | 4 | |
| Home for elderly | 3 | |
| Assisted living facilities | 1 | |
| Housing for down-sizing elderly/sheltered housing/flats | 1 | |
| | 9 | Include in NP Housing Policies |

Table 7: Objections to proposed development

| Topic | Points raised | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|---------------|--------------------------|
| Large development at 3 sites | 1 | |
| Bridgelands site is bog | 1 | |
| Unsatisfactory access High St./Hillside | 1 | |
| Sites unsuitable for small/affordable | 1 | |
| housing | | |
| Plan will produce big expensive houses | 1 | |
| | 5 | Noted |

Table 8: Support proposed development

| Topic | Points raised | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|---------------|--------------------------|
| Agree with development zones | 1 | |
| Agree with Design Statement | 1 | |
| Sites are appropriate | 2 | |
| Support in principle (need affordable hosing for young and old) | 1 | |
| | 5 | Noted |

Table 9: Other Issues

| Topic | Points | Proposed Action/Response |
|---|--------|--------------------------------|
| | raised | |
| Biodiversity issues: install bird/bat boxes | 1 | Noted |
| Improve public transport | 2 | Noted |
| Beware environmental impact | 2 | Noted |
| Install recycling point in development | 1 | Noted |
| Approve of walkways | 1 | Noted |
| Development would be good for | 1 | Noted |
| businesses | | |
| Should use alternative building sites | 1 | Sites quoted were rejected in |
| | | 2017 SHELAA |
| Offer of assistance re supported living | 1 | Noted |
| | 10 | |
| | | |
| Email addresses supplied | 19 | Use for email circulation list |