

Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan 2018 – 2028

Consultation Statement July 2019



This Consultation Statement has been prepared by the Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) Steering Group on behalf of Burwash Parish Council, who is the qualifying body responsible for the NDP. This Consultation Statement sets out the comments received during the pre-submission consultation period and the actions taken.

Contents

Section 1	NDP Consultation process	Page 4
Section 2	Responses from Statutory Consultees	Page 12
Section 3	Written Community Responses to NDP	Page 43
Section 4	Revisions to the Policies	Page 226

NDP Consultation process

The decision to go ahead with developing an NDP for Burwash was taken by the BPC in January 2016. This decision was formally registered and accepted by RDC in June 2016.

The Parish Council decided to create a Neighbourhood Development Plan. This work has been a community led project with support from many local residents

Setting up the Steering Group

A number of local residents volunteered to assist with the development of the plan and together they made up the NDP Steering Group.

Creation of Sub-Groups

Four Sub-Groups were set up to work on specific aspects of the plan and to report to the Steering Group. These were:

- Infrastructure, including Leisure Economy and Tourism
- Environment
- Housing
- Consultation and Communication.

The Steering Group and Sub-Groups carried out widespread consultation and research; identifying issues and objectives and developing required policies.

Developing the Plan

Through a combination of questionnaire surveys, public consultations, workshops, village events, e-mail correspondence and face to face meetings with local residents and businesses, the Steering Group was able to collect the communities views on what they wished to see for the future of their Parish. For residents, the most important aspects they wished the Neighbourhood Development Plan to address included Environment, Housing and Infrastructure (including Leisure, Economy and Tourism).

The vision and objectives in this document were presented to both the community and the BPC as a sound basis for proceeding with the NDP. There were various consultation events which informed the vision and objectives.

Further details on the consultation events and questionnaire results can be found in Appendices A, H, K and L of the draft NDP.

This is a summary of the steps taken to produce the NDP:

- a. A consultation questionnaire sent out to all households asking for their input into the key components of the Neighbourhood Plan (October/November 2016)
- b. Publicity stands at the Summer and Christmas Fairs (2017 and 2018)
- c. Stalls at the Annual Assembly (2017, 2018 and 2019)
- d. Transport and Traffic survey (Dec 2017 and Summer 2018)
- e. Call for Sites (February 2018)
- f. Vision and Objectives consultations (February/March 2018)
- g. A Housing Needs Questionnaire (April 2018)

- h. Air Pollution surveys (from June 2018 and ongoing)
- i. Dark Skies Monitoring (early Spring 2018)
- j. A Biodiversity survey of the Parish by the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre (November 2018)
- k. Site promoters/landowner presentations (April 2018)
- l. A survey of local businesses (April/June 2018)
- m. Community Consultation on the Call for Sites (July 2018)

Community Engagement

Obtaining the views of the community has been an essential part of the development of this draft plan.

Responses to the various consultations had a significant impact on formulating this Plan

The numerous consultation events gave residents and other stakeholders (e.g. local businesses) the opportunity to contribute to its shape, key messages and policies. A full description of the community engagement process is included in the Communication Strategy. (See Appendix B of the draft NDP)

Evidence Gathering

The Neighbourhood Development Plan Steering Group (NDPSG) began with a review of RDC's Core Strategy and Local Plan to ensure that our Plan addressed their objectives. Members of the NDPSG met with the High Weald AONB unit and reviewed their Management Plan and the ESCC Landscape Character Assessment. The NDPSG reviewed Parish records and relevant published statistical information including the Office of National Statistics, Census and East Sussex in Figures (ESiF). The Sub-Groups researched extensively, undertook surveys and engaged in community discussions to produce the documents in the Appendices.

Pre Submission consultation (Regulation 14)

30th May to 18th July 2019

The draft plan was approved by Burwash Parish Council and the consultation was launched at the Parish Annual Assembly on Thursday 30th May which was attended by over 50 local residents.

550 copies of the Plan were printed. These were a combination of the full plan and a summary document which set out the Executive Summary, proposed policies and future projects.

These plans and copies of a two paged leaflet which set out the consultation process, an outline summary of the plan and how to obtain more information were made freely available throughout the Parish in the local store, butchers shop, Pavilion, Internet Café and the three local public houses.

This leaflet was posted to all dwellings in the Parish. This also advertised two drop in sessions which were arranged to allow local residents to come along and raise any issues or points of clarification.

Posters were also distributed around the Parish and two large banners advertising the consultation were displayed in Burwash Common and in Burwash Village.

Individual letters encouraging replies were also sent to :

- 77 local businesses
- 27 local community groups and societies
- the 4 Call for sites landowners

Two further leaflets were posted to all dwellings in the Parish on 1st July and on 11th July to highlight the impending closure of the consultation process on 18th July.

The plan was notified to 35 statutory consulting bodies with 72 emails sent. Ten of these bodies responded and their replies are considered in Section two of this consultation statement.

Within the Burwash NDP website an electronic response form was set up to record the communities comments and the volunteers at the Internet Café were available to assist any resident who needed help to complete their return. NDP postal boxes were provided at the Internet Café, the butchers shop and the Burwash Common Pavilion for residents to place written responses.

The Plan and all appendices were made available on the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan website and responses could be made on line through this route. Throughout the consultation period the consultation was featured on the Burwash Parish Council website and app with regular prompts being sent. The consultation was also advertised regularly on Facebook.

The two drop-in sessions were held on Saturday 8th June at the Burwash Common Playing Fields Pavilion in the morning and at the Internet Café in Burwash village in the afternoon. These were attended by over 70 local residents.

Various other parish events have been used to promote the consultation and encourage responses including:

- Burwash Common quiz night
- Rose and Crown quiz night
- Presentation to Burwash Ladies Group
- Burwash Primary School Parent Teachers and Friends Association Summer Fair
- Burwash Village Open Garden event
- Burwash Primary School Sports Day

A pop up event was held throughout the day in Burwash High Street on Saturday 22nd June.

Pre-Submission responses

This extensive consultation process resulted in a total of 1,435 'hits' on the website. A total of 539 returns were made either through the website or the postal boxes provided. A database was set up to record all these responses and each has been numbered and hard copy files have also been established for audit or inspection purposes.

Of these, 529 responses came from local households and businesses. A further 10 replies were received from the statutory consulting bodies.

Within the responses from the local community there were over 1,000 comments which were all individually considered and are shown in the attached summary sheets.

The level of responses from the community was extremely high.

The analysis of these 529 returns shows :

Support the NDP	501	94.70%
Don't support the NDP	13	2.46%
Didn't indicate	15	2.84%

Further analysis

The reasons provided within the 13 Noes have been analysed and are as follows

7	Don't want any development
2	Suggested other sites
1	Impact on business
1	Not enough parking
1	Not enough Affordable housing
1	Non specific

The comments have also been analysed and covered the following issues

Topic	%
Affordable/Accessible homes for local people	16.98
Lobby for 6 or more rule to be changed/Small developments only	14.16
AONB/Views	10.94
Protect Village life and culture	10.94
Parking/ Electric car points	10.34
Traffic speed/volume	9.40
Infrastructure	6.87
Environment/Ecology	4.90
Other sites (Oakleys and Bell Inn)	4.49
No more sites/development	2.95
Young people	2.53
Community transport	2.10
Include Burwash Common and Weald in housing target	1.82
Footpaths/cycle path	1.68

Revisions to the Plan

The Steering Group considered the detailed responses received and whether any changes should be recommended to the Parish Council. This resulted in changes to all of the original policies. These changes mainly related to providing additional explanatory text and policy rewording. Of the original 26 policies, 2 have been combined, 1 subsumed into another policy and 6 removed.

Responses from Statutory Consultees

1	South East Water	Supports the Plan in the context of water supply	Thank you	No change
2	Natural England	No specific comments on this plan	Thank you	No change
3	SGN	Our concern at SGN would be number and size of developments. Stated in the Plan there is a target of 52 new homes by 2028. Regarding the SGN infrastructure there is capacity on our network to accommodate these homes. However, there may still be localised reinforcement required, dependent on where the developments are.	The Parish Council notes this concern and will bring this to the attention of RDC to ensure that should higher numbers of new homes start to emerge that they advise you.	No change but bring this matter to the attention of RDC
4	High Weald Joint Advisory Committee (AONB Unit)	<p>Thank you for consulting the High Weald AONB Unit on this draft neighbourhood plan. I would like to congratulate the community of Burwash for its hard work and commitment to producing this plan.</p> <p>The High Weald AONB Unit supports the policies in this Plan which seek to conserve and enhance the AONB. In particular Policy EN02 'Landscape Protection' effectively draws on the key landscape components in the AONB as identified in the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019-24. It is considered that the interpretation of this policy would be easier for users if there was accompanying text which referred to the Management Plan components and if maps were included in the plan showing where they are located in Burwash. These maps have been provided to the Steering Group previously.</p> <p>The other two policies of most relevance to the AONB are GP01 and GP02. GP01 is a rather vague policy which will be difficult for decision-makers to assess proposals against. It is recommended that GP01 is combined with EN02 to clarify the link between appropriate development in the AONB and conserving and enhancing the key landscape components.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Plan revised to reflect all the areas of concern raised by the High Weald AONB Unit</p>

		<p>Southern Water is the statutory sewerage undertaker for the area covered by Burwash Parish Council. Please find following our comments in respect of specific policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>We hope that you find our response useful and would be grateful if you could keep us informed of progress.</p> <p>Policy GP04: Development Boundaries</p> <p>Southern Water understands the desire to protect countryside areas surrounding the Parish settlements. However, we cannot support the current wording of the above policy as it could create a barrier to statutory utility providers, such as Southern Water, from delivering essential infrastructure required to serve existing and planned development.</p> <p>Prevention of development outside the settlement area is not in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018, unless the land has been designated as Green Belt (Paragraph 145). Paragraph 134 of the NPPF establishes that one of the purposes of Green Belt land is <i>'to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment'</i>. However, caveats necessarily exist, and in the case of Green Belts, paragraph 146 of the NPPF states that <i>'certain other forms of development are also not inappropriate'</i>, including <i>'engineering operations'</i>.</p> <p>Although there are no current plans for the expansion of existing wastewater treatment services to the settlements within Burwash, it would not be appropriate to restrict future development needs. Furthermore, there may be limited options available for the location of new sewerage infrastructure (e.g. a new pumping station) due to the need to connect into the existing sewerage network, and since such works would be</p>		
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

		<p>classified as 'engineering operations', it is considered that the provision of sewerage infrastructure constitutes appropriate development. The National Planning Practice Guidance (ref: 34-005-20140306) recognises this scenario and states that <i>'it will be important to recognise that water and wastewater infrastructure sometimes has particular locational needs (and often consists of engineering works rather than new buildings) which mean otherwise protected areas may exceptionally have to be considered'</i>.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the NPPF and National Planning Policy Guidance, we propose the following additional wording (underlined) for policy BUA1:</p> <p><i>Development proposals outside the existing development boundaries (as shown in Appendix M) will generally not be supported, <u>unless they are needed to meet operational requirements of utility infrastructure providers.</u></i></p>	Agreed	Policy reworded to reflect Southern Waters suggestion but with 'essential' included to provide protection from unnecessary works.
6	National Grid	No issues identified within the Burwash NDP area	Thank you	No change
7	Highways England	In the case of Burwash Parish, our interest relates to the A21 which runs to the east of the Parish. We note that Rother District Council's adopted Core Strategy sets a housing target for Burwash of 52 new homes by 2028. Burwash Parish Council has not been able to identify development sites that could provide six or more homes and so no sites are allocated in the draft Plan. New planning applications will be assessed according to the policies in the Neighbourhood Development Plan.		

		On this basis, Highways England does not have any objections to the draft Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan. However, if proposed new housing sites come forward or the quantum of development in Burwash Parish significantly exceeds the target of 52 new homes up to 2028, then we will wish to be consulted and may require an assessment of the cumulative impact upon the A21.	Thank you The Parish Council notes this concern and will bring this to the attention of RDC to ensure that should higher numbers of new homes start to emerge that they advise you.	No change but bring this matter to the attention of RDC
8	Etchingham Parish Council	At the Etchingham Parish Council meeting held on 20th June 2019 it was resolved to support the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan particularly as many of the policies and aspirations mirror those of the Etchingham Neighbourhood which will shortly be going forward to Reg 14 consultation itself.	Thank you	No change
9	East Sussex County Council	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan. The following are officer comments from East Sussex County Council (ESCC) which have been sub-divided into the respective disciplines for ease of reference. Where appropriate the specific section, policy or document within the consultation documents has been referred to. If you have any queries on the County Council's comments please contact:</p> <p>Strategic Economic Infrastructure Team Communities, Economy & Transport East Sussex County Council 01273 481397 chris.flavin@eastsussex.gov.uk</p> <p>1. Transport</p> <p>Section 2: Vision and Objectives (page 14)</p> <p>1.1 We note the inclusion of transport objectives outlined in this section these are in alignment with the ESCC Local Transport Plan 2011 – 2026 which is welcomed.</p>	Thank you	No change

	<p>Burwash Common -Linking Burwash and Etchingam (for station)</p> <p>Deletion of text on page 41</p> <p>1.5 Under the 'Parish Council Rolling Plan' in the section 'Environment and Maintenance' on pages 40-41 there is a point which states:</p> <p>'Seek listed status for village pavements, rights of way and footpaths.'</p> <p>1.6 Whilst it is possible for Listed Building Status to be applied to historic structures such as bridges (over which there are pavements or rights of way), the listed status can't be applied to pavements, rights of way or footpaths. We therefore recommend that the sentence above is deleted from the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>2. Landscape</p> <p>2.1 The plan and policies are informed by a landscape / townscape character appraisal and this is welcomed.</p> <p>2.2 The general policies such as GP01 (AONB) and GP02 (Views to and from the AONB) will help to ensure conservation of the landscape character and visual amenity of the parish and are supported.</p> <p>2.3 Policy GP05 (Design Standards) could include a cross reference to the emerging High Weald AONB Design Guide which is currently out for consultation (but it should have been adopted by the time that the Burwash NP reaches the Reg. 16). http://www.highweald.org/lookafter/planning/design-guide-consultation.html</p>		<p>The BPC has opened discussions with ESCC to explore how best to protect this valuable heritage asset.</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Policy reworded to reflect ESCC suggestion</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Larger developments of ten or more homes should be designed to provide new green amenity space, reflecting and extending the existing provision of accessible green spaces within the Parish and providing wildlife corridors and stepping stones between semi-natural habitats in the wider area.</p> <p>Environment Policies and Policy EN04 (Green Infrastructure: footpaths)</p> <p>3.4 The Environment Policies are welcomed and supported. For EN04 (Green infrastructure: Footpaths and bridleways), it needs to be made clear that improving footpaths and bridleways must not be done to the detriment of biodiversity.</p> <p>Biodiversity Records data</p> <p>3.5 Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre (SxBRC) report should be listed in schedule of evidence documents and /or SxBRC should be listed in sources of information.</p> <p>4. Historic Environment and Archaeology</p> <p>Section 1 – Overview</p> <p>4.1 The ‘History of Burwash Parish’ captures well the historic character of the parish and the distinction between the three separate villages. However it is uncertain whether it has drawn on the information held by the Historic Environment Record https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/environment/archaeology/her/</p> <p>Environment Sub-group</p> <p>4.2 The objectives only appear to consider designated heritage assets not archaeological sites. The parish contains 230</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Policy reworded to reflect ESCC suggestion</p> <p>Policy reworded to reflect ESCC suggestion</p> <p>Report will be listed</p> <p>Policy GP03 reworded to reflect ESCC concerns</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>recorded archaeological sites but none of these are designated Scheduled Monuments. In focusing on designated heritage assets it therefore appears that the NP working subgroup has just focused on the 138 Listed Buildings in the parish.</p> <p>Land evaluation</p> <p>4.3 The ESCC Archaeology Team were consulted by Rother DC on the SHLAA and identified sites that were of high archaeological significance that would inhibit development (Red), sites that would require archaeological assessment to establish their archaeological significance prior to a planning application being made (Amber), and sites with a low archaeological risk (Green).</p> <p>4.4 Although we recognise that the Neighbourhood Plan is not proposing housing allocations at this stage, were this position to be re-considered, we would be happy to undertake a similar high-level assessment on any of the sites that are being considered.</p> <p>Policy GP02 (Views to and from the AONB)</p> <p>4.5 Although the aspiration to “protect listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets “is commendable, it must be remembered that heritage assets includes archaeological sites.</p> <p>Policy GP03 (Heritage)</p> <p>4.6 Again this policy does not consider archaeology. Sites may contain significant archaeological remains, and the NPPF has a presumption for the preservation of significant remains. The parish would be encouraged to consider drawing up a local list of important non-designated historic buildings.</p> <p>GP05 (Design standards)</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>This refers to GP03 which has been reworded</p> <p>Policy reworded to reflect ESCC suggestion</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>allocations Plan for Burwash, therefore the key question is how the requisite allocations to meet the outstanding target be achieved?</p> <p>In advance of allocations set out within the Neighbourhood Plan, planning applications for development within Burwash Parish will be considered in the context of Policy OVE1 in the DaSA which states:</p> <p>Until such time as a Neighbourhood Plan for the relevant settlement with an outstanding Core Strategy housing requirement is in force, planning applications will be favourably considered for development proposals in those settlements where:</p> <p>(i) they contribute to meeting the housing target for that settlement and accord with the relevant spatial strategy; and</p> <p>(ii) the site and development proposals are otherwise suitable having regard to other relevant policies of the Core Strategy, including the considerations in OSS2 and OSS3, and of this Plan.</p> <p>Including allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan ensures positive planning for development in the area and does not leave the parish vulnerable to speculative planning applications. Having a Neighbourhood Plan, which includes housing allocations to meet the outstanding target, offers far better protection from speculative development than without it. Therefore it is considered that it is for the Neighbourhood Plan to make these allocations to meet the target set out in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>By the Neighbourhood Plan not including allocations, this creates a significant problem as to how allocations will be achieved within the area creating a potential policy vacuum.</p>		<p>and this supported the Steering Groups not to support their inclusion. Further detail to clarify this point will be added.</p> <p>The Parish Council understands the implications associated with not allocating housing and that the requisite allocations to meet the outstanding target will be achieved through Policy OVE1 in the DaSA.</p> <p>Whilst the Parish agrees that without a Parish allocation there is a degree of vulnerability, the Plan has been positively prepared. It has assessed the possibility of allocating sites and carried out extensive public consultation on this Plan. This Plan including this aspect reflects the clear views of the community and honours the overarching requirements of the Localism Act.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>There is concern as to whether the Plan will meet the basic conditions in due course.</p> <p>b) There are sites within Burwash which have been granted planning permission which results in a residual residential requirement of 22 dwellings. There are no maps of the sites that have been assessed from the call for sites exercise and the methodology is unclear so it is not possible for consultees (including the District Council) to comment meaningfully on the conclusions. Furthermore it is noted that there are existing, long-term vacant commercial sites within Burwash which are up for sale and should have been considered as part of the site finding exercise.</p> <p>c) It is noted that it is the intention of the BNDP to use the existing Development Boundaries adopted in the Rother Local Plan 2006. This not a positive approach to planning as required by the Neighbourhood Planning process.</p>		<p>Clarity is required from RDC on which of the basic conditions that RDC considers may not be met as a result of not allocating housing.</p> <p>The site selection criteria is clearly set out in Table 1 of the site assessment scoring process. The call for sites exercise includes maps for each of the sites and the site maps were available at the consultation event for the site assessment. The maps for each site assessed are included in the plan to provide greater clarity. The call for sites exercise was widely publicised and the sites which were brought forward were assessed. The conclusions from the site assessment are very clear that the sites which came forward were all preferred options but the Plan will include greater clarity on the response from the public which has shaped the final conclusion.</p> <p>The community has overwhelmingly rejected</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>d) The BNDP will need to include a Policies Map and other relevant Topic Maps on Ordnance Survey (OS) base mapping in order to complete the necessary information which outlines the requirements of each specific planning policy.</p> <p>e) The majority of the planning policies within the BNDP are relevant and appropriate for the Parish. Some additional explanatory text and policy rewording will be needed to progress the plan to Regulation 15 and onwards. The lack of explanatory text for planning policies is not helpful as it does not make the BNDP easy to read, provide context or give explanations about how policies should be applied. Further commentary relating to this is provided below.</p> <p>f) The evidence base to support the policies needs to be robust and there are issues about its incompleteness in certain policy elements particularly housing site allocations.</p> <p>h) It is recommended that the pre submission plan receives an NPIERS health check and if required revision (which may need new consultation under Regulation 14) before being presented to the LPA at Regulation 15 stage.</p> <p>RDC DETAILED COMMENTS BNDP Executive Summary</p> <p>Page 5 – para 9 We asked RDC to consider two additional sites for development which they subsequently rejected - Where are these sites? It is not clear where these sites are and why they were rejected.</p>		<p>alterations to the existing development boundaries and supported policy GP03 to strengthen this area. We will seek assistance from RDC to produce the correct map to show this.</p> <p>The Parish agrees that a Policies Map is needed and will seek assistance from RDC to produce the map.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Further clarity will be provided.</p> <p>An NPIERS health check will be considered.</p> <p>Extra detail will be added to this paragraph for clarity</p>
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>Page 5 – para 10 – four potential sites brought forward (three new, one from the SHLAA) Following presentations, detailed evaluation and consultation sessions with residents it was decided, by public opinion, that none of these sites were suitable for development .The evidence base for decision making should be related to planning policy, each sites merits based on a robust methodology and SEA analysis and not public opinion alone.</p> <p>Page 5 para 11 – Recent decisions taken by RDC on Denton Homes and Strand Meadow planning applications were considered with residents views about the need to protect the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. We are not clear what this reference means for the Neighbourhood Plan. Strand Meadow is an allocated site within the Burwash Development Boundary 2006 RDC Local Plan and has outline planning permission for 30 dwellings and counts towards the housing target for the settlement of Burwash. The Denton Homes site should also be evaluated as part of the site evaluation process and conclusions made regarding whether it can contribute towards meeting the outstanding target against a robust methodology as indicated above.</p> <p>Page 5 para 13 We have concluded that there are no suitable development sites which meet RDC’ requirement of six or more homes, which will be supported by RDC and the community and for this reason we are not allocating any sites for development within this plan.</p> <p>This is the key issue relating to the progress of the BNDP. The Government advice on this matter is contained in Planning Practice Guidance which states as follows: ‘A neighbourhood plan can also propose allocating alternative sites to those in a local plan (or spatial development strategy), where alternative proposals for inclusion in the neighbourhood</p>		<p>Extra detail will be added to this paragraph for clarity including the site assessment for the sites which have very clear criteria. This will also be reworded as the evaluation was on planning terms supported by the consultation.</p> <p>There was a call for sites process and the Denton Homes site was not brought forward hence not assessed as part of this site process.</p> <p>The Plan agrees with the allocation and supports applications to meet these requirements. This point will be further emphasised in para 14.</p> <p>We will also reword para 13 to better reflect an accurate account of the site assessment work and the public consultation.</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>plan are not strategic, but a qualifying body should discuss with the local planning authority why it considers the allocations set out in the strategic policies are no longer appropriate.</p> <p>The resulting draft neighbourhood plan must meet the basic conditions if it is to proceed. National planning policy states that it should support the strategic development needs set out in strategic policies for the area, plan positively to support local development and should not promote less development than set out in the strategic policies (see paragraph 13 and paragraph 29 of the National Planning Policy Framework). Nor should it be used to constrain the delivery of a strategic site allocated for development in the local plan or spatial development strategy.</p> <p>Should there be a conflict between a policy in a neighbourhood plan and a policy in a local plan or spatial development strategy, section 38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to become part of the development plan</p> <p>In this particular case the strategic document which forms of the development plan is the RDC Core Strategy 2014. There is considerable concern that the Neighbourhood Plan may not meet the basic conditions on the basis that, in the absence of the inclusion of allocations to meet the outstanding target and no other document planned to be prepared to include these allocations, there is a real risk that the Plan may not be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the</p>		<p>The Neighbourhood Development Plan supports the housing requirement for Burwash over the period 2011 to 2028 which is 52 units as allocated by Rother District Council Core Strategy 2014 but does not seek to allocate the sites for residential development. Any sites that are allocated in Burwash will be subject to compliance with other relevant policies in the development plan.</p> <p>We understand this to be correct</p> <p>The plan has to be in general conformity with the strategic policies. This does not mean</p>
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>development plan for the local area' for the reasons explained above.</p> <p>Page 5 para14 If this Plan is 'made' the current housing target of 52 new homes by 2028 will still apply but all new planning applications will be assessed in the light of the policies set out</p>		<p>that it has to allocate the sites but it needs to agree with them and not be contrary to them.</p> <p>The plan agrees with the allocation but there is no requirement to make the actual allocation. The text needs to be updated to make this clear. PPG makes it clear that the scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body. Where strategic policies set out a housing requirement figure for a designated neighbourhood area, the neighbourhood planning body does not have to make specific provision for housing, or seek to allocate sites to accommodate the requirement (which may have already been done through the strategic policies or through non-strategic policies produced by the local planning authority). The strategic policies will, however, have established the scale of housing expected to take place in the neighbourhood area.</p>
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>in the agreed NDP. Applications which meet these requirements will generally be welcomed and supported It is difficult to ascertain what this approach is trying to achieve. How will the mechanics of this work? Planning applications will have to be determined on the basis of the Development Plan which includes the Core Strategy, DaSA policies once adopted, as well as the Neighbourhood Plan if made. There are no housing policies or allocated sites or development boundaries (only extracts from the 2006 Local Plan) in the Burwash NDP with which one can determine planning applications.</p> <p>Page 5 para 15 Whilst the use of exception sites might provide some housing the key issue is how will that approach meet the Core Strategy targets for Burwash? Are there sites in mind in the parish?</p> <p>Page 8 Map It will be necessary for the BNDP to have an OS base map of the Parish to indicate where the built up areas of Burwash, Burwash Weald and Burwash Common are located.</p> <p>Page 19 para 3 Core Strategy housing requirement = 52 units</p> <p>Page 20 para 11 The Bell Inn is a listed building and unlikely to provide a site within its curtilage for 6 dwellings. It needs to be properly evaluated via using an appropriate sites methodology.</p>		<p>This paragraph will be reworded.</p> <p>Para 15 will be amended to provide clarity. There are no site assessments made in regards to exception sites and the plan is not purporting to allocate any sites, it is saying that it supports the delivery of exception sites as evidenced by Morris Close.</p> <p>The Parish agrees that a Policies Map is needed and will seek assistance from RDC to produce the map.</p> <p>This is correct</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Page 20 para 12 Oakleys Garage is brownfield site within the current village development boundary, unused for over two years and up for sale. This site should be evaluated for its potential for residential use in order to establish whether it can contribute to meeting the residual residential housing allocation for Burwash which currently stands at 22 dwellings.</p> <p>Page 20 para 14 Strand Meadow has an extant planning permission for 30 units and notwithstanding the current appeal for full approval of details; this site should be continue to be allocated within the Burwash NDP. It is currently allocated in the adopted plan for Burwash which is the Rother District Local Plan adopted in July 2006.</p> <p>Page 21 para 22 This summary identifies four sites that have been put forward for housing outside the current development boundary. They are Fairview Farm, Little Dawes, Glebe House and Field to the rear of 102-109 Shrub Lane. However whilst the four sites have been assessed in the Burwash Site Assessment Scoring Report June 2018 appendix there are no maps of the exact land for development within the four sites by which consultees could properly comment via the regulation 14 consultation. Nor is there any proper site assessment of any of the sites in this evidence base document.</p>		<p>The text is indicative based upon sites of similar size.</p> <p>There was a call for sites process and the Oakleys Garage site was not brought forward hence not assessed as part of this site process. PPG makes it clear that The scope of neighbourhood plans is up to the neighbourhood planning body. The text will be revised to explain the situation.</p> <p>The site is allocated in the RDC plan and not the Burwash NDP. The text will be revised to explain the situation.</p> <p>The site selection criteria is clearly set out in Table 1 of the site assessment scoring process. The call for sites exercise includes maps for each of the sites and the site maps were available at the consultation event for the site</p>
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Page 26 para 61 As a result of the decision not to allocate development sites in the Neighbourhood Plan this may create legal and administrative problems for the BNDP in meeting the Basic Conditions.</p> <p>Whilst a Neighbourhood Plan does not have to allocate sites, Burwash Parish Council decided that it did want to undertake this task. The consequences of that decision was that site allocations for Burwash were left to the parish NDP and not included in the DaSA. The housing policies for Rother District should be either within the DaSA or the nine designated Neighbourhood Plans. Five neighbourhood plans are made and four are in early preparation. The four in preparation are all to allocate housing sites in order that the District has complete housing policy cover as required by the Core Strategy 2014. It is therefore for Burwash to identify sites for an additional 22 dwellings and to provide a development boundary to the village extended if necessary</p> <p>In conclusion by not undertaking the site allocations, as initially considered, the BNDP may not meet the Neighbourhood Planning Basic Conditions requirements in due course which</p>		<p>assessment. The maps for each site assessed are included in the plan to provide greater clarity. The call for sites exercise was widely publicised and the sites which were brought forward were assessed. The conclusions from the site assessment are very clear that the sites which came forward were all evaluated on planning terms.</p>
--	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>include having regard to national policy and being in general conformity with the strategic policies in the development plan for the local area.</p> <p>BNDP General Policies</p> <p>Page 28 Policy GP01 Development within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty</p> <p>The introductory text to the policy should include mention of the RDC Core Strategy Policy EN1 (Landscape Stewardship) and the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019 -2024. The Policy GP01 needs to be reworded so that it is clear to developers and planners what is meant by 'appropriate' development. Development should conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the AONB and the policy state that objective.</p> <p>Page 28 Policy GP02 Views to and from the AONB.</p> <p>The introductory text should refer to the East Sussex Landscape Assessments relating to the Upper Rother Valley and the Dudwell Valley. The policy as drafted is too broad and not clear as to which views are to be protected. In order for this policy to be acceptable it will need to be redrafted and accompanied by annotated view points on OS base maps so that landowners, developers and decision makers can clearly identify where these viewpoints are within the parish. As drafted the policy is too vague. The Examiner for the Ticehurst NP required that a similar policy in the Ticehurst NP be modified to provide the exact location of the all the viewpoints along with accompanying OS base maps with arrows indicating the direction of the viewpoints before the Plan could proceed to referendum</p> <p>Page 28 Policy GP03 Heritage</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Clarity is required from RDC on which basic condition RDC considers may not be met as a result of not allocation housing.</p> <p>We have added in references to the AONB management Plan and core strategy.</p> <p>We have added text as suggested in the introductory text with reference to the East Sussex landscape assessments</p> <p>Agreed – work is underway to strengthen this through the provision of maps and the location of viewpoints.</p>
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>The introductory text should refer to and identify with an OS map the Burwash Conservation Area. Also is it only Burwash that this policy relates to or are Burwash Common and Burwash Weald included. Whilst details of the listed buildings in the parish can be obtained from the RDC or Historic England websites where can interested persons obtain details of the non- designated heritage assets? Whilst the thrust of the policy is understood the wording of the elements relating to nondesignated heritage assets seems to indicate that harm could be caused and yet permission could be granted. The policy should be indicating that positive proposals for non-designated heritage assets would be supported.</p> <p>Page 29 Policy GP04 Development Boundaries This is a fundamental issue in relation the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan and its interaction with the RDC Core Strategy and Development and Site Allocations Local Plan. The BNDP should seek to allocate sites for 52 dwellings with Burwash (taking into account any completions and commitments). It should include a development boundary with any necessary amendments. The residual amount of housing of 22 dwellings to be allocated is likely to result in the need for a revised development boundary. It is recommended that sites should be found to be included in the BNDP to plan positively for the area and move forward. The Plan should consider the need for amendments to Development Boundaries for Burwash, Burwash Weald and Burwash Common. Planning in rural areas is undertaken by the use of Development Boundaries to distinguish settlements from the countryside and the efficacy of the planning policies for the countryside is maintained by this approach. If Burwash does not have allocated sites and development boundaries in a 'made' NDP (Burwash is not in the DaSA) then this will make RDC decision making the Burwash Parish subject to the default position in</p>	Thank you	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Extensive consultation within our community has shown no appetite for extending the boundaries and clear support for maintaining 'the gaps' between the three settlements. No change.</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>the NPPF 2019 which is exacerbated by the lack of a five year housing land supply in the District. This will mean that the very situation of development on sites in the parish will be determined by external speculative development factors and appeals. The inclusion of allocated sites in the Neighbourhood Plan puts the parish in a much stronger position to defend speculative planning applications than without any allocations. In order for the NDP to proceed site allocations and development boundaries in clearly defined written policies accompanied by OS site plans and a policies map will be required</p> <p>Page 29 Policy GP05 Design Standards The approach taken is understood. The policy needs some amendment and rewording to become workable as a planning policy. The policy should apply to new build homes and other buildings and alterations to existing properties that require planning permission. It should not preclude skilful innovative design in contemporary architecture subject to context. Questions raised on the wording of item g. as to whether such infrastructure would be under planning controls. Similarly item h. would not apply to extensions which were undertaken under permitted development regulations. Clarification of wording and amendments to the policy are suggested.</p> <p>Page 30 Policy GP06 Existing Open Spaces This needs supporting text and an evidence base to explain the rationale of the policy. Also there should be an OS based map to show the location of the open spaces being referred to. It is not acceptable for wording 'such as' to be included in the policy. There needs to be a complete list of all the open space sites to which this policy applies. Also as it reads it means that if new development (all forms) does not impinge on the open</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>spaces then it should be approved. Is that the purpose of the policy?</p> <p>Page 30 Policy GP07 New Open Spaces This policy needs supporting text and an explanation as to its rationale. Where are developments of ten or more homes going to go? There are no allocations. What happens if a site adjoins an existing open space as referred to in Policy GP06? Will a further green space be required? The terms green space and open space are used interchangeably, one term should be used consistently.</p> <p>Page 30 Policy GP08 Sustainable Development The approach to sustainable development is understood. However the policy needs some explanatory text and consideration of what of the listed policy items can be achieved via the planning process. The provision of information that can reasonably be required to be submitted via a planning application is limited and therefore certain of the suggested policy submissions need to be checked as to their appropriateness.</p> <p>Page 31 Policy GP09 Resident Consultation Requirements for formal consultations within Rother District are contained within the National and Local List of Planning Application requirements Nov 2018. In this regard planning applications for any major proposal in excess of 50 dwellings or 1000 sqm of commercial floorspace must be subject to pre application engagement prior to being submitted. This is part of the statutory planning application process. Policy GP09 would not be considered acceptable in planning terms and should be removed. However the Parish Council could request developers to engage with parish residents prior to submitting development</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Amended wording for consistency for use of ‘open space’</p> <p>Policy GP08 (d) removed</p> <p>Policy removed</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>proposals as a matter of goodwill rather than through the planning system.</p> <p>BDNP Housing Policies Page 31 Policy HO01 Housing tenure and mix The supporting text needs to expand on the policy. As in GP04 the actual future development boundaries need to be considered in conjunction with this policy.</p> <p>Page 31 Policy HO02 Rural Exception Sites The supporting text needs to include reference to RDC Core Strategy Policy LHN3 Rural Exception Sites and Policy DHG2 Rural Exception Sites in the emerging DaSA in order that criteria for such sites is fully explained. Part of the criteria for approving a rural exception site viz (iv) is that The development is supported or initiated by the Parish Council. In this case it is questionable as to whether Policy HO02 is actually required in the BNDP.</p> <p>Page 32 Policy HO03 Local Connections There are various issues relating to affordable housing and the criteria for selecting occupiers and tenants which are not applied via the planning process. The requirements outlined this policy need to be checked as to their legality in terms of a planning policy. For the reasons expressed above this suggested policy is not considered to be exercisable via the planning system and should be removed. Environment</p> <p>Page 32 Policy EN01 Land Management</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions. As above changes to development boundaries were specifically rejected by the community</p> <p>Supporting text amended to include policy context</p> <p>Policy removed</p>
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>In the supporting text suggest reference to RDC Core Strategy Policy EN1 Landscape Stewardship and the High Weald AONB Management Plan 2019 -2024. In the second part of the policy the use of the word damage could lead to difficulties of interpretation in relation to decision making. Suggest rewording.</p> <p>Page 33 Policy EN02 Landscape protection There is comprehensive supporting text to this policy. It is suggested that the wording in the Policy stating In particular, development must be amended to shall. Suggest that in item (a) the wording Protect and if necessary be replaced by Protect and, where appropriate,</p> <p>Page 34 Policy EN03 Natural environment protection The supporting text identifies a number of sites to which this policy refers to. They should be plotted onto an OS base map so it is clearly evident to interested parties, developers and landholders the relevant locations of the sites. Also as the Biodiversity records are referred to in the policy there should be a hyperlink in the introductory text. Suggest that the introduction to the policy be reworded to state that Development shall preserve, protect..... . Also for clarity it is suggested that the wording of the policy be further amended to read as and biodiversity within the Parish. The reference to the Biodiversity Records Centre can then be removed from the policy and reference made to the relevant sites on the policies map.</p> <p>Page 34 Policy EN04 Green infrastructure: Footpaths and bridleways This policy will need to be endorsed by ESCC who have the responsibilities for footpaths and bridleways. In relation to the policy it needs to be clear exactly what is being required. The</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p>
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>policy would be better if prefaced by Where appropriate as not all new development might relate to existing footpaths and bridleways. Also it is unlikely that the requirements for upkeep, enhancement and maintenance can be undertaken via the planning system, particularly where they relate to existing deficiencies.</p> <p>Page 35 Policy EN05 Dark Skies The objectives of this policy will only be able to relate to those proposals which require planning permission. Within the introductory text it will be necessary to identify and explain which light pollution standards and restrictions will apply to item two of the policy. It is suggested that the introduction to the policy should read New development proposals</p> <p>Page 35 Policy EN06 Air pollution This policy needs to be endorsed by an evidence base. Have any discussions taken place with Environmental Health and ESCC Highways in relation to air quality? There needs to be a more detailed explanation of the policy requirements in the introductory text including types of mitigation and an outline of national policies. The policy should be prefaced with Where appropriate. The wording of the policy also needs to be tightened so that applicants are aware the type of information that might need to be submitted. Also it is important to note that this policy cannot to apply to all planning applications and only where relevant.</p> <p>Page 36 Policy EN07 Historic landscape environment This policy requires a more detailed explanatory text to outline its objectives and requirements. As presented the wording of the policy is too vague to be interpreted and usable in the determination of planning applications. The use of phrases such pose potential harm or threat and historic landscape assets</p>	Thank you	<p>No comment received from ESCC on this matter so considered to be endorsed</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>Data is being collated following surveys over the past 12 months to provide a benchmark. The policy will then be reworded accordingly</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>need to be explained and defined so that the decision maker and developers can make a judgement as to what are the policy requirements in order to make the proposal acceptable.</p> <p>Page 36 Policy EN08 Integration of landscaping The objectives of this policy are understood. However it is unreasonable and depending on site location unnecessary for every development to require an integrated landscape scheme as part of the proposal. It is suggested that the policy introduction should be amended to read Where appropriate developers will..... Infrastructure including Leisure, Economy and Tourism</p> <p>Page 36 Policy IN01 Pedestrian safety This particular policy needs some explanatory text to outline its objectives. Also certain of the footpath requirements mentioned in the policy appear to be within the remit of ESCC highways rather than planning. It is suggested that the policy be discussed with ESCC in order to ascertain its validity. The view is taken that the as written the policy appears to exceed what is possible under the planning regulations and needs to be rethought.</p> <p>Page 37 Policy IN02 Parking The car parking standards for development proposals in East Sussex are administered by ESCC Highways, The standards are contained within the following documents Guidance for Parking at New Residential Development – Transport Development Control 2017, Guidance for Parking at Non- Residential Development and the Car Parking Demand Calculator. It is important that this policy has been discussed with ESCC Highways and that the evidence referred to in the introductory text is robust. Suggest that the first part of the policy should read Where appropriate development shall provide adequate</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Agreed, this policy has been reworded and strengthened</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p> <p>ESCC made one small amendment to this policy which has been incorporated</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p>
--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>car parking in accordance with ESCC parking standards..... With regard to the local identified needthought needs to given as to how this will interact with the car parking standards.</p> <p>Page 37 Policy IN03 Integrated transport Whilst appreciating the intentions of this policy improvements to bus services and community transport are not usually within the purview of the planning system. The National and Local List of Planning Application requirements Nov 2018 states that only planning applications for any major proposal in excess of 50 dwellings or 1000 sqm of commercial floorspace can require a travel plan to be submitted. It appears that this is an aspiration for the parish rather than a land use policy and should be referred to as such.</p> <p>Page 38 Policy IN04 Supporting business The objectives of this policy are understood and could benefit from some additional evidential information in the introductory text. Many single businesses located within dwelling houses do not require permission and this should be clarified in the introductory text. Where permission is required it is because of the scale of the business eg. employees working at the site, deliveries, parking, noise etc. These elements can impact on the amenities of adjoining residents and in this case this policy should identify there should be no loss of amenities in determining the proposal. The first element of the policy needs significant rewording. In relation to the second element of the proposal more clarity is needed to as to its purpose and objectives.</p> <p>Page 38 Policy IN05 Retention of existing business premises The introductory text needs to be expanded to explain the rationale behind the policy. Certain changes of use can be</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Policy removed</p> <p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p>
--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>undertaken as permitted development. The situation relating to the permitted development regulations is that these are national regulations relating to England which apply irrespective of adopted Local Plan and made Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p> <p>In regard to the permitted development rights relating to the conversion of retail premises to either offices or residential the position is that development is not permitted if the building is on article 2 (3) land (which includes conservation areas and AONBs). As Burwash is within the AONB it appears that the permitted development rights would not apply to retail premises</p> <p>However, there are permitted development rights that allow B1(a) offices to be converted to residential use. This is permitted under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class O of the GPDO, subject to applicants going through a prior notification process to allow the local planning authority to assess the transport and highways impacts, contamination risks, flooding risks and the impact of noise from commercial premises on occupiers of the development. AONBs and conservation areas are not excluded and therefore offices in Burwash could potentially be converted to residential under the PD rights.</p> <p>With regard to the wording of the policy the creation of new and retention of existing businesses is welcomed but the definition of what is a business use should be defined in terms of the use classes. However in the introduction, any new development proposals should be determined on their merits but with due regard to the protection of existing businesses, where relevant. With regard to (a), the requirement of two independent valuation reports will need to be justified in the supporting text. The use of the word 'correct' is open to interpretation and it is suggested that this is reworded. The terms rent and lease are used interchangeably in the policy.</p>	Thank you	<p>Agreed – Policy has been changed to reflect RDC suggestions</p>
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>Page 39 Policy IN06 Provision of Telecommunications</p> <p>Much of the elements of this policy relate to matters which are permitted development via the prior approval system, With regard to item (b) of the policy it strongly recommended to delete reference to mimic trees which would not be considered appropriate in the AONB. The improvement to broadband services would appear to be an aspiration and not really within the purview on land use policy.</p>		Policy removed
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	----------------

General consultation responses

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
1	Y	Lobby for change of RDC rule to allow developments of less than 6 units to count towards targets in rural areas	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
2	Y	RDC rule to allow developments of less than 6 units to count towards targets in rural areas not acceptable	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
3	Y		Thank you	No change
4	Y	Important to build in keeping with East Sussex/ Kent border style of housing. Need to make sure we have AH for young people If we do not revitalise our village we will become a village of old people without a future	Policies GP03 and HO03 apply	No change
5	Y	Affordable housing is a must on any development in Burwash	Policy HO01 applies	No change
6	Y	We are impressed with the Plan and are in favour. It is important to keep the nature and atmosphere of the village intact Ludicrous not to include small developments under six units	Thank you Policies GP03 and GP04 apply The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards	No change No change No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	
7	Y	We have read the report and think the plan is excellent Use of barbed wire by farmers to be discouraged – support and protect wildlife in the area	Thank you This matter will be referred to the Environment Group within the Rolling Plan for consideration	No change No change
8	Y	The plan has my support	Thank you	No change
9	y	Proposed policies enable small in-keeping developments is right	Thank you	No change
10		Concern about the continued dis-use and state of Oakleys	The Parish Council is also concerned and has raised this with the owner. It has also received numerous requests from the community to consider this as a possible site during this consultation process. The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	No change The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
11	Y		Thank you	No change
12	Y	Concentrating on smaller developments to meet the village targets is the correct way – to protect village character and minimise disruption of increased traffic flow	The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			developments will need to take these policies into account	
13	Y	Village gates with visible speed limits 20mph only, Pedestrian footpaths should not be used by car owners as parking areas	This is part of the Parish Council's Rolling Plan Enforcement of parking is not within the Parish Council powers but we have raised this issue with the Police and RDC. The Parish Council is also looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC	No change No change
14	Y	Agree with all the policies put forward Need to maintain our rural historic environment, provide affordable housing for locals, scrutiny of developers and parking provision. Need to ensure infrastructure is adequate for any future development	Thank you Policies GP03, HO03, IN02 and GP05 apply to these areas	No change No change
15	Y	Have read and support the plan. Concerned about the rate of new developments across the County with little evidence of necessary social amenities/facilities, waste collections/recycling, sewerage, all of which struggle to meet current demands. Provision of water supplies most	The Parish Council has consulted with South East Water as part of this process and been informed that a major project to install new water supply pipework has recently been completed at Shrub Lane and Battenhurst Road, Burwash. South East	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		concerning. Is enough being done to meet increased water demands?	<p>Water has recently indicated that it would envisage no difficulty supplying clean water to (up to) a further 60 housing units within the Parish. This should be sufficient for the housing expansion currently envisaged.</p> <p>South East Water was clear that it can meet fresh water needs for the current housing target within its current 5-year investment programme. If the housing target increases above 60 anytime during the period covered by the NDP then we (and they) could have a problem which would require further provision of infrastructure</p>	No change
16	Y	Wholehearted support for the Plan	Thank you	No change
17	Y	There is no sustainable bus service to support new housing	Policy IN03 looks at Integrated Transport. The Parish Council is looking into the business case for a Community Bus.	No change
18	Y	<p>Plan captures the unique and special qualities of Burwash. We fully agree with conclusion reached.</p> <p>Recognise the need for small scale exception sites while preserving the special qualities of the village</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
19	Y	Plan presented with obvious care and passion. I would like to endorse it and all contents with my complete support.	Thank you	No change
20	Y	I am impressed with level of consultation and evidence based conclusions reached. Requirement for sites for 6 or more units is restrictive	Thank you The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
21	Y	Read the plan and wholeheartedly support it	Thank you	No change
22	Y	I fully support and endorse the Plan Nowhere suitable for such a large number of homes and impossible to find sites given the constraints Parish Infrastructure can't support that number of homes	Thank you	No change
23	Y	Parish is better equipped to support small scale developments on in-fill sites. Examiner should tackle RDC decisions not to include these This will protect AONB.	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
24	Y	I confirm my agreement with its comments and conclusion	Thank you	No change
25	Y	Main comments centred on proposed 20mph speed limit in village would support this limit in Rosemary Gardens, Strand Meadow and Highfields	The Parish Council has made speed and traffic calming a key priority within its Rolling Plan.	No change
26	Y	I support all key messages. What is the point of an AONB if it is going to be overwhelmed by unrestricted development	Policies GP01 and GP02 look to protect the AONB	No change
27	Y	Plan recognises the need for bungalows and single level housing Pavements are a potential hazard with no street lighting	Policy HO01 applies The Parish Council is pressing East Sussex County Council (ESCC) to continue to improve the brick pavers which are a wonderful asset within the Conservation Area. We will not support the introduction of street lighting as this would compromise our much loved dark skies	No change No change No change
28	Y		Thank you	No change
29	Y	We cannot allow building by profit greedy house builders. We need affordable homes for local people	Policy HO03 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
30	Y	<p>Disappointing that no sites identified.</p> <p>Oakleys site should be supported for development.</p> <p>The Bell Inn should also be supported</p> <p>Ashwood Nursing Home should be included.</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>The Bell Inn is unlikely in our view to provide 6 homes of more and count towards our housing target.</p> <p>The owners have in the past submitted applications for change of use which have been refused. Should they wish to bring this forward for residential they will need to submit a further application</p> <p>This building is outside the development area and is within Burwash Common so will not count towards the housing target. It also has the possibility of remaining as a Nursing Home which will be a useful asset for our aging population and also a provider of local employment opportunities.</p>	<p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Some policies seem too restrictive ie affordable homes will only be available for people in the Parish - this would not be acceptable for developers or HAs.</p> <p>The Parish needs to be more encouraging and support homes for young people.</p> <p>Provision of green space in rural areas seems unnecessary</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees and Policy HO03 will be amended</p> <p>This is supported within HO01</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that larger developments should provide accessible green space</p>	<p>HO03 has been modified to reflect this concern</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
31	Y	<p>Well done – totally agree</p> <p>Burwash needs to monitor development because of AONB</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
32	Y	I have lived in Burwash for 31 years and fully support the plan	Thank you	No change
33	Y	I fully support the plan. I have lived in Burwash all my life	Thank you	No change
34		Local people cannot afford new houses that are being built. Many new people are not interested in village life.	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Level of traffic created on narrow roads is unthinkable and parking difficult. There is no work in Burwash	Policy IN02 applies Policies IN04 and IN05 apply	No change No change
35	Y	Calculations for current housing needs are based on historic need including historic immigration needs. This is likely to drop in future. If development is considered, it should be prioritised for first time purchase. My son cannot afford house prices here.	Policy HO01 encourages a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes.	No change
36	Y	Fully support the plan. Village needs affordable homes and accessible homes for an increasingly older population	Thank you Policy HO01 applies	No change No change
37	Y	Supports the NPD but suggests that there may be options of more housing behind the Hastoe and Laundry sites	The Parish Council would not support further development in the fields behind these recent schemes as this would mean encroachment into the AONB with unacceptable impacts.	No change
38	Y	Especially support the housing element of the plan. There are no suitable sites in Burwash. The aspirational projects – some are aspirational thinking as the capital cost is not viable	Thank you As these are aspirational they have not been worked up at all at this	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			time so no costings have been produced and none of the owners/trustees consulted.	
39	Y	Totally concur	Thank you	No change
40	N	NDP is a fancy name to make more overcrowding acceptable. The character of the area will be ruined if any further development goes ahead. It will never stop at 52 homes.	The Parish Council notes these comments.	No change
41	Y	I agree with the NDP conclusion that there are no suitable sites for new homes - smaller infill sites should be used	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
42	Y	Important to have infill and brownfield sites for development - do not want large developments for the village	Policy HO02 applies	No change
43	Y	As a new resident, I am looking for Affordable Housing near family and job	Policy HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
44	Y	Needs more emphasis on lack of infrastructure, power going off continually, lack of highway maintenance	The production of the draft NDP involved discussion with all of the relevant utility companies. Those discussions are recorded in the Infrastructure Assessment report. In short, the majority of the utility companies say they can support the development of 52 new homes but they would prefer that this is synchronised with their own	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			investment plans. As well as timing, the location of new housing developments will also be important. Power cuts now occur less frequently thanks to investment in the local infrastructure by UK Power Networks Ltd. However, there is more work to do, particularly to put overhead power lines underground. The PC and the Burwash Common and Weald Residents' Association is pushing the company to give this work higher priority.	
45	Y	Homes are needed but not luxury homes - need homes for young people and families	Policy HO03 applies	No change
46	Y	Plan looks very sensible	Thank you	No change
47	Y	Agree with every proposal	Thank you	No change
48	Y	Comprehensive plan which covers village needs	Thank you	No change
49	Y	Once our fields have gone, they are gone forever	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
50	Y	I support these draft proposals	Thank you	No change
51	Y	Good Plan	Thank you	No change
52	Y	This Plan will help the 3 villages retain their identities.	Policy GP04 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Should consider the adoption of a 20mph limit on residential roads such as Vicarage Road	The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change
53	Y	We write to confirm that we support the NDP	Thank you	No change
54	Y	Plan identifies a positive way forward whilst addressing whole community needs	Thank you	No change
55	Y	Property development needs to be tightly controlled and within clearly identified boundaries	Policy GP04 applies	No change
56	Y	Being an area of AONB, developments should be small scale and predominantly infill.	Policies GP01, GP02 and HO02 apply	No change
57	N	Respondent is local landowner - believes there are sites for development and offers to identify them. 50 new homes in 10 years is a farce. It is an abuse of powers vested in you and yours	The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan. We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
58	Y	I hope the plan achieves the success it deserves	Thank you	No change
59	Y	Burwash villages have lots of heritage and natural beauty, development should be sensitive to this. Support affordable housing for young people.	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 apply Policy HO03 applies	No change No change
60	N	This plan provides no assurances that our children will have a future here. Village must secure a robust plan for housing and not concentrate on what the Parish Council are not prepared to do. I fear for both local services and local economy. The plan where it relates to environment, tourism, infrastructure and economy are scant high level wishes that cannot be supported if this village does not ensure a robust plan for housing. The 9 1/2 pages on housing concentrate solely on what the BPC are not prepared to do. This document is the extension of local planning protest group obsession with building nothing. I believe that BPC should be put under scrutiny for its involvement with protest groups, its funding of enquiries and surveys outside of its remit	The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan. We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community.	No change
61	Y	This is the plan we need to move forward	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
62	Y	I hope this can be achieved	Thank you	No change
63	Y	Let's make our own local plans and not have Govt targets imposed on us	The Parish Council accepts the housing target of 52 homes but seeks through this Plan to ensure that the units provided meet our needs and aspirations.	No change
64	Y	Ridge-top village has no room for large developments. Minimum of 6 dwellings is a nonsense. Large executive dwellings are not needed. We need appropriate housing for young people, families and the elderly. Our prime concern is not the profitability of developers	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). Policy HO01 applies	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change
65	Y		Thank you	No change
66	Y	Some aspects not mentioned in plan; protection of firefly in the church wall; need for sustainable building materials; reducing church light at night; review and management of ancient woodland boundaries; coppicing of forest; survey of flora and fauna	This matter will be referred to the Environment Group within the Rolling Plan for consideration	No change
67	Y	Plan accurately reflects needs of community	Thank you	No change
68	Y	Bigger houses are aimed at commuters driving prices up. Houses that would have been taken by local people are few and far between.	Policy HO02 applies Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Burwash is beautiful, why take away green and natural areas Large developments will spoil the look and feel of the village. Parking is an issue in residential areas	Policy IN02 applies	No change
69	Y	Bigger houses are aimed at commuters driving prices up. Houses that would have been taken by local people are few and far between. Burwash is beautiful, why take away green and natural areas Large developments will spoil the look and feel of the village. Parking is an issue in residential areas	Policy HO02 applies Policies GP01 and GP02 apply Policy IN02 applies	No change No change No change
70	Y	Just how the plan should be	Thank you	No change
71	Y	I support the NP. Plan has flaw in not identifying the two obvious potential sites - Oakleys and the Bell Inn - between them they could provide 16 small units	Thank you The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this. The Bell Inn is unlikely in our view to provide 6 homes of more and count towards our housing target. The owners have in the past submitted applications for change of use which have been refused. Should they wish to bring this	No change The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			forward for residential they will need to submit a further application	
72	Y	RDC stance on housing is unreasonable - all residential properties built should count towards the target	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
73	Y	RDC target is unachievable, given their stance on SHLAA sites. All developments should count towards the target	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
74	Y	As a business we rely on local custom and would welcome more residential building as long as it is in keeping with the village character and type of housing required.	Policies GP03 and HO01 apply	No change
75	Y	I agree with the plan and fully support the ideas of the NP	Thank you	No change
76	Y	The documents have my full support	Thank you	No change
77	Y	I support the draft plan	Thank you	No change
78	Y	I agree with the NP	Thank you	No change
79	Y	I agree with the draft plan	Thank you	No change
80	Y	This is an important step forward to protect the village, hamlets and surrounding countryside	Policies GP01, GP02, GP03 and HO01 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		against unscrupulous developers and house builders		
81	Y	Need to find suitable development to fulfil needs of residents not developers' pockets	Policies HO01 and HO02 apply	No change
82	Y	I believe the NP is a good idea. Parents selling Oakleys site and believe it is suitable for 10 affordable dwellings	Thank you The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	No change The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
83	Y	I support the Plan to allow locals and those who love the area to protect themselves and this area by the plan	Thank you	No change
84	Y	I would like to register my endorsement of the draft NP. It is well considered and takes account of views of relevant stakeholders	Thank you	No change
85	Y	I believe this is a good plan and firmly believe in such plans	Thank you	No change
86	N	I am a local businessman who wants to retire at some point and maximise return on property - opposed to people dictating what he can do with my assets and therefore opposed to policy IN05 section a and b. Footfall on pavement is low and declining not helped by recent introduction of parking restrictions. Retaining the remaining shops is like shutting the stable door after the horse has bolted.	The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>My shop has numerous out-buildings which have to be maintained on a low and dwindling turnover.</p> <p>Outside interference is making business decisions difficult</p>	<p>viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall.</p> <p>Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p> <p>Policy IN05 is designed to retain businesses and only allow these to obtain change of use where it can be clearly demonstrated that the building no longer has any prospect of business use.</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
87	Y	I support the draft plan	Thank you	No change
88	Y	As regular visitors to Burwash we have looked at the draft plan and consider it to be both reasonable and practicable	Thank you	No change
89	Y	I give the plan my full endorsement. Preservation of the AONB is vitally important	Thank you Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change No change
90	Y	No logical reason why housing has to be in groups of 6 to count. Housing built in Burwash Weald should count. I feel development north or south of greenfield Road would be appropriate. Reasons in paragraph 9 of page 20 would stop anyone building anywhere	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services. As set out in the Plan these sites have been rejected by RDC and previously by Government Inspector Comment relates to the same site	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
91	Y	<p>Housing built in Burwash Common and Weald should be included.</p> <p>In fills should count towards our target</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services.</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p>
92	Y	Omitted from plan - reduction in speed limit on Heathfield Road from 50 to 40mph.	The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change
93	Y		Thank you	No change
94	Y		Thank you	No change
95	Y		Thank you	No change
96	Y	Omitted from plan – Reduction in speed limit on Heathfield Road, Burwash	Thank you	No change
97	Y		Thank you	No change
98	Y	Beautiful, peaceful place to live. Save our place!!	Thank you	No change
99	Y		Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
100	Y	There does not seem to be anywhere in or around Burwash Village that would be suitable for building development	The Parish Council agrees	No change
101	Y	Large scale development wrong for this village- realise that we need homes but smaller, affordable homes must be built in time	Policy HO01 applies	No change
102	Y	The plan represents the views of residents. Any development should be small and low impact, housing should reflect what people need and some social housing provision should be included	Thank you Policy HO01 applies	No change No change
103	Y	Fully support all aspects of this plan	Thank you	No change
104	Y		Thank you	No change
105	Y	Fully support Plan in all aspects	Thank you	No change
106	Y	Future developments should be for local people and should be affordable - must not affect the AONB	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change No change
107	Y	Plan comprehensively covers all relevant issues. Would be good to have more homes (affordable) for young people There are not employment opportunities with transport links to make that realistic	Thank you Policy HO01 applies Policies IN03, IN04 and IN05 apply	No change No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
108	Y	Site to use is Oakleys Garage to build Council housing. AONB means it should be kept whether the District like it or not	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this. Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site No change
109	Y	We have enough houses; the lanes are overcrowded. School can't expand AONB should be kept	The Parish Council consulted the School and the Surgery and both confirmed that they currently have capacity for more pupils/patients. Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change No change
110	Y	I agree	Thank you	No change
111	Y	We need affordable housing for the locals not the imports	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
112	Y	Any development should provide a significant proportion of affordable housing, Must be in character with local architecture and landscape Not detrimental to the AONB	Policy HO01 will be reviewed Policy GP03 and EN02 apply Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	Policy HO01 amended to set a minimum provision of affordable housing in each development. No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
113	Y	Fully support all aspects of the plan	Thank you	No change
114	Y	Housing for local people	Policy HO01 applies	No change
115	Y	Protecting the fields and making sure that there is priority housing for people in the village	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply Policy HO03 applies	No change No change
116	Y	We need a balance of affordable property and it is critical that the community has a level of control over what gets built	Policy HO01 applies.	No change
117	Y	This Parish is not suitable for large scale development. We need small scale development for local people	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
118	Y	We wholly support the NP Particularly in favour of provision of community bus to address problem of lack of access to station Extra footpath access between villages	Thank you The Parish Council will be looking at the business case for a Community Bus as one of its Rolling Plan projects This will also be looked at within the Rolling Plan	No change No change No change
119	Y	Need local housing for local people only	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
120	Y	Agree	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
121	Y	Let's keep the young residents of Burwash in the area in affordable housing	Policy HO03 applies	No change
122	Y		Thank you	No change
123	Y	My real concern is whether the village can cope based on infrastructure – electric, gas, water supply, sewage, roads, parking and school. It can't have a detrimental effect	The school and the surgery have both confirmed that they have capacity for the planned increases in homes. The utilities are being consulted on this Plan	No change
124	Y	<p>Consider building on brownfield sites/commercial sites such as Oakleys Garage.</p> <p>Take into consideration smaller sites (less than 6)</p> <p>Include Burwash Common and Weald in numbers</p> <p>Balance of housing, small and larger homes</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey carried out as part of this Plan shows that there is little local need for larger</p>	<p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			homes. The provision of new scheme which smaller bungalows or level access flats for sale and rent would release larger homes without the need to build additional larger homes.	
125	Y	Very comprehensive, I read the whole plan	Thank you	No change
126	Y	We need affordable housing to keep the young people in the village not 4,5, bedroom luxury houses for outsiders	Policy HO03 applies	No change
127	Y		Thank you	No change
128	Y	The Infrastructure could not withstand more cars/traffic - the essence of Burwash would be lost and spoilt	The Parish Council feels that this Plan strikes the correct balance between retaining the essence of the Parish while looking to find a way for new homes which are appropriate for the area, work within available infrastructure and meet local housing needs	No change
129	Y	Burwash needs to stay a village so that the school, Doctors and shop can still cope with the amount of people who live here	Policy GP04 applies	No change
130	Y	Keep Burwash a village	Policy GP04 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
131	Y	<p>Would like to have some flats for the elderly to release our houses.</p> <p>Not in Shrub Lane as the road is not suitable for more cars and such like</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is aware of the issues of additional traffic particularly in Shrub Lane (Appendix K of this Plan sets out the Traffic Survey)</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
132	Y	Likely traffic holdups top of Shrub Lane	The Parish Council is aware of the issues of additional traffic particularly in Shrub Lane (Appendix K of this Plan sets out the Traffic Survey)	No change
133	Y		Thank you	No change
134	Y	Keep the developers away from Burwash and our lovely fields	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
135	Y	<p>The Infrastructure Assessment is good.</p> <p>Be interesting to see if the PC actually review, analyse and come up with any recommendations from its list of development options/projects.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council has approved the Rolling Plan which is based upon the items raised by the community during the consultation of this Plan. These projects will be considered during the current PC term.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
136	Y	Agree with the plan. Infrastructure Assessment gives a good base line of where we live in the Parish	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
137	Y		Thank you	No change
138	Y	Take into account all one smaller building properties. We fully support all aspects of this plan	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). Thank you	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change
139	Y	Build what's needed as affordable housing for families	Policy HO01 applies	No change
140	Y		Thank you	No change
141	Y	Look forward to seeing some of the development proposals in the Infrastructure Assessment reviews and taken forward by the PC. Agree with the zero site approach for housing development	The Parish Council has approved the Rolling Plan which is based upon the items raised by the community during the consultation of this Plan. These projects will be considered during the current PC term. We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which taken overall delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community.	No change No change
142	Y	More affordable housing for local people needed. Stop the greedy developers	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
143	Y	<p>School full, Doctors over stretched.</p> <p>Not good public transport.</p> <p>Not enough parking.</p> <p>Traffic through the village very heavy</p>	<p>The Parish Council consulted the School and the Surgery and both confirmed that they currently have capacity for more pupils/patients.</p> <p>The Parish Council will be looking at the business case for a Community Bus as one of its Rolling Plan projects</p> <p>Enforcement of parking is not within the Parish Council powers but we have raised this issue with the Police and RDC. The Parish Council is also looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
144	Y	I love Burwash	Thank you	No change
145	Y	Consideration must be given to the younger people who want to live and work in Burwash so there needs to be built small houses/flats which they can afford. Homes of 1/2 beds for single people and young couples. This will keep Burwash alive	Policy HO01 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
146		<p>Concerned about speed of traffic along A265.</p> <p>No public transport access to stations.</p> <p>It is important that as a neighbourhood we do everything we can to look after and protect the area we live in</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council will be looking at the business case for a Community Bus as one of its Rolling Plan projects</p> <p>Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
147	Y		Thank you	No change
148	Y	Yes, I support	Thank you	No change
149	Y	Well done and thank you	Thank you	No change
150	Y	Leave Burwash as it is - give the locals the choice	Policy HO03 applies	No change
151	Y	<p>Agree we need more affordable housing and do not need more executive homes.</p> <p>Future projects I completely support and think the development of Burwash re aspirational projects should be encouraged and developed</p>	<p>Policies HO01 and HO03 apply</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
152	Y	Small and more schemes and infill sites	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
153	Y	Heartily wish such far-sighted and sensible plans every success	Thank you	No change
154	Y	Why only 6 units and above counting towards target. Would expect more creativity to address the affordable housing. Private sector rented is not a solution. Option to CPO Oakleys as a social rented site?	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). Policy HO01 applies The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
155	Y	There are a number of small sites in Burwash Common with options for less than 6 units. Need to regulate traffic and manage safe routes for pedestrians	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change
156	Y	I would like to see Plan adopted as it has best interests of Burwash at its heart	Thank you	No change
157	Y	I would like to add my support to the plan. I agree with all the key points	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
158	Y	Hard to believe there are no available sites. Surely there must be some areas where we can develop the village and meet housing needs.	The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB.	No change
		There should be a push on the speedwatch programme	Speedwatch is run entirely by volunteers. The Parish Council is seeking additional volunteers to enable this scheme to be enlarged.	No change
		There is a visible lack of provision for young people in the community. I really like the priority for spaces for leisure pursuits for young people.	Thank you	No change
		Why do we need to upgrade the primary School? What is wrong with current one?	The reference to the school was within the aspirational section of this Plan which would only be brought forward if the current building came to the end of its useful life or became redundant through some other reason. There are currently no plans to upgrade the school and no	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			discussions have been held with the school.	
159	N	<p>Plan does not address small scale development in the Common and Weald.</p> <p>There needs to be set criteria and justification for change of use taking into account needs of households directly affected. BPC needs to consult with interested parties</p> <p>Plan is vague in definition of AONB which weakens its protection and needs to be clearer about protection of AONB with specific criteria indicating exactly what is meant</p> <p>Issue of regular consultation with residents and BPC processes covering applications should be updated and made clear</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services</p> <p>Policy IN05 is designed to retain businesses and only allow these to obtain change of use where it can be clearly demonstrated that the building no longer has any prospect of business use.</p> <p>We are looking to strengthen Policy GP02 to be clearer about the protection we are seeking</p> <p>The Parish Council is a statutory consultee and holds Planning Committee meetings to consider all planning applications as and when these are required. These are advertised on the PC website, the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>GP02 has been amended to clarify the protection we are seeking</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Relationship between RDC and BPC should be spelt out</p> <p>BPC should be pro-active vision is weak - needs more in-depth consideration of the young and elderly</p>	<p>Parish Council app and on the various PC noticeboards.</p> <p>The Parish Council is a statutory consultee. RDC are the Planning authority for Rother.</p> <p>We note your comments but feel this Plan accurately reflects the points the community raised and taken with the Rolling Plan provides a way forward for the Parish.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
160		<p>Disagree with policy GP05 - houses were built in different eras - shouldn't remain in an historic bubble - modern designs are OK as long as they complement in terms of scale and skyline –</p> <p>Do support HO01 in respect of need for level access one and two bedroom homes</p>	<p>The Parish Council feels that the inclusion of the word traditional within this section may be the cause of this concern so it has agreed to remove this word</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Policy GP05 amended to remove the word traditional</p> <p>No change</p>
161	Y	I am pleased to confirm my support for the plan	Thank you	No change
162	Y	I confirm that I support the draft plan	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
163		<p>People do not put sites forward as they do not want to be isolated by other residents. Having all sites ruled out does not bode well for the future.</p> <p>Respondent has a potential site but was advised by RDC that development would cause light pollution, footpath 4 miles away, spoilt view. RDC don't support average land owner but development companies and builders get planning permission as they know the application process.</p> <p>Would love to see Oakleys Garage and the Bell developed into flats.</p>	<p>The Parish Council encouraged the submission of sites and received four submissions which were considered but were not supported for the reasons set out within the Plan.</p> <p>RDC are the planning authority and this would be a matter for them.</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>The Bell Inn is unlikely in our view to provide 6 homes of more and count towards our housing target.</p> <p>The owners have in the past submitted applications for change of use which have been refused. Should they wish to bring this forward for residential they will need to submit a further application</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		RDC and BPC need to consider why land is not put forward. Attitude needs to change to embrace a new way to search for sites	The Parish Council complied with all the requirements in order to encourage sites to be submitted.	No change
164	Y	Sensible vision for Burwash	Thank you	No change
165	Y	Sensible policies which marry the need for new housing and protection of the intrinsic beauty of Burwash	Thank you	No change
166	Y	Important to protect the character of the village and defend it from inappropriate development	Policies GP03 applies	No change
167	Y		Thank you	No change
168	Y	We commend this encouraging report and plan	Thank you	No change
169	Y	When will the BPC review the Infrastructure projects?	The Parish Council has approved the Rolling Plan which is based upon the items raised by the community during the consultation of this Plan. These projects will be considered during the current PC term.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		There are some good ones especially trying to stop overflying of Burwash Common by Easyjet flights. The noise is constant during the summer	This is not within the powers of the Parish Council.	No change
170	Y	We commend the efforts of all concerned in producing this encouraging report and plan	Thank you	No change
171	Y	Thoroughly agree with the plan, excellent ideas and suggestions	Thank you	No change
172	Y	Need to maintain beautiful, peaceful village. We need to enable newcomers to be integrated into a tranquil, special, friendly space	Policy GP03 applies The Parish Council is keen to maintain this Parish as a welcoming place for new residents and visitors alike. The Rolling Plan includes the introduction of a Welcome Pack for all new visitors.	No change No change
173	Y	Plan encapsulates needs and wishes of the community to preserve biodiversity, develop appropriate and sustainable housing, improve accessibility for business viability and employment. Support establishment of Community Land Trust	Thank you	No change
174	Y	How will Drs and school cope. Burwash is as pretty, lovely, friendly village. That will change with more houses	The Parish Council consulted the School and the Surgery and both confirmed that they currently have capacity for more pupils/patients.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
175	Y	<p>Truly wonderful to have this draft after so long.</p> <p>It is a shame that the housing target cannot be shared across the Parish.</p> <p>Smaller developments should count</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p>
176	Y		Thank you	No change
177	Y	It is the only way to keep the village of Burwash a village	Policy GP04 applies	No change
178	Y	<p>A wonderful piece of work.</p> <p>Too bad no potential sites were found</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
179	Y	<p>It is an excellent plan and has my full support.</p> <p>Agree particularly where development is planned outside existing boundaries - a threat that must be strongly opposed</p> <p>Where is the funding for so many of the proposals outlined here?</p> <p>Road safety and parking are obvious priorities.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy GP04 applies</p> <p>The Rolling Plan will be delivered by a combination of the Parish precept, Grants and local fund raising</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. The Parish Council is also looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
180	Y	I fully support the NP. Particularly support housing proposals	Thank you	No change
181	Y	Makes sense - particularly the housing points	Thank you	No change
182	y		Thank you	No change
183	Y	Suspect there will need to be a compromise to accommodate objectives and some areas of the AONB will need to be sacrificed	The Parish Council accepts the housing target of 52 homes by 2028 but are looking to ensure these are brought forward while meeting the various policies contained in this Plan	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
184	Y	<p>Protect AONB</p> <p>Find a site for a community self build</p> <p>Develop Oakleys into low cost community housing</p> <p>Come up with ideas to encourage businesses into village</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Councils Rolling Plan includes a project to look at the option of setting up a Community Land Trust. This vehicle will look at suitable sites for development</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p> <p>Policies IN04 and IN05 look to support and retain existing businesses. The Parish Council feels that increased footfall is the key to be able to attract new shops and for better telecommunications as set in Policy IN06 to support the shops and wider businesses</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p> <p>No change</p>
185	Y	Watercress field not suitable and Shrub Lane too narrow for any more traffic. Not enough infrastructure in this village	The policies in this Plan would require all future applications to be able to demonstrate that there is sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals.	No change
186	Y		Thank you	No change
187	Y	Village lacks infrastructure and public transport such building wouldn't be appropriate at this time	The policies in this Plan would require all future applications to be able to demonstrate that there is	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals. The Parish Council will be looking at the business case for a Community Bus as one of its Rolling Plan projects	
188	Y	We must have proper affordable housing	Policy HO01 applies	No change
189	Y	<p>It is an important AONB</p> <p>Any housing should be in keeping with traditional design Social and affordable housing needed as opposed to 3-4-5 bedroom housing</p> <p>Existing housing should not be joined reducing existing housing stock</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies</p> <p>RDC are the Planning authority for Rother.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
190	Y	Reflects views of community	Thank you	No change
191	Y	Burwash is unique village which needs to be protected from unsuitable development for which there is no supporting infrastructure. Once destroyed, this special place cannot be restored	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 look to provide this protection. The policies in this Plan would require all future applications to be able to demonstrate that there is sufficient infrastructure to support the proposals	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
192	Y	I support all policies laid out in your summary particularly: affordable housing, Environment, Maintaining our rural, environment, Monitoring developers, provision for parking and maintaining our dark skies	Thank you	No change
193	Y	Good plan, as an alternative to being forced to have what we don't want	Thank you	No change
194	Y	No Watercress Field	Thank you	No change
195		Include need to set up list of volunteers to help in an emergency. This is a BPC workstream but should be mentioned in the NP	The Rolling Plan contains this and this is included within the Plan	No change
196	Y	I approve the NP. For the future it would be beneficial to demolish pavilion on Playing Field and replace with sports hall for use by whole community Surely we should be thinking of the young who have inadequate sports facilities at present	Thank you Future consideration of the Swan Meadow Pavilion is included within the Aspirational section of this Plan The Parish Councils Rolling Plan will be reviewed over the coming period and bringing forward options for youth facilities will be included in these considerations	No change No change No change
197	Y	I fully support the NP Particularly support in respect of protecting village from inappropriate large scale housing	Thank you The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new	No charge No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		developments that do not meet needs of community	developments will need to take these policies into account.	
198	Y		Thank you	No change
199	Y	This plan reflects main concerns of community and I fully endorse the proposed policies	Thank you	No change
200	Y	Owner of small local business – key concern for me is lack of parking both on-street and car parks Simply adding additional homes without regard to this issue and at detriment to the AONB is unacceptable The policies are well thought through and meet the aspirations of this community	The Parish Council is also looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC Policies GP01 and GP02 apply Thank you	No change No change No change
201	Y	Yes I support this plan	Thank you	No change
202	Y	To confirm, I am supportive of the plan	Thank you	No change
203	Y	A well thought out plan covering all the areas of the Parish. I totally support the plan	Thank you	No change
204	Y	Like the idea of development happening in small areas so maintaining the character of the village whilst still providing much needed housing	Policy HO02 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
205	Y	Small developments and retaining the character of Burwash is essential - NO big development	Policy HO02 applies	No change
206	Y		Thank you	No change
207	Y	Yes I agree with the proposals of the NP	Thank you	No change
208	Y	<p>Particularly agree with challenge to RDC re developments of less than 6 properties counting towards target.</p> <p>Unsure if plan supports the general principle of development at Park Lane Homes site or not.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>This scheme is currently being considered by the Government Planning Inspectorate following the developers appeal of RDC decision to refuse their application</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p>
209	Y	I support the NP	Thank you	No change
210	Y	We need to protect this beautiful village and the AONB from greedy developers who are just for profit	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 apply	No change
211	Y	There is a desperate need for suitable low cost housing for the younger population who aren't entitled to benefits or council properties. Price of properties in the village does not reflect the earnings of the younger or minimal wage earners	Policy HO01 encourages a variety of affordable homes to be built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
212	Y	<p>Housing should be addressed and find suitable land for houses in the Parish.</p> <p>Parking should be addressed. All new houses should have a parking spot.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. It believes the way forward is through small sites which are designed to meet local needs.</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
213	Y	<p>Environment has deteriorated in recent years due to increase in traffic which is having negative impact.</p> <p>Plan is vital for Burwash and its surrounds as it preserves the AONB and creates opportunities for young people.</p> <p>Key to plan is restriction on development as the area is already at capacity. Further development will compromise and destroy rare medieval field system. Alternative approaches to housing and employment must be created. Considerations for supporting residents and local assets should be prioritised over profit-driven development.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02</p> <p>The Parish Council accepts the housing target of 52 homes by 2028 but are looking to ensure these are brought forward while meeting the various policies contained in this Plan which amongst other things will</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Minimum of six units appears to be an arbitrary number and meaningless	<p>protect the rare medieval field systems</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p>	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
214	Y	<p>Express support for the NDP. Burwash and surrounding area is a jewel of the Sussex Weald. I come from 7 generations of Burwash residents and feel the village should stay as unspoilt as possible.</p> <p>Need for affordable housing is great. Small scale development giving homes to first time buyers and families would be asset. Burwash does not need more executive housing.</p> <p>Future plans would be an enhancement ie cycle path.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO01 encourages a variety of affordable homes to be built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes.</p> <p>The Rolling Plan includes a number of improvements including looking at the feasibility or providing cycle and walking paths to link the three villages and Burwash with Etchingam</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Parking in village is an issue and needs to be increased	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	No charge
215	Y	Need to support the AONB Recognise the need for housing to be affordable and appropriate without spoiling the infrastructure of the existing village	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply Policy HO01 applies	No change No change
216	Y	Housing is required for local people including first time buyers, not executive houses. All developments should respect the AONB, maintain the village in current form, meet the unique needs of local people of all ages.	Policy HO01 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 apply	No change No change
217	Y	Burwash needs affordable housing Need housing for young people	Policy HO01 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Protect the AONB	local housing needs and incomes to support young families and older households Policies GP01 and GP02	No change
218	Y	Preserve AONB No big developments, not suitable for Burwash Small developments should count towards target	Policies GP01 and GP02 The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new developments will need to take these policies into account. The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
219	Y	It is important to provide affordable housing in small groups to keep the character of a rural village	The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new developments will need to take these policies into account. However, Policy HO01 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match local housing needs	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			and incomes to support young families and older households	
220	Y	Affordable housing is important for young people and families. Small groups of housing is best	The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new developments will need to take these policies into account. However, Policy HO01 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match local housing needs and incomes to support young families and older households	No change
221	Y	Support the plan because East Sussex needs a sensible sustainable approach to building which does not destroy the rural and community lives of towns such as Burwash	Thank you	No change
222	Y	<p>Whilst small housing schemes are a priority, we have to protect our village and families already living here. Totally agree with the NDP and support fully.</p> <p>We need to have accommodation for smaller younger families urgently</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO01 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match local housing needs and incomes to</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			support young families and older households	
223	Y	Burwash is a unique community with an important literary history with Rudyard Kipling an important part of the village. This brings tourists in and they are enchanted by the Englishness of the place. This must not be spoilt by inappropriate development	<p>The Parish Council recognises the importance of tourism. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall.</p> <p>Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p>	No change
224	Y	An excellent and well thought out plan	Thank you	No change
225	Y	Any new housing should not negatively impact the beauty of the village	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 look to protect the heritage and ANOB setting	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
226	Y	<p>Our AONB needs to be preserved. Additional housing options should continue to be considered but not at the expense of the AONB.</p> <p>Parking in Burwash continues to be a challenge</p> <p>Need to enable our local businesses to flourish</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall.</p> <p>Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
227	Y	<p>Very comprehensive.</p> <p>Urgent action required for parking</p>	Thank you	No change
228	Y	Have lived in Burwash for over 20 years. We love and cherish the place very much. We wholeheartedly agree and support the NDP for us and future generations	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
229	Y		Thank you	No change
230	Y		Thank you	No change
231	Y	Parking is a big issue in all areas of Burwash. This should be addressed when new properties are built, that they provide adequate parking. Double yellow lines have been a waste, no one adheres to them.	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	
232	Y	<p>Decision not to allocate sites may be controversial but is realistic. It is regrettable that housing developments of fewer than 6 dwellings do not count towards target as they fit into the village very well, within the development boundary and provide work for local builders.</p> <p>Need for smaller dwellings, suitable for young families and older people wishing to downsize must be emphasised. As many as possible should be affordable.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The Parish Council has no control over the size of the developments which come forward but once this NDP is in place all new developments will need to take these policies into account. However, Policy H001 encourages a variety of homes to be provided including affordable homes (shared ownership and social rented units) to match local housing needs and incomes to support young families and older households</p> <p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>It is important to support local businesses and encourage new ones, particularly so people do not have to travel to work.</p> <p>Increasing traffic is a major problem.</p>	<p>employment and vibrancy to the Parish.</p> <p>It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall.</p> <p>Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council will be looking at the business case for a Community Bus as one of its Rolling Plan projects which hopefully will reduce personal car use</p> <p>Policy GP05 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Good design and quality materials is most important.</p> <p>The AONB must be protected</p>	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
233	Y		Thank you	No change
234	Y		Thank you	No change
235	Y	I support the NDP	Thank you	No change
236	Y	I agree with the principals of the plan	Thank you	No change
237	Y	<p>I broadly agree with the principals of the plan</p> <p>In particular the challenge made to RDC over the refusal to consider any development of less than 6 properties counting towards the housing target.</p> <p>I am unsure if the plan supports the general principle of development at the Park Lane Homes site or not. Although overall the scheme is objected to, I can't see if there is an acceptance</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>This scheme is currently being considered by the Government Planning Inspectorate following the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No charge</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		that development in that area is worthy of consideration provided that it is of a design and scale complementary to the village	developers appeal of RDC decision to refuse their application	
238	Y	I fully support the plan	Thank you	No change
239	Y	Burwash is a beautiful village - people live here for that reason along with the community feel and the countryside. Large developments of modern executive homes do not fit in with this. We do need new homes but they need to be affordable and in small developments, perhaps on the outskirts of the village and should cater for accessible homes, elderly, young people, families etc	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies	No change
240	Y	I wholeheartedly agree with and support the NP. As a long term resident, it is important that the community has a say in development in and around the village	Thank you	No change
241	Y	I think it is a well thought out plan which rightly emphasises the need to preserve the character of the villages and the AONB	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
242	Y	It's time we got control on how we treat our beautiful area rather than letting development companies decide where they are going to ruin it	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP03 apply	No change
243	Y	Express support for the NDP. To preserve the character and business viability of this unique village large impersonal housing developments must be ruled out	Thank you	No change
244		<p>Vision statement would be enhanced by including something about health and well-being of the population.</p> <p>I do not understand why smaller developments do not count towards the planning targets. Is there a way of challenging this?</p> <p>Policies are all very broad but I support them all.</p> <p>I would like to see something in future projects about younger people and communication across generations</p>	<p>Your comments are noted</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>The Rolling Plan will be reviewed over the coming period and this will be considered</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
245	Y	Development policies are commendable but are they realistic? Development almost anywhere will affect the AONB	Policies GP01 and GP02 do not rule out development but look for sensitivity and appropriateness of location	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Complementing scale and form of buildings will prove difficult as precedents have been set in existing developments which have disregarded this aspect</p> <p>Lobbying our MP with regard RDC policy of disregarding any developments of 6 or less homes. There should be some discretion in small villages</p> <p>I am unsure how BPC are able to allocate sites without ownership of the land</p> <p>I am wholeheartedly against the dark skies policy and the idea of no lights outside houses</p> <p>I doubt if increased public transport will be used, this will increase parking in village car parks</p> <p>Acknowledge that an increase in village shops will be against a national trend. Supporting existing</p>	<p>The Parish Council is looking for good quality developments which take the best examples from their location not a race to the bottom.</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The Parish Council does not allocate sites</p> <p>This policy looks to protect our dark skies from intrusive lighting on new developments. Developers will need to provide one of the many forms or external lighting which does not have an impact. It is not a ban on lighting outside homes.</p> <p>With an increasingly aged population public transport becomes a necessity and needs our support</p> <p>Policy IN05 is designed to retain businesses and only allow these to obtain change of use where it can be clearly demonstrated that the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>businesses is good but a policy against change of use not necessarily so. Bell Pub case in point.</p> <p>Safety on footpaths – HGVs regularly drive on footpaths – bollards would prevent this. Reduce speed limit in village</p> <p>Need to replace lollipop person urgently</p> <p>Perhaps a bypass too?</p> <p>There is clearly a good long term view in place.</p>	<p>building no longer has any prospect of business use. The Bell has never made that case successfully</p> <p>The Parish Council has made speed and traffic calming a key priority within its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>A team of volunteers have taken this on but they need more volunteers</p> <p>Policies contained in GP01 and GP02 would rightly rule this out</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
246		<p>Long term residents of Burwash and own 40 acres of this beautiful area. Wholeheartedly applaud this careful analysis of Burwash special character and determination to preserve it.</p> <p>Given the target of 52 homes, any plan that comes up with no sites is not a plan at all. The need for new housing and in particular affordable housing must be the overriding priority.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>This Plan covers much more than just the delivery of the 52 homes. The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable</p>	<p>No charge</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Steering group should identify a sufficient number of exception sites within the whole of the Burwash area	<p>development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB which gives the Parish its special character. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Councils Rolling Plan includes a project to look at the option of setting up a Community Land Trust. This vehicle will look at suitable sites for development</p>	No change
247	Y	I fully support the NDP and has village welfare at heart both now and in the future	Thank you	No change
248	Y	<p>Thoroughly endorse the draft plan. It sets out a compelling vision for the future development of Burwash Parish.</p> <p>It promotes appropriate housing development to meet the needs of local families seeking affordable homes.</p> <p>It seeks to enhance and protect the AONB</p>	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		It backs new infrastructure and businesses which will sustain Burwash as a vibrant community		
249	Y	The plan is very comprehensive and will give much needed protection for the environment, protect services and support tourism and businesses. It will provide a good quality of life for existing residents and for people wanting to live in the area	Thank you	No change
250	Y	<p>I congratulate you on compiling an impressive document</p> <p>I think more attention needs to be given to the heavy traffic through the High Street. The traffic survey in the NDP amounts to views of residents but is not an empirical assessment of what volume of traffic is encountered. We urgently need to identify the scale of the problem in a manner that is more than biased local views.</p> <p>The decision to not support any identified sites in Burwash for future housing is I believe a huge mistake. The RDC appear to be saying “only 6 or more counts” and the village appears to be saying “not in this space/AONB”. Something will have to give or developers will continue to be able to push for even less desirable sites like Watercress Fields. Aside from anything else I think the NDP should</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>In addition to the Traffic survey further speed tests have been carried out and a traffic consultant has advised the Parish Council on options for traffic calming. These measures have now been accepted by East Sussex County Council and Sussex Police and will be the subject of resident consultation in the next few months.</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>actively support a potential change of use for Oakley site.</p> <p>Further, the largest site in the RDC assessment on the side of Shrub Lane is capable of accommodating the full complement of units and this should be supported. This site is potentially infill within existing development rather than extension beyond its current boundaries. Yes, it sits in the AONB, but footpath links etc quoted as reason for rejection will surely apply to anywhere pretty much short of the High Street itself. Do we really want the High Street redeveloped? A network of pedestrian/cycle access to any site can be resolved if the will is there.</p> <p>In my view, the NDP needs to be supportive of the necessary developments as much as set out in the guidelines which new developments should adhere to. As drafted the NDP can legitimately be regarded as “NIMBY” charter and this I forecast will be to the detriment of the entire community if it is not amended.</p>	<p>As set out in the NDP these two sites were rejected by RDC as not being suitable for a number of reasons “the rural setting and character of the village, landscape setting and lack of footpaths....”</p> <p>This view was supported by the Inspector at the last Local Plan Inquiry who concluded “the green field location in the AONB, landscape intrusion and lack of adequate local employment made these sites unsuitable for development”.</p> <p>This is not the view of the Parish Council and certainly not the views provided by the majority of our community during the extensive consultation exercise we have undertaken on this Plan. The Parish Council has supported the Hastoe exception site taking a prominent role in bringing this about and pressed Optivo to bring forward a replacement scheme for the Old Rectory which complements the heritage nature of the High Street.</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			This Plan looks to deliver new homes of the right design, size and tenure to meet local needs and achieve our housing target	No change
251	Y	I support the NDP as created by local people with local interests. A well thought out plan for the future of the community. My children would love to be able to afford to live in the Parish as would many others of their age groups. This plan is the only way for affordable housing to be remotely affordable.	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
252		<p>Promoting good health and well-being should be included in the vision. Supporting people as they move into old age should be a priority and the NP should have a view on this</p> <p>I would support any action that could be taken to address aspects in Section 3 – Our Future, in particular road safety. I would like to see traffic calming introduced and parking banned altogether in the High Street</p> <p>I assume that policies comply with RDC and ESCC policies as well as other Government offices.</p>	<p>The Community Group within the Rolling Plan will be asked to consider these points</p> <p>The Parish Council has made speed and traffic calming a key priority within its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>There are no plans to ban parking in the High Street</p> <p>We believe so</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>I think the summary document would read better if the policies were put before the commentary in each case.</p> <p>I wish the best of luck to the document</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
253	Y	<p>I am most impressed by the details looked at and recommended.</p> <p>Sections dealing with Environment and maintenance, traffic and transport as well as aspirational capital projects for the future are most interesting</p>	Thank you	No change
254	Y	<p>I am concerned that the hamlets such as Burwash Common are deemed not to need any attention and do consider that it is not simply large scale building we need to guard against, but also small-scale erosion of AONB</p> <p>I would like to see more attention given to guard against in-filling and smaller scale housing developments</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council supports well thought through small scale developments as the way to deliver the housing target</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
255	Y	I consider the village has been well served by policy of using in-fill to increase housing stock as that has enabled the character of the village to be	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>preserved. The requirement to have a minimum of 6 housing in a development is ridiculous and more suited to urban areas.</p> <p>Planning needs to be kept local. Councillors agreeing planning decisions need to be made aware of local environment</p> <p>This is an AONB area and it is important to preserve that for the future.</p> <p>It is wrong to include any development that includes street lighting as these are ridge-top developments</p> <p>Local housing needs to be aimed at those living locally and not include housing at such a price that only those commuting to London can afford.</p>	<p>the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The Parish Council is a statutory consultee on all planning applications and makes comments on all cases</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>Policy EN05 applies</p> <p>Policy HO01 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
256	Y	<p>The Plan fully addresses all the issues that could impact the community as a whole. It has been constructed in a way of impartiality.</p> <p>While it recognises the need for affordable housing, it should not be drawn into identifying possible development sites. This is the remit of the local Council to offer up for community consultation with emphasis on brown field sites held by the</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council does not agree with this statement. We intend to look at setting up a Community Land Trust which would seek to identify small scale development</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Council as suitable locales without impacting on services and infrastructure.</p> <p>AONB should be preserved at all costs for future generations. This is not merely a platitude but a statement of fact and should be in the forefront of any proposed development proposed to the Council</p>	<p>opportunities to deliver homes for local people</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	No change
257	Y	<p>People have the right to stay in their own village so any building needs to be able to supply local people. Important that any building in the village takes into account the fact that services need to be able to cope.</p> <p>A very comprehensive NP for our village</p>	<p>Policy HO03 applies</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
258	Y	<p>I fully support the NP</p> <p>I cannot overemphasise the need to fully protect and preserve the AONB</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
259	Y	Reluctantly support the plan. With major infrastructure investment, land could surely be available off Shrub Lane for Social Housing.	The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Clear parts of the High Street of parked cars, I recently attended an accident in the High Street and saw cars driving on the pavement occupied by pedestrians.	<p>observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p>	No change
260	y	<p>We cannot develop on land which is AONB. Burwash is not able to provide suitable areas for housing development meeting the criteria.</p> <p>Any large-scale development would create additional traffic problems in our extremely busy lanes, most without pavements and dangerous to pedestrians and other road users</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
261	N	The village is in desperate needs of social housing for the young people who have grown up in the village and are forced to leave the area.	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Clear the western end of the High Street of parked cars, this is a hazard and danger	housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	No change
262	Y	All good, attitude fine, details on how to achieve? Why is the Oakley's Garage site not suitable for housing? Surely brownfield is better than Greenfield? Permanent crossing on A265?	The Parish Council believes that taken as a whole this Plan provides a blueprint for the future of our community and allows developments to work within the ANOB setting. The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this. The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site No change
263	Y	Affordable houses needed so that our young people can continue to live in Burwash	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Could not new homes be built in the Morris Close area?	housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies The Parish Council would not support further development on the Morris Close site as this would mean building on the fields behind which would have a material impact on the AONB.	No change
264	Y	Congratulations – well thought out	Thank you	No change
265	Y	A well thought through document. It is important to respect the setting of Burwash in the AONB, the main emphasis is on infrastructure. Burwash is an ancient village with a large number of listed buildings. Villages do not develop in units of 6 and it is unreasonable of RDC not to count smaller units towards our quota. There is no shortage of large executive homes but there is for affordable homes for young people and bungalows for the elderly.	Thank you Policies GP01 and GP02 apply Policy GP03 applies The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC). Policy HO01 applies	No change No change No change No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
266		<p>The NP offers no positive and realistic plan. 52 new homes have to be built in Burwash by 2028 and this plan offers no suitable development sites.</p> <p>This document talks about improving footpaths yet when a developer included a footpath to the Playing Fields, local groups rigorously opposed it.</p> <p>How can this be reconciled with a friendly, welcoming community?</p>	<p>The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan.</p> <p>This planning application was refused by RDC the planning authority and this has now gone to appeal</p> <p>We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
267	Y	Each proposed development for housing was unable to provide any affordable housing to rent for local needs. They would also not have been in character with the historic Burwash and each development would have created additional traffic problems	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
268	Y	These are sensible suggestions for the future	Thank you	No change
269	Y	<p>Within the links with community and a community hub, BPC needs to make connections with Brownies, Guides and Scouts groups.</p> <p>Future developments in the plan should contribute to community projects eg all weather playground, replacement building for Swan Meadow pavilion. BPC should be represented at AGM</p>	<p>The Parish Council will pick up on this request</p> <p>Approved developments are required to pay Community infrastructure Levy payments. At present the Parish Council would receive 15% but if this Plan is approved this rises to 25%. The Rolling Plan sets out the schemes to which any levies received might be used.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
270	Y	I wholeheartedly support all the separate points that have been made. I very much agree with the need to have this plan, run by locals who care about our village and know what it needs and what it doesn't	Thank you	No change
271	Y	I am pleased to say I am in agreement with the draft plan	Thank you	No change
272	Y	I agree with the aims and objectives of the NDP and feel that this should be pushed forward as soon as possible to give the community greater control over development of our villages	Thank you	No change
273	Y	I would like to express my support for the NDP. I would like those involved to press forward with it in	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		order to reduce the opportunities for unscrupulous developers to take advantage of our beautiful villages and to ensure that Burwash villages thrive in the future		
274	Y	I support the plan but feel that it lacks ambitions and that the arguments support the status quo. I would like to see the plans starting point being that it is a good thing to find ways of creating developments that will allow the young people of Burwash to live in the village, be that through truly affordable housing for sale or HA rental	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies	No change
275	Y	<p>I have carefully read the plan and support its findings and conclusions.</p> <p>The key determinant for any new housing should be the provision of affordable housing for local residents. Schemes that do not provide this should be rejected.</p> <p>I fail to understand why there is a minimum number of 6 before they are included in RDC figures. A larger number of smaller developments on brownfield sites could be preferable to fewer large-scale developments. As long as the right numbers of homes are provided in a way that meets the requirements for additional housing, it should be left up to the local community as to how and where they are sited. The current RDC approach seems unnecessarily prescriptive</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
276		<p>The marketing of the Oakleys site considered a number of opportunities for the site. It became apparent that the real interest in the property was from developers looking to construct new housing on the site in the form of a terrace of 2/3 bedroom houses aimed at the affordable end of the market.</p> <p>Consideration could be given by BPC to support such a scheme</p>	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
277	N	<p>We must look after our historic village, its slowly losing its character.</p> <p>There is not enough parking now. The roads are far too busy and Shrub lane is a nightmare.</p> <p>Every new house should have 3 parking spaces.</p> <p>We need to keep and look after our green areas. Our environment and parking should be top priority</p>	<p>Policy GP03 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
278	Y	<p>It is right not to select sites for development. Neither RDC or this process has come up with suitable sites.</p> <p>All sites put forward have significant downsides in relation to sustainability and their impact on the</p>	The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>AONB. The numbers allocated by RDC seem fanciful and have not been borne out by actual development</p> <p>Development would be better done more organically with smaller developments. It is also important that further development is suitable for family housing for people who work in the area and for older people wishing to downsize.</p> <p>The AONB is a treasure. Once it is gone, it is gone forever</p>	<p>observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan. Two sites suggested to RDC were rejected as being unsuitable.</p> <p>The two “Green” sites within the SHLAA, one was built out with only 4 homes and the other was refused by RDC.</p> <p>The only “Amber” scheme was the subject of a larger application involving a “Red” SHLAA site and this was refused by RDC.</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	No change
279	Y	It is regrettable that no suitable major sites have been found. I wholeheartedly support the action of the NP team, that they should not, in desperation, or at the risk of not having this draft plan approved, put forward sites that would have compromised the beauty of the Burwash landscape and wantonly disregarded the rules of planning put in place to	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>protect the AONB and particularly historical ridge top, High Weald settlements such as ours.</p> <p>Rother District Council has been particularly misguided in insisting on the blanket number of 6 houses in order to qualify towards the Govt. quota in every parish. In -filling within the built area and small pockets of 6 or less is the most sensible way of providing extra homes for our community.</p> <p>Imposed major development will not work with our rural infrastructure and our poor transport links and job opportunities.</p> <p>If more houses are needed nationally then they need to be put where there are plentiful jobs, with good road and rail connections.</p> <p>Local jobs are few and local wages mostly basic, therefore any new housing in Burwash should reflect the need for affordable social renting or smaller properties for older people to downsize into.</p> <p>The Environment -We need a programme within the community to advise residents how they can improve not only their natural environment and that of the resident wildlife but also their own well-being.</p> <p>Dark Skies- there are too many properties around Burwash that have security lights which stay on all through the night. This occurs not only in our</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>This matter will be referred to the Environment Group within the Rolling Plan for consideration</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>parish, but also happens in neighbouring parishes and impacts on us, especially on ridges. (ie Ticehurst). This involves planning issues also.</p> <p>Wild Flower Verges- there has been wanton destruction of verges, by off lane parking around the entrance to Stonegate station and other places. Expensive station parking has been the excuse for this.</p> <p>Hedges-some landowners are neglecting their responsibility to cut their hedges in the Autumn as is traditional in East Sussex, which denies tourists and residents the glorious views of the Sussex High Weald as they travel around. For example-the field next to Judins, owned by a non-resident developer, which was subject to a failed planning appeal, the hedge there has been totally neglected and allowed to grow up to a great height, resulting in the loss of spectacular views and extra expense to the Highways Authority to cut the roadside part because of visibility issues for motorists. In other places, hedges have been wantonly removed to make it easier to erect stock proof fencing. This is a destruction of a precious wildlife habitat and of the traditional High Weald landscape</p> <p>I am not sure what is meant by a Parish Planting scheme, but I am all for helping the wildflowers in the hedgerows to flourish. I am in favour of a</p>	<p>Policy EN05 applies</p> <p>The Rolling Plan includes an Environment Sub Group that amongst other things are looking at how to create and encourage more wild flower verges</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking into how to encourage better management of hedges as part of its Rolling Plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>limited amount of discreet, naturalised planting on certain verges.</p> <p>Planning- The High Weald Unit's draft proposal for the design features of any new planning application regarding new buildings and extensions should be rigorously upheld by the Burwash Parish Council planning team and should be incorporated into the Draft Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	<p>This involves localised planting and will be looked after by the Environment Sub Group</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be amended to reflect this</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Reference to the HW design guide will be included in GP05</p>
280	Y	Fully in agreement – a sensible and sensitive plan for our area	Thank you	No change
281	Y	<p>Very extensive plan for the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Agree that new developments undertaken to existing buildings should be in keeping but this can be costly</p> <p>In stating that developers need to provide sufficient parking – will this not encroach on the land we are trying to protect</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Each application will need to demonstrate that it is not impacting adversely on the AONB</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
282	Y	I agree with all of the points in the N.P for Burwash parish.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>As hard as we try to build the right type of houses here, the system for counting them isn't fair or just.</p> <p>This is a medieval village, and it is easy to take living in the High Weald for granted, but let's not forget that we're the second largest AONB, as well as the best preserved medieval landscape in northern Europe, so planning quotas should be counted to accommodate this.</p> <p>All new housing should have parking spaces adjacent and not in front to avoid creating a detrimental appearance.</p> <p>Because all 3 villages in the parish are Dark Skies any new housing cannot have flood lights or lighting that would impact negatively on our wildlife (bats, glow worms etc.) Building in and around ancient woodlands and hedgerows must be taken into account sensitively.</p> <p>Parking incorrectly over pavements not only changes the look of a village but is dangerous and must be taken into account with any new housing.</p> <p>Any new roads created for new housing should have pavements leading into the heart of the village. This will link the housing to the village to avoid it becoming a soulless cul de sac, instead of a</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p> <p>Policy EN05 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>Policy EN04 applies</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>meaningful street that is an integral part of the overall village.</p> <p>We should make our waste ground work for the environment by allowing wild flowers to flourish to make corridors for pollinating insects. This would look beautiful and make people happy, as well as looking in-keeping with a country village, and not like a suburban park or street. More could be made of the numerous small pockets of land that are dotted about the villages in the parish. Residents should be educated in the benefits of mowing verges only once a year at the end of August. This information can be included in the Welcome New Resident Pack along with the benefits of not creating light pollution with outdoor lighting that burns away all night long.</p>	The Rolling Plan includes an Environment Sub Group that amongst other things are looking at how to create and encourage more wild flower verges	No change
283	Y		Thank you	No change
284	Y	Any plans for development of Burwash should be agreed by the people who live in the village – who know what can be integrated without undermining infrastructure	The Neighbourhood Development Plan process is designed to achieve just this aim.	No change
285	Y	We agree with the plan	Thank you	No change
286	Y	We find the plan positive and excellent	Thank you	No change
287	Y	Excellent	Thank you	No change
288	Y	A very good plan for the development of Burwash	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
289	Y	<p>In general we support the Plan, but would suggest the following additions/amendments:</p> <p>Policy GP01 – Development within the AONB</p> <p>Materials should be included as one of the aspects of any proposal that needs to be appropriate to the AONB, as these can often ruin what, on paper, looks to be a good scheme and make it appear obtrusive in its setting and the wider landscape if they are inappropriate/out of keeping with the locally-used palette.</p> <p>Policy GP03 – Heritage -The Conservation Area as a whole in itself is a designated heritage asset and requires the same level of protection of its historic significance under the NPPF as listed buildings do. The pre-amble to the policy should reflect this – the first sentence currently only makes reference to listed buildings and non-designated heritage assets.</p> <p>Second sentence of the Policy wording – should be affect not effect.</p> <p>Second sentence of the Policy wording refers to non-designated heritage assets, but it would seem that this should be designated heritage assets otherwise there is no overt protection of listed buildings and the conservation area.</p> <p>Third sentence of the Policy wording should be more specific in terms of explaining what is required i.e. unavoidable means “there is no less</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>GP01 will be amended to include the need to use appropriate materials</p> <p>Policy GP03 will be amended to include Conservation Area</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Policy GP03 has been amended to reflect this</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>GP01 has been changed</p> <p>Policy GP03 has been amended</p> <p>Policy GP03 has been amended</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>harmful possible alternative” and justified means that the public benefits outweigh the harm (as per the NPPF).</p> <p>Suggested amended wording for the Policy text: Development proposals will be expected to complement and enhance the distinctiveness of the local vernacular, buildings, structures and other features and their settings of historic significance.</p> <p>Proposals for development that affect designated heritage assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. Applications must clearly demonstrate that any harm is both unavoidable, in that there is no less harmful possible alternative, and justified, on the basis that the public benefits the scheme delivers would outweigh that harm.</p>	<p>Policy GP03 has been amended to reflect this</p> <p>Policy GP03 has been amended to reflect this</p>	<p>Policy GP03 has been amended</p> <p>Policy GP03 has been amended</p>
290	Y	<p>I fully support the NDP.</p> <p>I also think it is silly that there is a minimum number of 6 dwellings which qualify. Is it possible to lower the number?</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p>
291	Y	<p>Please accept that I agree with the draft plan – thank you</p>	<p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
292	Y	BPC needs to make strong links with Brownies, Guides, Beavers, Cubs and Scouts BPC to go to AGMs to make strong links with community	The Parish Council will pick upon this request	No change
293	Y	<p>Very thorough. If sites cannot be identified, there should be clear policies showing how and where development could work.</p> <p>The topographical constraints and protected heritage mean that small scale building must be highly selective and carefully chosen to meet actual need</p>	Thank you	No change
294	Y	Any development must be carefully considered and small scale (not estate). Priority is to protect the AONB	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
295	Y	<p>Fully support the Plan. It is vital to obtain the correct facilities for local needs</p> <p>In rural environment, small pockets of small developments would be more appropriate and more easily absorbed into villages and hamlets with the least impact. Developers should not be allowed to agree to affordable housing and then renege on this after planning application.</p> <p>80% of market price is still not affordable to those on lower income.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey shows that the highest levels of need are for social rented units for young low income families and level access accommodation both rented and for</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>A community bus connecting stations and the shops would be a good idea.</p> <p>The car park for the Drs is now used for trade vehicles, caravans. It is becoming harder to park for appointments</p>	<p>sale to older people who are downsizing. Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking into the business case for this within its Rolling Plan</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
296	N	Against any form of development at all. It never stops	The Parish Council notes these comments.	No change
297	Y	<p>The Plan is a careful evaluation and its conclusions must be correct.</p> <p>I would emphasise the need to find more parking close to Burwash High Street.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		The Oakleys site seems worth investigating either for housing or parking	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	
298	Y	<p>We need the right kind of housing, ie a mix of private and social. Social housing should go to locals before others</p> <p>There should be enough parking and sufficient access for emergency vehicles and public transport</p> <p>Everything that can be done, should be done to protect the AONB</p> <p>Can water supplies and sewage cope with the demand?</p>	<p>Policies HO01 and HO03 apply</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p> <p>Policy GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council is consulting with the various statutory authorities on this Plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
299	Y	The submission is a huge piece of work. I suggest the BPC and Councils nationwide lobby for a change to the absurd rule that developments must be at least 6 houses to count towards the target. Is there such a thing as a national association of PCs that could take this up?	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
300	Y	<p>I am in agreement with the NDP</p> <p>AONB status is not given lightly and it is important that it is retained at all cost. Once gone it is lost forever.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>The exclusion of developments under six properties is unacceptable, they must be part of the housing quota</p> <p>Burwash needs to keep its rural integrity</p> <p>A clause on approved planning applications must be included ie withdrawal of affordable housing etc will negate the approval unless changes are compliant with the NDP</p> <p>Parking is a major issue, especially in avoiding despoiling our AONB</p> <p>All developments must have adequate parking – not just driveway/garage for one car</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>These requirements are already subject to S106 agreements the case you are probably referring to was where the planning approval which promised affordable homes was an outline planning permission and the withdrawal of the affordable homes was at the full application stage.</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
301	Y	<p>The plan is comprehensive in its approach and includes some aspirational projects. It is clear that the geography of the village makes it virtually impossible to find space for another large housing estate, though there might be space for smaller developments</p>	<p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		It would be very useful to have more parking space and the Oakleys site looks to be a potentially exciting space	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.	The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
302	Y	<p>I do support the Plan</p> <p>I would encourage all buildings to be environmentally friendly and for contractors to contribute some sort of other development for the community, ie play area, hall space for school, leisure facilities etc</p> <p>I am very much in favour of maintaining the local environment as it is AONB. But I am also in favour of building homes so the community can grow.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Approved developments are required to pay Community infrastructure Levy payments. At present the Parish Council would receive 15% but if this Plan is approved this rises to 25%. The Rolling Plan sets out the schemes to which any levies received might be used.</p> <p>This Plan seeks to protect the AONB but also look to provide a mix of much needed homes that meet local need in developments that fit well into the local environment</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
303	Y	Please accept this email as acknowledgement of our support for the BNDP from all members of my family living in Burwash	Thank you	No change
304	Y	I wholeheartedly support the draft neighbourhood plan for Burwash Parish.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>I regret that government and county council policies force communities like Burwash into a place that compels us to look like nimbies when we refuse to allow unsuitable developments in our area. We are not nimbies. I remain of the view that sensitive, sensible, space appropriate clusters of housing could so easily be built in this parish ... providing dozens of homes when and where needed.</p> <p>Instead - we have a standoff. That said, I applaud this community and the NP steering group for putting its hands on its collective hips and saying "No" we won't play the 52 units game ... by its own rules, Rother can't find the sites, and neither can we.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan sets out a compelling vision for the future of our Parish, with clear policies aimed at sustaining the area as a vibrant, viable and forward looking community. It has been a marvellous consultative process and many of the ideas sewn through its pages have already become part of the Parish Council's ambitious 4-year-rolling Plan.</p>		
305	Y	I support the BNDP	Thank you	No change
306	Y	<p>A very comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Let us hope this plan will help to secure this wonderful historic area of natural beauty.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		I cannot understand why RDC does not include building developments of less than 6 units. It makes more sense to build small units on empty or rundown brownfield sites	The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
307	N	<p>Objections to the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>1. These representations are submitted on behalf of Park Lane Homes (South East) Ltd. and object to the Consultation Draft version of the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan on the following grounds;</p> <p>i. Firstly, the lack of any sites allocated for housing development in accordance with the adopted strategic housing policies for the area</p> <p>ii. Secondly, the proposal not to re-allocate the land south west of Strand VL1 of the adopted Local Plan and</p> <p>iii. Thirdly, the lack of any Neighbourhood Plan drawing allocating housing sites and the Development Boundary at Burwash.</p> <p>i) Strategic Housing Policies</p> <p>2. Strategic housing policies for the Neighbourhood Plan area are set out in the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy adopted in September 2014. Policy OSS1 sets out a District wide requirement to provide “at</p>		No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>least 5,700 dwellings (net) in the district over the period 2011 – 2028”. Of this amount of additional housing required during this period, Policy RA1 (v) requires (in effect ‘at least’) 1,670 dwellings to be provided in villages, with at least 35 additional dwellings being provided at Burwash over and above the existing 22 dwelling commitment (Figure 12 of Policy RA1).</p> <p>3. Paragraph 37 of the National Planning Policy Framework (February 2019) confirms that “Neighbourhood plans must meet certain ‘basic conditions’ and other legal requirements before they can come into force. These are tested through an independent examination before Neighbourhood Plans may proceed to referendum”. Paragraph 8 of Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires a Neighbourhood Plan Examiner to assess whether the Neighbourhood Plan meets ‘basic conditions’, which include “general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area”.</p> <p>4. The consultation draft version of the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan seeks to make the case (at paragraph 13 of Section 1 and paragraph 61 of section 3) that there are no suitable housing sites at Burwash, but this therefore, fails one of the ‘basic conditions’ tests in not providing any additional housing in accordance with the strategic housing</p>	<p>The figures relating to Burwash in this paragraph do not align with our housing target of 52 homes.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>requirements set out in Policies OSS1 and RA1 (v) of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>5. As a consequence of the Core Strategy requirement for Burwash to meet some of the District wide housing requirement over and above existing commitments, the District Council (as the local planning authority) required the Neighbourhood Plan to be the subject of a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA). While a SEA has been produced as part of the Neighbourhood Plan (in Appendix D), this is itself seriously flawed as the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet the strategic housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Furthermore, paragraph 1.5.0 of the SEA is clearly wrong in claiming that “The Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan is being prepared to be in general conformity with the provisions of the Rother Local Plan and national policies”.</p> <p>ii) Land west of Strand Meadow</p> <p>6. The land to the west of Strand Meadow is allocated for “housing and recreational purposes” in Policy VL1 of the Rother District Local Plan adopted in July 2006. The land, which is within the Development Boundary of Burwash as identified on Inset Map 8 of the Local Plan, is the subject of extant outline planning permission for either 17 or</p>	<p>The Parish Council, following advice from RDC understand, that it is possible to not allocate to the Plan.</p> <p>The key point here in terms of conformity is that we do accept the housing target of 52 homes, which we have confirmed</p> <p>We understand that the same principal applies to the SEA.</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>30 dwellings (planning permission nos. RR/2011/2205/P and RR/2017/582/P respectively).</p> <p>7. This allocated and approved housing land makes an important contribution to the housing requirement set out in Strategic Policies OSS1 and RA1 (v). The 17 dwellings approved as part of planning permission no. RR/2011/2205/P contribute towards the 22 dwelling commitment identified in Figure 12 of Policy RA1 (v) and the additional 13 units on the site the subject of the subsequent outline consent (planning permission no. RR/2017/582/P) contributes towards the requirement to provide an additional 35 dwellings at Burwash. This would still leave a balance of 22 additional units that still need to be provided for in the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan in order to meet the strategic housing requirements of the adopted Development Plan, and comply with one of the 'Basic Conditions' tests.</p> <p>8. The objector's case is that this land should therefore, continue to be identified for housing and recreational use as currently shown on Inset Map 8 of the adopted Local Plan and in addition, at least a further 22 dwellings must to be identified at Burwash in order to meet the residual part of the strategic housing requirement.</p> <p>9. The consultation draft of the Neighbourhood Plan makes various comments in Section 3 about the already allocated and approved housing land to</p>	<p>The current application for 30 homes was refused by RDC and is now subject to an appeal. This was objected to by over 400 people.</p> <p>We are awaiting the outcome of this appeal.</p> <p>Once again the figures for Burwash used here do not reflect the 52 homes housing target.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>the south west of Strand Meadow in relation to a current appeal (at paragraphs 14, 19, 20 and 58), which are not appropriate for a Neighbourhood Plan for it to be 'made' to form part of the Development Plan for the area. Paragraphs 14, 19, 20 and 58 should therefore, be amended and/or deleted at the time the 'Submission Draft' is produced for Formal Examination and instead, the Neighbourhood Plan should recognise that the land west of Strand Meadow has extant consent for 30 dwellings.</p> <p>iii) The Burwash Development Boundary</p> <p>10. Policy OSS2 of the Core Strategy requires a 'Development Boundary' to be identified around settlements (including Burwash) "to differentiate between areas where most forms of new development would be acceptable and where they would not". While Appendix M of the consultation draft Neighbourhood Plan shows the Development Boundary of Inset Map 8 of the current Local Plan, it is not clear whether it is intended to retain the existing Development Boundary in its existing form. It is the objector's case that the Neighbourhood Plan should make it clear that the current Development Boundary is to be retained or alternatively extended to provide for the additional 22 dwellings required to meet the strategic housing policies at Burwash.</p>	<p>There are no plans to amend the existing development boundaries (Para 31) and this is supported by Policy GP04</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
308	Y	I support this plan	Thank you	No change
309		<p>I have been living in Burwash Common for over 35 years and for a few years before at Burwash.</p> <p>I have a keen interest in the area and its improvement so that it enhances the sense of community within the village and each of its hamlets, meeting the socio-economic demands of modern life while retaining its beauty and its heritage.</p> <p>I have read the Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2028 - Pre-Submission Consultation and, by and large, I agree and support the plans set out for the area.</p> <p>However, what I would like to address with a stronger voice is the need to ensure that each of our communities within the development is doing well and thriving. There ought to be put a greater emphasis for the elderly and their needs with suitable housing and social facilities within the community so that the sense of belonging continues to remain strong.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is keen to ensure that the wonderful community spirit we have across the Parish is supported and built upon to create a thriving community.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Particular thought should be given in ways to increase the local employment which is likely to bring a higher wealth and a stronger community.</p> <p>We need to continue the life in the village and every effort should be made for young professionals and skilled people to come back to the area that they were born and grew up. This way the life in the village will continue vibrant and the customs will stay alive when the elderly have gone. Some incentives, therefore, particularly with accommodation is essential for this purpose. It also reduces the burden to the tax payer because the elderly will look after their grandchildren while the parents are working and when there is the need the elderly will be looked after by their children.</p> <p>Finally, it is essential that there are local facilities for a community to be able to thrive; e.g. the local post office, the church, the availability of some form of a banking facility locally and local trade. The High Street must not die.</p>	<p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. We recognise the challenges faced by our shops today, which is shared in most High Streets in the nation.</p> <p>We have undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall.</p> <p>Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p>	No change
310		<p>Our view is that development at the site of Shrub Lane and Watercress Field are both excellent ideas and will add diversity and talent to the village.</p> <p>Parking will need to be on the site of each development and access carefully planned. Shrub Lane is the best option in terms of access. Strand</p>	<p>Both of these schemes were refused by RDC.</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Meadow is overcrowded with cars already so unless another access road is planned that doesn't involve Strand Meadow, it would be impractical.</p> <p>Ancient woodland would benefit from forest management so they can be enjoyed by more people in a structured way with paths</p>		
311	Y	A well thought out document that has taken care to preserve the village, in this ever changing world	Thank you	No change
312	Y	<p>We are supportive of the plan.</p> <p>Parking at the top of Shrub lane and the car park at this location cannot cope with the number of vehicles that need space</p> <p>The number of very large lorry's travelling through the village is a big worry especially at school times.</p> <p>We support the idea of a cycle path/bridleway from Burwash to Etchingham or at least to Borders lane, our property's boundary runs along the A265 to the south as you exit the village and we would be happy to allow the route to use a stretch of this land next to the road. If Glebe House were to agree</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>Thank you for this very kind offer. The Parish Council is looking to start looking at the viability of this path in the near future.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		to this that would make a great start in making this happen.		
313	Y	<p>The Housing target allowing only developments of six or more new homes is unrealistic given the location of the village within the AONB, its constricted boundaries, and heritage. For practical purposes, RDC should be required to lower the minimum development size to three or four houses, and accept the use of more rural exception sites.</p> <p>Policy GP03 Heritage requires that development complement and enhance the local vernacular, buildings and settings etc.</p> <p>As part of this policy the BPC's Rolling Plan on community and communications should ensure that all residents, especially those living in listed buildings and within conservation areas, are reminded of their responsibilities for appropriate property maintenance to protect and enhance these heritage assets.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The powers to protect the conservation area and listed buildings sits with RDC but the Parish Council has on occasions reminded owners that with ownership comes responsibility. We will continue to highlight areas where we feel more could be done and where necessary advise RDC.</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p>
314	Y	<p>We wish to commend the proposed NDP for Burwash</p> <p>There is little scope for major economic change within the bounds of the Parish</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is however trying to support existing businesses</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Most of the area that could be considered for development sits along the adjacent hilltop sites or around Shrub Lane. The A265 is not structurally adequate to take today's heavy lorry traffic. This road is unsustainable in the long term particularly given the extra traffic that more building would bring.	through encouraging more visitors to come to the village and Policies IN04 and IN05 apply The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. However it has no powers to prevent or restrict heavy good traffic from using the A265	No change
315	Y	The Plan is thorough and well balanced and provides a good set of clear guiding principles against which support for future development within the Parish can be determined. Given the geographical situation of the Parish and its needs, it is essential that future developments should be judged by the policies set out in the plan rather than reference to any arbitrary target.	Thank you	No change
316	Y		Thank you	No change
317	Y	Partnership working - No mention of other partnerships ie local businesses and shops Not sure a welcome pack is a necessary expense. Burwash has a community site and the people	A good point and one which the Parish Council will look to put right The Parish Council is looking for sponsorship to offset the small cost of putting this in place	No change but need to expand the scope of the Rolling Plan to include local businesses in partnership working No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Aspirational Projects – We agree maintenance upgrade of projects – not sure replacing village hall, Drs, Pavilion would be a good use of public money – maintaining and upgrading is necessary</p> <p>In principal we support this plan</p>	<p>Replacement of any of these facilities would only be considered at the end of their useful life</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
318	Y	I am very impressed with the amount of thought that has gone into the document. I have no adverse comments and think it is a good idea to take over the car parks	Thank you	No change
319	Y	A well developed plan – fully support	Thank you	No change
320	Y	The car park should remain free to park to avoid increase of on-street parking	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There are no plans to introduce charges.	No change
321	Y		Thank you	No change
322	Y		Thank you	No change
323	Y	We are told we need a lot more houses but not at any price. I am glad you have looked to the future, which none of us know what it holds but some foresight is good	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
324	Y	<p>What Burwash needs for the family future – 3 bedroom affordable houses NOT 5 bed houses that could have 3-5 cars a house.</p> <p>Our lanes and roads are overcrowded now. Can never park in the High Street or car park</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
325	Y	<p>We need to ensure that we benefit from CIL payments: there is a danger that these may be going to Bexhill</p> <p>Suggest electric car charging points</p>	<p>Approved developments are required to pay Community infrastructure Levy payments. At present the Parish Council would receive 15% but if this Plan is approved this rises to 25%. The Rolling Plan sets out the schemes to which any levies received might be used.</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. With the increasing use of electric cars changing points will be a key consideration if we take over these car parks</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change but key point for the Parish Council to consider with the car parks</p>
326	Y	More homes and flats to rent with up to date buildings, affordable rents and parking off roads	Various policies support this wide range of views	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Get your act together – start charging for parking in Burwash – those lazy people that park outside the hairdressers	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There are no plans to introduce charges.	No change
327	Y	<p>More homes and flats to rent and social housing with off road parking</p> <p>Start charging for parking in the streets and Burwash car park. No one needs to park there for more than an hour or so.</p> <p>I would like to move to a new property that is more up to date. The problem is that wherever you want to build, someone owns the property nearby and they will object but they were happy enough when theirs was built.</p> <p>Do the 20mph in the High Street and fine people for dropping litter</p>	<p>Policies HO01 and HO03 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There are no plans to introduce charges.</p> <p>The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. We have no powers concerning the dropping of litter</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
328	Y	An excellent NDP for the villages	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
329	Y		Thank you	No change
330	Y	<p>The BPC must resist all efforts to force development on the AONB area, there is little point in promoting the link between Batemans/Burwash if we allow the landscape that inspired him to be destroyed. If he were Shakespeare the whole area would be untouchable</p> <p>Can we get the ugly lamp in Shrub Lane removed or replaced with something more stylish or traditional? The whole village should be treated to the same standard as the High Street</p>	<p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council will consider this request</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
331	Y	<p>The BNDP is important to protect Burwash and the adjoining area from housing schemes such as Dentons and Park Lane who pulled out of affordable homes</p> <p>The local infrastructure is important, can the school, surgery, water supply, sewerage and bus service be maintained.</p> <p>Parking is another big issue</p>	<p>The school and the surgery have confirmed that they have capacity for the planned increases in population through the housing target.</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		The NDP should have everyone's support	Thank you	No change
332	Y	Affordable homes. Otherwise I am happy	Thank you	No change
333	Y	No available site for more development	Thank you	No change
334	Y	Happy with it	Thank you	No change
335	Y	Burwash wants to retain its lovely ambience	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
		Burwash wants affordable housing in the right location	Policy HO01 applies	No change
		Burwash wants to encourage a younger element to move to the village area	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies. The Housing Needs Survey showed that along with level access accommodation for downsizers the highest level of need was from young families requiring truly affordable (social rented) housing.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Burwash will have to extend its facilities – schools, Drs, bus</p> <p>Burwash would still be a lovely village if all this could be achieved</p> <p>More information regarding the CLT would be appreciated</p>	<p>These form part of the Aspirational projects in the Rolling Plan</p> <p>Approved developments are required to pay Community infrastructure Levy payments. At present the Parish Council would receive 15% but if this Plan is approved this rises to 25%. The Rolling Plan sets out the schemes to which any levies received might be used. These can be used to support schemes of the type set out in the Rolling Plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
336	Y	<p>Why has the Oakleys site been discounted – could this be a first purchase for the CLT</p> <p>If we are not quick we could lose an ideal opportunity to have a piece of land which could be innovative and varied within the consensus of the village</p>	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this	The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
337	Y	The objections on large housing developments are needed in light of parking difficulties and demands on the Parish infrastructure	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Implementation of all the ideas may be impossible but good luck		
338	Y	This is really important as without this plan, developers will be free to dictate what is best for them and not what is needed in the village	Thank you	No change
339	Y	I would welcome work on the transport plan – regular, reliable links with the trains and other infrastructure Housing approach appears balanced	This is being considered by the Parish Council as part of its 4 year Rolling Plan Thank you	No change No change
340	Y		Thank you	No change
341	Y	I think that there shouldn't be any more housing built as it will bring more people to the village and Burwash is already small and sustainable I do think we need more public transport to places like Etchingham as it will be more convenient for a lot of people and will reduce the pollution	The provision of a cycle and walking path between Etchingham and Burwash and the business case for a Community Bus are part of the Parish Council's 4 year Rolling Plan	No change
342	Y	I believe that the policy outlined in the NDP will best serve the conservation of Burwash's place identity and the environmental profile of the three villages which are of profound importance to residents and the role of Burwash comprising part of the AONB Although many of the issues facing Burwash's future development and conservation are	Policies GP01, GP02 and GP04 apply Thank you	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		becoming increasingly complex, I believe the priorities in the Plan establish a framework by which Burwash's planning challenges can be approached most appropriately		
343	Y	Plan totally supported, especially need for sustainable development and adherence to tenets of the newly formed Commission for building better beautiful buildings – plus green infrastructure	Thank you	No change
344	Y	A huge vote of thanks for this Houses for first time buyers, small homes as above, not allowed to be added to, which fit in with the village	Thank you The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local housing needs and incomes. Policies HO01 applies	No change No change
345	Y	Plan totally supported especially the need for incorporation of need for sustainable development and adherents to the tenets of Building, Better, Beautiful commission	Thank you	No change
346	Y	Affordable housing a must	The Parish Council is keen to see a variety of affordable homes built including shared ownership and social rented units to match local	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Parking is still an issue	housing needs and incomes. Policies H001 applies The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	No change
347	Y		Thank you	No change
348	Y	<p>I have at last managed to spend time reading the draft plan in detail, in order to provide the requested feedback. Firstly, I must compliment all those involved in the creation of this plan. It has obviously been a large and challenging project to capture the local views of residents and business owners alike, in a well -crafted 45 page document.</p> <p>I fully support the need for such a plan and indeed support the majority of what I have read. Within the policies section there are only two that I disagree with.</p> <p>These are GP04 and H002. My grounds for disagreement with these policies are the same. In my view development boundaries, while important for restricting uncontrolled ribbon development, are not as important as the protection of the AONB. Development proposals that have minimal impact on the AONB in our area should be supported even if outside the development</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council believes that the historic nature of our three settlements would be damaged by erosion of the 'gaps'. It is not a question of which is the most important the gaps or the ANOB as we feel that both elements are</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>boundary. Just as development proposals within development boundaries that have a detrimental impact on the AONB must be rejected. In short, boundaries are not as important as the protection of the AONB.</p> <p>Regarding H002, I agree that the right exception sites are a vital way to help the community meet its housing target but it is surely irrelevant to put a maximum of 10 houses within your policy wording. If it is the right site, supported by the parish, then the number should be relevant to the site rather than an arbitrary policy statement.</p> <p>It occurs to me that the difficulty with getting successful new housing agreed within our community is caused by the 2010 SHLAA (reviewed in 2013). Not including Burwash Common and Burwash Weald within the housing target is out of step with the reality of 2019. A new thriving village shop in Burwash Common and refurbished cricket pavilion together with fitness equipment and childrens' play area should be ample reason to broaden the housing target to include the whole community. I would like this suggested within the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>May I wish the parish councillors every success with this Plan. It deserves our community support.</p>	<p>important and need support in order to ensure we protect these much loved aspects</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and will amend the policy accordingly.</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services, the more recent provision of a part time café with some basic shop provisions does not alter this evaluation.</p>	<p>Policy H002 amended to remove the restriction of up to ten homes</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			Thank you	No change
349		With regard to the local plan, I am very much against large developments, because of the nature of our area ,inadequate jobs , and transport challenges plus the very important fact that we are fortunate to live in an area of great beauty, and it should not be ruined by more houses	Thank you	No change
350		Please make a special effort to protect Burwash's fields in the AONB	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
351	Y	I feel that the work, aims and objectives of the Burwash NDP present a realistic vision for the village to thrive while maintaining the community which so important to village life and not damaging	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		the area in which we live. After all, we have chosen to live in this area because of the unspoiled nature of the countryside, if this is lost, people leave and the community breaks down.		
352	Y	<p>On the whole I think the plan is well developed and well thought through.</p> <p>I have some comments which are specific rather than general as generally I agree with the plan.</p> <p>Parking: The issue of parking/safety/traffic flow at the narrowest part of Burwash on the A265 is an ongoing issue. Hopefully the policy will be that the parking will be reviewed in light of the negative affect it has on the residents and properties at this point in the village.</p> <p>Traffic: Huge lorries drive through the village as the shortest route to their destinations. Their size being totally inappropriate to the conditions of the High Street, so could future traffic calming be a way of encouraging where possible these particularly commercial vehicles to find a different route away from Burwash?</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. However it has no powers to prevent or restrict heavy good traffic from using the A265</p> <p>This is sadly not within the Parish Council's powers however we hope that if the measures we are planning to take have the right impact ad that this slows down the traffic passing through it might result in lorries finding less restricted routes.</p> <p>As part of the work towards this Plan we commissioned a study to</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Pollution: I believe that at the narrowest point of Burwash High Street pollution from the traffic is more of a problem. Apart from the affect it has on residents and possibly birds (fewer swifts and swallows are seen flying over this part of the High Street) maintaining properties is very difficult as the exterior of the houses are constantly needing repair/cleaning/repainting due to the closeness size and volume of traffic.</p> <p>Environment: Encourage new developments/households, where appropriate, to plant hedgerows rather than erecting fences and where fences are erected ask residents and developers to create wildlife corridors. Perhaps research grants that would help facilitate this.</p> <p>Encourage developments/households not to erect fencing which blocks a beautiful view from sight.</p>	<p>measure pollution in three locations including the pinch point</p> <p>This did not result in readings that breached any of the current legal limits. The Environment Group within the Rolling Plan will continue to monitor this.</p> <p>These matters are also being looked at by the Environmental Group within the Rolling Plan</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
353	Y	<p>I am supportive of the plan, especially the points that protect the beauty of the parish including:</p> <p>ensuring that the AONB is protected in terms of restricting building on green sites and that any new development should be sympathetic to the surrounding countryside and other buildings</p> <p>that the three villages maintain their distinct identities and that they are kept separate. This includes ensuring that any new development should keep to the ridge tops and not change the</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>Policy GP04 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>beauty of the current views either towards the 3 villages or from the 3 villages.</p> <p>There should be a good degree of social housing and that new developments should include a mix of smaller size dwellings (1-3 bedrooms) to meet local demand. There is also demand for downsizing by elderly residents from larger properties which could free up some larger houses.</p> <p>any new development should not be in an enclosed area e.g. a cul-de-sac and It should have footpath so that the development joins the village and is not apart.</p> <p>all new developments should not distract from the dark skies in the parish</p> <p>The A265 has become much busier over the last few years so any new development should work to minimise the impact to local traffic and steps should be taken to increase public transport, footpaths and cycle lanes to link the villages more and to link to the railway stations.</p> <p>An aspect of the Rother criteria that I feel very strongly about is that developments of fewer than six are not counted to the parish numbers. Although I understand that may be appropriate for an urban area, in a rural area even one additional house could have a major impact on the</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>Policy EN04 applies</p> <p>Policy EN05 applies</p> <p>The Parish Councils Rolling Plan is looking into increasing the links by foot and by cycle between the 3 villages and with Etchingham Station. We will also be looking at the business case for a Community Bus.</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		community, so any new housing development that happens within the parish, irrespective of number of units, should be counted towards the number of new dwellings	the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).	No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point
354		<p>Bell Inn, Burwash -There are missed opportunities being ignored by the NDP regarding this vacant building purely because, it is claimed, "it is unlikely to provide 6 [or more] homes.</p> <p>The Bell Inn would lend itself well for conversion to one bedroom flats.</p> <p>a) The option exists for permission to be granted for change of use to a B&B to meet the needs of increased tourism.</p> <p>(b) In accordance with the Housing Needs Survey, Para 44, it is stated that 79% movers require one (or two) bedroom accommodation for the elderly to buy or rent.</p> <p>Oakley' Garage, Burwash - There are missed opportunities being ignored by the NDP regarding this, yes, increasingly derelict property purely</p>	<p>The Bell Inn is unlikely in our view to provide 6 homes of more and count towards our housing target.</p> <p>The owners have in the past submitted applications for change of use which have been refused. Should they wish to bring this forward for residential they will need to submit a further application</p> <p>The majority of this particular need is for level access or lifted accommodation. This is in our view unlikely to be possible in this building</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>because there has been no application for change of use to a residential development.</p> <p>In the Future Planning section, page 38, the case is made for the retention of existing business premises, quoting “too many properties have obtained change of use to residential over the years and this is inhibiting the expansion of new shops.”</p> <p>Purchase applications should, therefore, not be solely restricted by the NDP to applications for change of use to residential.</p> <p>3.Traffic & Parking in Burwash - In the eight years that my wife and I have lived within the Burwash area, traffic through Burwash (on the A265) and roadside parking (on the A265) has notably increased, not least with illegal parking on both sides of the road, with both increased traffic and increased parking preventing the safe flow and safe transit of Burwash High Street. On-road parking (particularly illegally) has to be decreased, and new facilities for off-road parking have to be increased – before it is too late and the A265 in Burwash becomes gridlocked and dangerous to both road users and pedestrians.</p> <p>4.Parking in Burwash - It is alarming concern that Rother District Council plans to take over control of the (Bear Inn) public car park used by my wife and I (and many of our neighbours) purely as a need to</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. However it has no powers to prevent or restrict heavy good traffic from using the A265</p>	<p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>attend the GP practise, Fairfield Surgery – particularly if (as is suspected) under a new regime, it becomes a compulsory pay & display car park.</p> <p>As it is, it is more often than not impossible to find a parking slot in this car park because selfish residents and businesses ‘hog’ the parking slots all day, which is aggravated (more so in spring and summer) by ‘walkers’ and hikers parking their vehicles in this car park for lengthy periods.</p> <p>5.Aspirational Capital Projects - It is a concern that the Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan has not considered its resolution for the pre-school and primary school in more detail regarding their upgrade or replacement, suggesting that at the end of their useful life they will need to be replaced. The facility at School Hill, Burwash, is (in my opinion) no-longer adequate for the expanding needs of the community with growing families. It has also become, at peak times, a danger to children and parents as a result of increased and prolonged parking of ‘school run’ vehicles on School Hill preventing safe transit by other road users, particularly on the infamous bend in the road.</p> <p>However, rather than demolish and replace this historic school house, I would prefer to see Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan look to alternative sites for a new, larger, safer school – with the existing school house sold off for use as a</p>	<p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision</p>	<p>No charge</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>result in a drop in business, I would have to consider relocating.</p> <p>The Forge has provided a wonderful location from which to operate, we all very much enjoy being part of the Burwash community and we would obviously prefer to stay put.</p> <p>I would add that, since the lines appeared, traffic has tended to move even faster through the High Street and this is particularly noticeable with lorries and farm vehicles. We all noticed this on the very first day that the lines were in place.</p> <p>I would therefore conclude that these lines will not only negatively impact High Street businesses but act against the villages efforts to slow down the flow of through traffic.</p> <p>I realise that my comment may seem primarily selfish but I do believe that we are not the only ones to have been affected by this.</p> <p>Many thanks for the work that you do on behalf of the village, it's businesses and residents.</p>	<p>looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	No change
357	Y	<p>Having read the summary as a resident and a small business in the village (Burwash Musical Theatre) The detail and thought in this plan has really reflected my views.</p>	Thank you	No change
358	Y	Regarding parking, this links with provision of integrated public transport and/or cycling and	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>walking links (the proposal for a cycle way and footpath to Etchingham and Stonegate are excellent) are direct and clear, limited and non-integrated public transport = more cars in the village and the resulting pressure on car parking. I cycle daily from Burwash to Etchingham railway station and empathise with people who are frightened to walk or cycle this route, it's not for the inexperienced or faint hearted, which is not right of course! The provision of a safe cycle route would I am sure allow more people to cycle or walk which would reduce car numbers, improve health, reduce CO2 emissions AND reduce costs, a car is an expensive thing to buy and run compared to a bicycle or walking after all. The walking route to Stonegate is actually quite possible given the existing foot paths are quite direct, some signage and a managed grass surface would be relatively fast and low cost. Adding an off road bike route as well would be superb!</p> <p>I would add that provision of electric charging points need to be considered - these can be funded by the companies wishing to provide this commercial service so may/should be a low or no cost option.</p> <p>Exciting prospects indeed, fully support you on it all.</p>	<p>Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>The Rolling Plan includes looking at the business case for a Community Bus and the provision of pathways for walkers and cycles to link our three villages and to Etchingham</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
359	Y	I agree with the Plan	Thank you	No change
360	Y	<p>Whilst I understand the need of affordable housing, this must happen sympathetically and only if infrastructure is increased accordingly.</p> <p>Walking my granddaughter along shrub lane to school has made me realise how dangerous the lack of a footpath is particularly if the traffic ignore the 30mph limit</p>	<p>Policy GP05 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to introduce a 20mph limit through the village and will be consulting on this in the coming weeks</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
361		<p>Congratulations on the production of a comprehensive plan that should stand the parish in good stead for future local and regional planning. There is an area I feel should be specifically mentioned given the way forward to use zero emission vehicles.</p> <p>The NDP mentions:The Parish Council is in discussion with RDC to take over the car parks and is looking at ways to increase the options for off-street parking. This forms part of the Parish Councils Rolling Programme for 2019-2023.</p> <p>To protect and conserve the environment and minimise air pollution.</p> <p>An aspect that is not specifically mentioned is the introduction of an infrastructure to support the use of electric vehicles. Whilst the parish may currently</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>Once this happens we will be looking at what improvements to undertake</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>enjoy low levels of air pollution it should not mean that we don't take steps to reduce harmful emissions within and outside our parish.</p> <p>With the ever increasing emphasis on reducing pollution some mention of initiatives aimed at helping this cause would be a positive and helpful inclusion in the NDP.</p> <p>Housing Developments: Plans for new housing developments where off-street parking is provided should be required to include Electric Vehicle charging points.</p> <p>The use of electric/hybrid vehicles is the way forward and yet the plan has no mention of how the residents in the parish of Burwash will be supported in their use. Many reports on the use of zero emission vehicles refer to the dilemma of the 'chicken and egg' situation of what comes first....people want to move to electric but the appropriate infrastructure is not in place to support this. Why shouldn't Burwash be at the forefront of rural communities taking the initiative to promote and support reduction in harmful emissions?</p> <p>The draft plan refers to the aspiration/potential takeover of the parish car parks; this would be the ideal opportunity to plan for the inclusion of electrical charging points.</p> <p>To promote and support the use of cleaner transport is a positive step towards reducing</p>	<p>including the provision of electric power points</p> <p>Policy GP05 will be amended to include the provision of electric power points on new developments</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Policy GP05 has been amended</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>harmful emissions. In a rural community such as ours there are many vehicle users who do short journeys to surrounding towns and villages and the use of electric cars would be ideal. The Government target of no new diesels and petrols by 2040 is not that far away and the shift to zero emission vehicles in the meantime can only happen if the infrastructure is there to support it.</p> <p>In addition to provision of charging points for those owning electric cars, the charging infrastructure would support an all-electric community minibus/SUV vehicle. The introduction of an electric charging facility and a local community bus for use by residents of any age has the potential to serve several purposes that would benefit the community; these include:</p> <p>Cleaner, convenient transport</p> <p>Vehicle sharing to reduce number of vehicles on the road</p> <p>Support for independent living for those who do not/no longer wish to own a car</p> <p>Assist residents of all age groups to participate in activities in neighbouring villages/towns</p> <p>Train station shuttle service (reducing cars on roads, supporting commuters, freeing up spaces in the overcrowded car parks)</p>	<p>The Rolling Plan includes looking at the business case for a Community Bus and the provision of pathways for walkers and cycles to link our three villages and to Etchingham</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Car service for Fairfield surgery</p> <p>The initiative could work well with the local running of the car parks; however, it would seem the timing of the Parish Council taking on responsibility of the car parks would take into account any plan that Rother DC may/may not have to carry out such work in accordance with the Office for Low Emission Vehicles (OLEV) initiative providing Grants to provide residential on-street chargepoints for plug-in electric vehicles - Guidance for Local Authorities March 2019 v1.2.</p>		

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Policy IN02 should be strengthened and is crucial to the community.</p> <p>I support IN06, all parish buildings should have access to Wi-Fi through community subscription and support from the Burwash Parish Council.</p>	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	No change
363	Y	Vitally important to maintain this area of AONB. Affordable housing acceptable, executive housing not.	Policies GP01 and GP02 apply	No change
364	Y	Keep affordable housing – there isn't enough already to the point of crisis	Thank you	No change
365	Y	Homes should be affordable and for the people. Long term investment over short term profit	Thank you	No change
366	Y	Housing is not cheap these days. Don't make it unrealistic to afford. Support the community	Thank you	No change
367	Y	Support the place	Thank you	No change
368	Y	We choose to live in the country for its beauty. It is important that we can maintain that as well as being a suitable enjoyable place for residents to live. We are in a housing crisis and it is imperative that any building in the country solves the housing crisis. It must be affordable	Policy HO01 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
369	Y	Am passionate about the plan and its importance. Imperative that this is understood and accepted	Thank you	No change
370	Y	We want to preserve the Burwash Community with a mixture of families on a variety of incomes	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
371	Y	I agree with the plan	Thank you	No change
372	Y	Help the village life	Thank you	No change
373	Y	Don't do it!	Thank you	No change
374	Y	As part of the Burwash community I believe in this plan as it prioritises the people	Thank you	No change
375	Y	Everyone needs a home, why does that home need to cost a fortune. Why does a good view have to exclusively belong to the rich? Let's keep home prices down and the community a community, not a holiday home	Thank you	No change
376	Y	Great news!	Thank you	No change
377	Y	No need for over development	Thank you	No change
378	Y	The plan will benefit Burwash	Thank you	No change
379	Y		Thank you	No change
380	Y	I consider that the Plan has been well produced and provides for both the present and future needs of the Burwash community.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
381	Y	<p>A huge thank you to those who have obviously devoted an enormous amount of time and energy to producing this very sensible plan.</p> <p>It is a shame that there are no sites identified to provide 6+ houses, partly because I question whether Rother will be as supportive of the plan and partly because the only way to prevent the closing of existing businesses is to persuade more residents to use our local shops, etc and the more residents we have, the more chance we have of achieving this.</p> <p>I think we also need to rethink parking- we primarily use the car park for 5-15 minutes to visit the surgery, Londis or Jarvis, but it is often full of cars that seem to be there permanently. I'm not against this, but if we recognise the 2 different types of customer, could we find a separate site for long term customers to free up the current car park for people visiting local businesses? However, we must ensure that the car park remains free.</p>	<p>Thank You</p> <p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
382	Y	Thorough and well thought out plan.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Development boundaries do, however, need to be more flexible to allow for sensible development that will not impact negatively on the AONB. In your sections GP04 and H002, you appear to see things the other way around. I believe the AONB decision should be considered before the boundary decision, and in this way you may well end up with more opportunities for sensible development in sensible places.	The Parish Council believes that the historic nature of our three settlements would be damaged by erosion of the 'gaps'. It is not a question of which is the most important the gaps or the ANOB as we feel that both elements need support in order to ensure we protect these much loved aspects	No change
383	Y	<p>Views on Burwash Neighbourhood Development Plan – I support this plan, but have the following concerns:-</p> <p>Burwash is steeped in history and has many areas of outstanding natural beauty, which need to be preserved.</p> <p>The target of providing 52 new homes by 2028 is an impossible task, in Burwash – there are many issues to consider:-</p> <p>Environment issues – effect of additional gas, electric & water cables along with additional telecommunications, effect of additional traffic to</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council accepts the housing target of 52 homes but seeks through this Plan to ensure that the units provided meet our needs and aspirations and that the infrastructure is there to support it.</p> <p>The school and the surgery have advised that they have capacity to deal with the additional demands</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>the area and air pollution connected to this, light pollution, the need to provide adequate additional parking. In addition, the strain on local resources – GP surgery & local Schools. We also need to think about the effect of providing additional services by the Local Authority in connection with emptying of refuse/re-cycling bins.</p> <p>I have concerns about the effect of providing additional houses will have and the effect on the peace and tranquillity of the village.</p> <p>I believe this plan needs to be implemented to ensure that the beauty of the village of Burwash remains.</p>	resulting from the 52 new homes housing target.	No change
384	Y	I support the draft plan	Thank you	No change
385	Y	I consider that the Plan has been well produced and includes for both the present and future needs of the Burwash community.	Thank you	No change
386	Y	Thanks for all the hard work	Thank you	No change
387	Y	<p>I am writing to comment on the draft neighbourhood plan, which I have just read.</p> <p>I would like to start by commending you on the obvious amount of hard work that has been put into this document. The reason that our community is flourishing today is due in large part to people</p>	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>like yourselves who give up theirs time to make it what it is. Please know that it is greatly appreciated by residents.</p> <p>My thoughts are that this is an excellent plan. It was important to me that it commented on the need to develop affordable and accessible housing for residents, and it has done just that.</p> <p>I am also very pleased to see such weight given to environmental factors, including the preservation and enhancement of various habitats. I think that when considering developments, priority should be given to developers who have genuine desire to create new housing with a truly ecological vision.</p> <p>Regarding parking, this has clearly been identified as a priority for residents, but I wonder if the plan could go a step further in detailing specific minimum requirements? When we were house hunting in this area we viewed the development at Boundary's Edge. At the time we were the owners of one medium sized saloon as a family car, plus one small car used for station runs (not unusual I would say for a four person family in this area). We were astounded that four houses had been developed with such small spaces, and had to rule</p>	<p>RDC policies cover the provision of car spaces per unit which the Parish Council is not looking to amend</p>	<p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>out purchasing one of these houses because the family car wouldn't fit in the space we would need to put it in. Furthermore there was no provision for visitor parking. As I result I know that residents now regularly park on street on Vicarage Road on the side of the main road. I appreciate that you can't account for every kind of development, however, it seems to me that a minimum number of parking spaces could be set per likely number of residents, and that (given cars seem to be getting larger), a minimum size of space could be required. Just a thought.</p> <p>The other parking issue is that if the school continues to expand its numbers (which financially is key to its survival and success), that the pressure at drop off and pick up times is only likely to increase. Issues like the closure of the pre-school mean that additional parents are having to get in their cars in the morning to access nursery care whereas previously they could have just done one school run on foot). The NP probably isn't the place for a full discussion of this but I think it's important to acknowledge that school parking is a particular pinch point.</p> <p>I appreciate that it is not something that you can control, but the fact that only developments of six houses or more count towards the figures is completely bizarre in an area with such a small</p>	<p>The Parish Council is concerned about the pressure on this small lane at school drop off and pick up times. It has supported the introduction of community volunteers as 'Lollipop' persons.</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>target. When you are only aiming for 52, a few houses here and there can really make a difference. I guess it's unlikely to change but wanted to feed that back.</p> <p>I may have missed this in the draft, but I wonder, are there any risks attached to the PC not having identified sufficient suitable development sites by a certain point that need to be acknowledged in the plan? Clearly given all the (perfectly reasonable in my opinion) restrictions and parameters on large developments in the AONB, it won't be easy to meet even a target of 52. What happens if we don't meet it?</p> <p>I think those are all my comments for now, but if I think of anything further then I'll drop you a line.</p> <p>In the meantime thank you again and well done on all your hard work and commitment to getting it right.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p>
388	Y	I have read the NDP and support it	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
389	Y	<p>1 I make the following comments.</p> <p>a) I can see the large amount of work done by those who contributed to the plan. Those involved should be publicly thanked.</p> <p>b) I wholeheartedly support the plan.</p> <p>c) Page 6 para 2 The grant was by Prince Edward acting on the authority of his father. There is no evidence that King Henry III knew about the grant, so he could not have been prompted.</p> <p>d) Page 6 para 3 There are not 137 listed buildings in the High Street. The normal use of the word 'listed' means listed by Heritage England. There are about 75 listed buildings in the High Street. The 137 relates both to listed buildings and those buildings listed by Rother District Council.</p> <p>e) Page 6 para 5, page 7 para 8 and page 29 top box A ridge-top village is one where the village is sited at the top of a ridge. Only Burwash is a ridge-top village.</p> <p>f) Page 17 para 14 Presumably the list a) to f) in this paragraph is a list of objectives. If this is the case, it should say so.</p> <p>g) Page 20 para 11 I should add that The Bell could be a restaurant, wedding venue or drinking</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Thank you</p> <p>The following helpful comments have been considered in advance of the production of the final version of the Plan.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>establishment. Keeping employment opportunities in the village was considered very important.</p> <p>h) I understand that comment has been made about Oakleys being reserved for housing. This would be wrong and would restrict future planning applications. Planning options, including commercial options, should not be closed down by the Neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>i) Page 21 para 19a The two main reasons for rejection have been rolled into one in para a. It would be better to separate and expand them.</p> <p>j) Page 20 I'm not sure that the procedure takes the NP anywhere. If it is retained, it should be brought up to date.</p> <p>k) Page 22 paras 23-26 I should add in each para that the site has been rejected on good grounds by Rother District Council.</p> <p>l) Page 24 para 47 There needs to be a new section title here as the sub-sections are not part of the 'Housing Needs Survey'.</p> <p>m) Page 26 para 61 The reasons may seem obvious to the authors but they should be set out clearly. I suggest the following:</p> <p>62 The reasons for the decision not to suggest any sites for housing include the following:</p>		

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>(i) Rother District Council has rejected all possible sites. This rejection was correct.</p> <p>(ii) It is very important that the Burwash part of the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is retained. It is a medieval landscape of international importance. People travel from all over the world to enjoy it.</p> <p>(iii) If Burwash Weald and Burwash Common are rejected for housing because of sustainability, the only site for housing is Burwash village.</p> <p>(iv) Due to the steep slope on the north and south sides of the village and the need to protect the integrity of the High Street, these areas have to be ruled out.</p> <p>(v) Due to a series of slopes, the areas to the west and east of the village have to be ruled out. On both sides, the visual impact of housing would be very great.</p> <p>(vi) There are no suitable sites in Shrub Lane. The general view is that except for infilling, the area is unsuitable for any more housing.</p> <p>(vii) That means that there is no area near the High Street that is suitable for housing.</p> <p>(viii) On occasions a settlement is so important and its surroundings so special that in the interests of the local and national community the area</p>		

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>should be left alone. Infilling can take place in limited sites.</p> <p>n) Page 28 bottom box I should add 'Importance will be given to both individual buildings and the collage of groups of buildings'.</p> <p>o) Page 30 second box As you have ruled out development this box is in conflict with the earlier paragraphs. It should be deleted.</p> <p>p) Page 30 last box For the same reason, substitute 'housing units' for 'development'.</p> <p>q) Page 31 top box Substitute 'significant' for 'meaningful'.</p> <p>2 I wish the plan every success at the various stages to come.</p>		
390	y	We need improved road calming and less parked cars on the main road, better management of the lime trees off the highstreet in highfields, and more thought for housing for younger people of the village	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. However it has no powers to prevent or restrict heavy good traffic from using the A265</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
391	Y	I support the BNDP	Thank you	No change
392	Y	A great deal of work has gone into developing a workable plan which balances the demands of an increasingly sophisticated community with a continuing appetites and needs for modern services while endeavouring to retain the charm and traditions of a community with a unique history. The result is a workable effective balance between the needs of the community today and how the anticipated changes demanded can be addressed going forward.	Thank you	No change
393	Y	Support the plan. However, more consideration required for proper affordable for first time buyers and social/rented housing Adequate roads and proper parking	Policy HO01 applies The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. However it has no powers to prevent or restrict heavy good traffic from using the A265 The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision	No change No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
394	Y	I support the Plan and affordable housing	Thank you	No change
395	Y	The Plan is well thought out and very comprehensive. I think it extremely important that the village agree with this plan as it protects our village in many ways	Thank you	No change
396	Y	Fully support the NDP I grew up in Burwash and both my parents in law still live there. I feel it is important that the community has a say in development that will affect them	Thank you	No change
397	Y	I fully support the NDP as I grew up in Burwash and my parents and parents in law still live there	Thank you	No change
398	N	We object to yet more expensive housing being built in an area that is already full of unaffordable houses	Thank you	No change
399	Y	Consideration should be given to proposals for including 6-8 houses/flats in appropriate places as part of the RDC building quota The importance of this must be emphasised and for affordable homes	Policy HO01 applies	No change
400	Y		Thank you	No change
401	Y	I do not agree with the 20mph limit as you need to go faster to get by parked traffic at village hall end.	The Parish Council is looking to introduce a 20mph limit through the village and for other traffic calming	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		It can take a long time to get through and line of parked cars is already long	measures designed to allow good progress without the need to speed	
402	Y		Thank you	No change
403	Y		Thank you	No change
404	Y	<p>A long time in coming due to well constructed proposals based on the various views of Burwash folk</p> <p>Burwash is unique for historical considerations and geographic location, rural and agricultural importance</p> <p>This important cocktail must be preserved for future generations at the same time acknowledging current needs for employment and housing</p> <p>The NDP meets these requirements and protects the countryside from exploitation by those concerned with profit and financial advantage</p>	Thank you	No change
405	Y	<p>Support in the main</p> <p>Sadly all too often, these policies are not adhered to and LAs override NDPs</p> <p>GP08 Non-specific indications leave options wide open and therefore wind turbines and ugly solar panels will be permitted as blots on the AONB landscape. Even listed properties now are regularly permitted solar panels</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy GP08 will be strengthened to reflect this</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>GP08 has been amended</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>HO03 C&D open to abuse- more flexibility to individual cases may be required and a panel decision perhaps</p> <p>IN02 wording is too woolly “where possible” additional parking should be a strict condition</p> <p>Oakleys Garage site – surely this is an answer to part of the new housing requirement with low impact on the AONB</p>	<p>The Parish Council does not support this view</p> <p>The words where possible do not appear in this policy</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p>
406	Y	Please build affordable property for the village	Policies HO01 and HO03 apply	No change
407		Please limit any development that will increase traffic coming up and down the top of Shrub Lane , as it is it is dangerous and inconvenient when trying to get to the village ,with the dangerous part being the most important . We are all aware that new housing is a must in the future but the area from Bankside downwards has surely got enough houses bearing in mind the narrowness of the top of Shrub Lane .	Any new development will need to demonstrate through a traffic survey the impact this would have on the area.	No change
408	Y	As a long term resident of Burwash (approximately 24 years) - having grown up here in both Strand Meadow and Shrub Lane residences, and now through family connections a regular visitor with my own children having moved away, I love the unique character of the village which I am able to share on visits with my three young children. We love enjoying the rural views, relaxed walks along the high street, and the dark nighttime skies.		

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Beyond nostalgia, Burwash is a very special place that must be preserved at all costs!</p> <p>As such, I wholly endorse this plan and believe it to be a valuable tool to do so.</p>	Thank you	No change
409	Y	I support the plan	Thank you	No change
410	Y	Plan seems clear and comprehensive. I have no comments or questions at this time	Thank you	No change
411	Y	<p>A bus service at least to Heathfield and back to the village and to at least one railway station would be very useful for our young people.</p> <p>Unless a lift is provided they are unable to get anywhere at the weekend</p>	The Parish Council has recognised that the existing limited bus service which does not run at all at weekends needs to be enhanced. As part of its Rolling Plan it is looking at the business case for a Community Bus.	No change
412		*Traffic calming Shrub Lane - We live at number 54 and I walk my children to school each day - terrified that we will be hit by a speeding car or a car swerving around dangerously parked cars on bends. We have had many near misses before the pavements begin at strand meadow. Please, before one of our younger generation gets killed on their way to school - please support traffic calming coming into the village. I will support and help in this matter as much as I can. Why was a pavement	The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>never built all through the 30mph? Is this a possibility?</p> <p>*A crossing ANYWHERE in Burwash. Along the same lines as above - everyone takes their lives in their hands trying to cross the road - if high street residents are concerned about lights/crossing aesthetic, I would really like an honest an open conversation where this can be addressed and not just left until there is an accident.</p>	Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street	No change
413	Y	I have reviewed the NDP and would like to fully endorse it	Thank you	No change
414	Y		Thank you	No change
415	Y		Thank you	No change
416		<p>I support the aims of the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan and make the following observation about the impact of traffic through the village which urgently needs to be addressed for the safety of residents and visitors.</p> <p>Using the pavements along the High Street or attempting to cross the road can be hazardous for pedestrians. Daily occurrences of traffic violations particularly by lorries mounting pavements and speeding vehicles intimidating pedestrians on pavements particularly at "the pinch" and when attempting to cross the road.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>I support the proposed reduction in the speed limit to 20mph which but must be implemented to provide a safer environment for pedestrians. It would not hinder the flow of traffic, merely slow it down through the village and should promote greater consideration by drivers, particularly of huge lorries, for the historic buildings and safety of Burwash residents and visitors.</p> <p>(Pictures included in email)</p>	Thank you	No change
417	Y	I fully support this plan, it truly does put the community in control of their village's future	Thank you	No change
418	Y	<p>It is evident that a great deal of time and thought has gone into the plan. I support the 'aspirational plans for the future when money permits. Not sure about the point of the village gates. As to the placement of new houses, there really is a problem. The proposed sites have too many problems, mainly access, lack of safe foot paths, and most of all overloading the already failing sewage system. I felt there were possible options either end of the village but was told they are outside the envelope. Burwash is a pretty village in an ANOB area, BUT sited on a ridge making development difficult.</p>	Thank you	No change
419	Y	I would like to comment on the introduction and success of the Community Arts and Crafts	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Exhibition in May held at Burwash Common Pavilion.</p> <p>A Christmas Frost Fair will be held in there in November.</p> <p>The Open Garden was a wonderful event for all ages.</p>		
420	Y	Decisions concerning the development of the three villages with regard to housing and facilities should be a matter of the residents and businesses affected.	Thank you	No change
421	Y	<p>I think the plan is a well thought through and positive plan.</p> <p>My additional thoughts are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Footpaths are an important feature of the plan and rightly so. That being said I think we should stress responsible use of footpaths which includes staying to designated paths, picking up dog waste and keeping dogs on leads or under control. The fields where there are footpaths produce food (human or livestock). Excessive dog waste renders them unusable. - We should lobby for existing power lines to be buried especially when they are not at safe heights 	<p>Thank you</p> <p>On the Playing Fields and in the High Street The Parish Council has provided dog litter pins and there are a number of signs that encourage responsible dog ownership.</p> <p>The Parish Council supported by Burwash Common and Weald Residents' Association is pushing the</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		- We should include lobbying for a pedestrian crossing (or two) in the village. One by the shop and/or one by the school.	power company to give this work higher priority. The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street	No change
422	Y		Thank you	No change
423	Y	Yes I do support the plan and am very grateful to all the people who have put together such a thoughtful and comprehensive plan.	Thank you	No change
424		I have read the Burwash Neighbourhood Plan which appears to be very well thought out and comprehensive - not that I've ever read one before. Even as a relative newcomer to Burwash, I can tell you that the reasons I love living here are all reflected in the content and the future aspirations are in line with what I would be very happy to see in years to come. I believe that the only way our villages will continue to "live" is if they cater to the needs of young people.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		To that end, the only thing that I would personally like to add to the Housing Policy section is the need for rental properties suitable for young, single people who want to leave home when they start work - studio and one bedroom apartments. Realistically low cost housing. It would also be good to include this in the Rural Exception Sites section	The Parish Council through its Rolling Plan will look at the particular needs of young people in the Parish.	No change
425	Y		Thank you	No change
426	Y	<p>I support the plan.</p> <p>It is essential that the village decides what sort of housing it wants and needs.</p> <p>Any development should be in keeping with the current housing stock and sensitive to the AONB. Small developments of affordable homes would be ideal, and preferably in in-fill sites. We cannot allow fields to be built on by property companies who are only interested in profit rather than the residents.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01, GP02 and HO02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
427	Y	<p>I would like to add my support to the proposed neighbourhood plan for Burwash.</p> <p>It is obvious that a great deal of consultation, consideration, thought and hard work has gone into producing this document and I would like to see it published in its entirety in due course.</p>	Thank you	No change
428	Y	The Plan is comprehensive and fulfils expectations. The village needs affordable housing for the next	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		generation and the Council should concentrate on innovative ways for achieving the 52 homes target		
429	Y	<p>As someone that works from home having a better communications infrastructure is vital.</p> <p>Agree important to sustain local economy and encourage new businesses and tourists to the area</p>	<p>Policy IN06 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
430	Y	<p>Especially agree with making local roads and pedestrians safer</p> <p>A set of lights for crossing would be fantastic for children</p>		No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
431	Y	<p>A well thought out plan. Support fully the protection of AONB.</p> <p>Any further built development would have to respect this unique area.</p> <p>Tourists should be encouraged to support the local economy</p> <p>Traffic is a big problem. Speed limits should be lowered. The High Street is not now user friendly</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
432	N	A comprehensive plan which completely fails to address the issue of unplanned development.		

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>With forward planning it would have been easy to provide access to Watercress included in the Rosemary Gardens/firestation development, together with a parking area for top of Shrub Lane and also Beechwood Close with only 3 less dwellings. Opportunity missed</p> <p>New infrastructure needed. Vested interests locally prevent suitable sites being earmarked.</p> <p>Put mini roundabout shrub lane/Strand Meadow.</p> <p>New road up to opposite Glebe House Drive</p> <p>Plenty of space for development and new school</p> <p>Also Glebe, area west of drive. New sewer to waterworks. Alternative route to Bankside . The draft plan does not seem to change anything</p>	<p>Theses land areas are in numerous different ownerships. This would produce a significant adverse impact upon the AONB.</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure is a key concern of the community and is covered within this Plan</p> <p>It is unclear what this would achieve as congestion is not an issue at that point.</p> <p>This would produce a significant adverse impact upon the AONB.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
433	Y	<p>Essential to maintain heritage of Burwash</p> <p>Essential to protect AONB</p> <p>Need to highlight small vacant areas for development. Any large development for housing inappropriate</p> <p>Recognise housing needs – smaller units for local families, elderly and disabled</p>	<p>Policy GP03 applies</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>Policy HO02 applies</p> <p>Policies HO01 and HO03 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Need for integrated transport services</p> <p>No mention of maintenance and quality education, social and health care for all sections of the community</p> <p>Address traffic problems in the village</p>	<p>Policy IN03 applies</p> <p>The NDP does not specifically cover these aspects</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
434	N	<p>No more development in Burwash at any way.</p> <p>So many villages have been destroyed by development</p> <p>Must not let it happen here</p> <p>Car parking must remain free</p>	<p>The Parish Council does not agree with these comments.</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There is no intention at this time to introduce charges</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
435	Y	I want the character and nature of Burwash today to be maintained and feel the Parish Council is best	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		placed to protect our interest in what housing needs can be met		
436	Y	I would like to see more 2/3 bed homes built for the next generation to get on the housing ladder	Policy HO01 applies	No change
437	Y	Excellent	Thank you	No change
438	Y	Absolutely spot on. Much needed	Thank you	No change
439	Y	We support all on the draft Burwash Plans, one point we don't need any more luxury houses, lets hope common sense prevails	Thank you	No change
440	Y	Good plan, lets hope the policies are robust and the ethos is accepted	Thank you	No change
441	Y	I tried ploughing through the plan, even went over the summary – too much information for me. However I think anything that is a buffer against bureaucracy is a good step in the right direction. Apathy is our worst enemy	Thank you	No change
442	Y	I support most of the plan I am opposed to the 20mph speed limit proposal for the following reasons 1 The police are not in a position to monitor it. 2 The problem is the few drivers who drive without care irrespective of limits.	Thank you The Parish Council has the support of the Police and ESCC for this. Speed Restrictions have been shown to bring down the average speed. Gates at either end with a message such as your example are planned as part of the traffic calming package.	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>3 Existing pinch points already reduce speed.</p> <p>4 Not imaginative ----- why not signs at each end of the Village WELCOME ENJOY OUR BEAUTIFUL VILLAGE AS YOU ARE PASSING THROUGH.</p> <p>ALSO</p> <p>Are you actively considering the Oaklands Garage for a new car park?</p>	<p>We are also looking at how and where to provide a safe crossing point.</p> <p>Following representations through this exercise the Parish Council has decided to include this site as a potential development site.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
443	Y	Having read through this plan, I am impressed by the quality of the document and its in-depth content that demonstrates a real connection between the residents of Burwash in wishing to maintain this beautiful community. I endorse the Draft BNDP wholeheartedly and am comforted that the voice of local opinion against the recent development proposals was sufficient to have them rejected. We must continue to protect this AONB. Thank you to all those people involved in preparing this document and for organising the consultation period; their dedication to this project is commendable	Thank you	No change
444	Y		Thank you	No change
445	Y		Thank you	No change
446	Y	We endorse the plan	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
447	Y	<p>I write to you as a citizen of Burwash and as a member of the village and not with my NT hat on, as it would Be wrong of me to comment in my official capacity.</p> <p>As a Burwasher of 13 years though, I do feel I can comment without my official hat on, instead as purely a resident. I am in support of the Development Plan and am in agreement of the draft. There are a few issues though I'd like to make, that maybe can be considered for the re-draft.</p> <p>I feel more can be made of the support of the bus/transport links. There is a line of support for buses, and the linkage with the trains. However, I do feel we should be looking not just to support the current service, but extend it. There is no mention of a connection to Heathfield or to Robertsbridge, only the current service to Etchingham station and Stonegate.</p> <p>· There is no mention of electric vehicles and the exploration of charging points in the future.</p>	<p>The provision of the existing bus service is not within the powers of the Parish Council but we are aware that ESCC have been cutting services including ours and the provision does not include weekends. The Parish Council is looking at the business case for a community bus service which could link up with all the major towns and stations.</p> <p>This has been raised by a number of respondents. The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. We will</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>In the aspirational section, there is a suggestion of building a new Village Hall. Is this as a replacement of the current village hall or as an addition to the current Village Hall? As the document talks quite a bit about saving and preserving old buildings, I'd be disappointed if the plan looked at demolishing an a historic building.</p>	<p>ensure electric charging points form part of this project.</p> <p>This is a blue sky project and only when the building is no longer able to be economically maintained.</p>	No change
448	Y	Burwash is a traditional and ancient village set in an AONB. The village cannot support any large development. We must be allowed to dot the new buildings around	Thank you	No change
449	Y	Burwash and the surrounding buildings are unsuitable for large scale housing developments. I would welcome smaller developments that are sympathetic to the traditional local architecture but that are suitable for older residents who wish to live independently but within a manageable home for as long as possible	Thank you	No change
450	Y		Thank you	No change
451	Y	Need more affordable housing	Policy HO01 applies	No change
452	Y	AN excellent plan. Burwash is an historically important village with significant history linked with Batemans. It is already incredibly busy with a major A road running through and a significant lack	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		of car parking. I moved from the High Street because of the noise. New housing would provide an added strain on this beautiful village. Houses on the outskirts of Burwash Weald and Burwash Common would be more environmentally friendly. A community shop and bus would help in Burwash Weald and Common		
453	Y	<p>An excellently developed plan! Clear, well researched and consultative. It presents a set of competing interests that make it hard, if not impossible to see how the kind of development required by RDC can be achieved.</p> <p>It is clear that there is overwhelming local support for preserving the special qualities and character of Burwash.</p> <p>Simply requiring developments of 6+ houses to be added to meet the housing target without being open and changing some of the criteria makes it almost impossible to find constructive and workable solutions.</p> <p>I agree that the only practical way forward is smaller housing developments that meet the need for more affordable housing, even if they don't meet the housing target. But I also think other infrastructure changes to Burwash Weald and Common might be worth considering too</p>	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
454	Y	<p>Yes we need houses for people to live in the village so that younger ones can stay where their parents live. Not just for developers to make lots of money.</p> <p>Also proper parking with these houses to be available</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
455	Y	We need houses for youngsters	Thank you	No change
456	Y	<p>We need to determine our own destiny regarding development</p> <p>Current developments are all about profit for developers rather than the needs of local people – we need to address this. Our village needs protection from ill-suited developments</p>	Thank you	No change
457	Y	<p>Burwash is called a small village for a reason. We don't need any more housing in this village because otherwise it will turn into a small town like Heathfield</p> <p>Furthermore people come from far and wide to visit for its heritage and unique character as a village. Therefore, more housing and development will put more pressure on the village as the traffic and lack of parking is already an on-going issue as well as medical treatment in the local GP</p>	Thank you	No change
458	Y	We need to choose as a village, not developers deciding for their own benefits. Stop trying to	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		change a village into a town and keep its unique character		
459		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Whilst I support much of what has been said I do have a number of issues and reservations that should be considered as below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Why does Burwash have to take the pain for all 3 Burwash including Weald and Common? Burwash may be the largest and have the most facilities but to exclude the other 2 is wrong and puts pressure on what is also a small village in any event with limited opportunities due to the linear nature of the High Street and the High Weald. 2. Item 1 will inevitably increase traffic. The village is already at breaking point and needs more double yellow lines. The High Street is dangerous, cars travelling too fast and lorries too. It is a road our school children cross daily. Due to recent measures parking has been shoved down Shrub lane such that that is also now a dangerous road with long runs of single file due to the amount of parked vehicles. 3. Plans to develop down Shrub Lane will just exacerbate this. 4. Yes you need social housing but do you need more bungalows. There are many already. Don't turn the village into a retirement village.....the 	<p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey showed that level access units including</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>village needs a population that will support and fund the shops etc.</p> <p>5. The development in Shrub Lane is an eye sore yet the Council seem to think it should be held out as exemplary. It is not and although I agree the Council cannot be blamed for the delivery of that project and builders failing etc it is a design that is not in keeping in any way.</p> <p>6. The garage should be brought forward and the Council should argue that small in fill developments can count to the quota.....otherwise you will have to support larger developments.</p> <p>7 There needs to be a realism about how to achieve what is needed.....larger developments probably work but all off one street such as Shrub lane will just create problems.</p>	<p>bungalows were required in order to provide mainly elderly residents the ability to downsize to more suitable accommodation and to allow them to remain within the community.</p> <p>The designs are a matter for the planning authority, RDC.</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site</p>
460	Y	<p>Speeding cars outside our property next to Spring Lane is a problem - the flashing sign by the road there does not slow traffic down.</p> <p>Speeding vehicles through the High Street is extremely dangerous.</p> <p>More stringent road calming measures should be implemented.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Parking in the High Street between the florist shop and The Bear is unnecessary when there is free parking next to The Bear.</p> <p>A small amount of house building in Burwash would be acceptable - but only if it does not interfere with the "village" aspect of the area</p>	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There is no intention at this time to introduce charges	No change
461	Y	I approve the contents of the BNDP	Thank you	No change
462	Y	I am totally for any plan which supports a community looking at its specific needs and limitations before striding ahead with developments. Burwash needs to hold onto its special charm and green areas and only incorporate developments which take that into consideration.	Thank you	No change
463	Y	<p>Burwash is a beautiful village and I think this plan will help it stay that way. I understand the need for more housing in England, but there are places where a development will work and places where it won't. Also, not all developments are created equal. Any building plan must consider everything from environmental impact to the effect on traffic to the aesthetics. Furthermore, you must ask, who will live in these homes? Will they meet a need, whether that be low-income, downsizing adults, starting families, or growing families, and will the price be affordable to people who fulfil the need? The neighbourhood plan isn't saying that no one</p>	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		can ever build in Burwash, but it is asking that any proposals tick off these common-sense boxes.		
464		<p>We think there has been enough development in and around the village: You can't drive through the High Street safely.</p> <p>The car park is always overflowing. Difficult to get Dr's appointments.</p> <p>Why ruin a lovely area with more development – the services just aren't there...buses, pavements, broadband, mobile phone reception etc.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
465	Y		Thank you	No change
466	Y	I fully support all aspects of the NDP	Thank you	No change
467	Y	<p>This village has a wonderful community and the people who live and work here everyday need to be listened to by those taking decisions that impact upon us.</p> <p>I use the paths and bridleways daily and the landscape is simply stunning, please ensure it is preserved for future generations - this is a very special piece of England, the likes of which I've never found anywhere else</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
468		<p>There are no suitable sites in the parish for large developments (10 houses or more)</p> <p>Affordable housing is a must for any developments more than one house.</p>	Policy HO01 applies	No change
469	Y	<p>Reading through the summary document I support the core principles included in the document</p> <p>The priorities (in no particular order) that I feel are of special importance are</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The protection of the village boundaries as a joint parish but individual communities 2. Any additional New housing even single “in fill” dwellings should be counted towards the RDC target and that dwellings build in Burwash Common and Weald should also count 3. Housing needs for the communities should be prioritised in any development 4. All building work should be sympathetic to the surroundings and in keeping with the area 5. Free Parking should be maintained including the WCs in the main car park 	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy GP04 applies</p> <p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>Policy HO03 applies</p> <p>Policies GP03 and GP05 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. There is no</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>6. Business properties in the High street should wherever possible remain as businesses</p> <p>7. Green Spaces should not be lost</p> <p>8. Dark Skies should be preserved</p> <p>9. Broadband - Fibre to the house should be made available even in the more remote locations</p> <p>10. Road Surfaces should be kept in good condition and the Brick pavements protected</p> <p>11. Upgrades to the primary school and doctors surgery</p>	<p>intention at this time to introduce charges</p> <p>Policy IN05 applies</p> <p>Policy GP06 applies</p> <p>Policy IN06 applies</p> <p>This is part of the Rolling Plan</p> <p>These are in the Aspirational section of the Rolling Plan and are only likely to proceed once these buildings began to reach the end of their useful life</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
470	Y	<p>I have lived in the village for the last 10 years and have two children who are both at the local school.</p> <p>The key issues that I have concerns on are the dangerous speeding through the village and local roads that takes place despite the signage. The safety aspects involved with this especially when the school run takes place. It would be beneficial to reduce the speed to 20 if possible and</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	<p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>introduce some further calming methods on the smaller roads that become a rat race.</p> <p>The parking in the village is also becoming more and more difficult. Is it possible to enlarge any of the car parks or have additional parking somewhere? My house unfortunately has no driveway or garage and it is nearly impossible to park even within a 5 minute walk.</p> <p>The facilities for the community of the village are also of interest. It would be fantastic to have better play equipment for the young and maybe more exercise equipment for the older generations.</p> <p>We also require a couple more dog poo bins to ensure the cleanliness of the verges and paths.</p> <p>Especially one where the memorial poppy bench is if possible.</p> <p>We desperately need new housing if we can only find the correct site. Will the Doctors surgery be able to cope with increasing numbers in the village?</p> <p>Any housing really needs to offer parking too to prevent further congestion in the village.</p> <p>Mostly I think we live in a beautiful village with a vibrant and passionate community. It is a joy to be a part of somewhere so cared for.</p>	<p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.</p> <p>The Parish Council will consider this within its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>This will be considered.</p> <p>The Doctors have confirmed that they have capacity to handle the potential increase from the housing target</p> <p>Policy IN02 applies</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		It is just a shame not everyone will make take time to voice their views.		No change
471		I previously put forward a part of my land for the development of low cost housing for the local community and I feel that it should be reconsidered. My site sits just outside of the development boundary but would make up infill between current residential properties on the A265, to the west of the village High street. It is high on the ridge, commands amazing views that capture the beauty of the landscape, presents no flood risk, is close to mains services and currently has an existing access/road frontage. All these factors pose little inconvenience to other households should development be allowed on this site and I would ask that this is taken into consideration and the site re-evaluated.	This site was fully considered within the Call for Sites process including a community consultation event and was not supported. The full details of the Call for Sites process is set out in appendices F and G of the full report.	No change
472	Y	<p>I would like to see traffic calming through the village. We have had several close calls with cars driving too fast through the village. Also whilst I was cycling, I saw a woman overtake parked cars and then hit one. I have also had people losing their temper whilst waiting in a queue by hairdressers and then raising fists and swearing.</p> <p>Also would like to see no parking by the hairdressers - customers can always park in Catholic Church car park.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p> <p>Parking restrictions need to be sensitive to the needs of our shops.</p> <p>High Street businesses and facing lots of issues across the country and</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Also feel we have too many building projects for such a small village. They are completely changing Burwash - from village to a small town.	need as much support as we can provide.	
473	Y	Concerned over the growing amount of cars and residents in the village. We moved here for a quiet country life for our children and this is slowly deteriorating due to the increase in housing requests and areas being built on. So far in the past 3 years Morris close has been built along with the houses just down from there and 2 separate detached houses all being built on shrub lane.	Thank you	No change
474	Y	I would like to show my support for my local area and community and I am fully in support of the Burwash Neighbourhood Development plan. I feel it is important that our local area is protected, and as a relatively new parent, I am concerned that without this plan the local area will be gradually ruined for my son	Thank you	No change
475	Y	Invaluable for local people to have a say on the local building and planning. With the farce of some of the larger developers trying to push incorrect revisions to planning application through, this is an absolute must.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
476	Y	Very well thought out. Congratulations on the plan-very professional. I agree with the housing policy especially	Thank you	No change
477	Y	Very informative and reflects views of our community	Thank you	No change
478	Y	Excellent plan – very informative. The village needs a mix of housing to meet local needs	Thank you	No change
479	Y	The AONB is exceptionally important and should be protected		
480	Y	I am writing on behalf of my son, Alexander Bowles to register his approval to the NP	Thank you	No change
481	Y	<p>I wish to endorse our NDP. It is essential that the very special place that Burwash is, is retained and not allowed to urbanise the beauty of this environment.</p> <p>This area is very much used for people to visit, walk and ramble, from all over the County and beyond.</p> <p>Only appropriate development for the people who live in the village should be allowed</p> <p>The Plan is very comprehensive and I hope the County Authorities will honour it</p>	Thank you	No change
482	Y	<p>A good well thought out and forward looking plan</p> <p>New development – The views are good and safeguarding but with a change to a more liberal</p>	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>approach at RDC where perhaps our rural end of the District will not have a planning request subject to the scrutiny as before</p> <p>Car parking – If RDC look after – will charges apply? If charges will free visits to the Drs, Internet café etc.</p> <p>Good luck with the consultation or dilemma</p>	The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision.	No change
483	Y	I think the NDP is very well balanced in its approach to the local needs of the communities. Within the proposals there is also due respect given to the AONB< its preservation and the wildlife within	Thank you	No change
484	Y	Very well thought out and covers the needs of the village and residents	Thank you	No change
485	Y	It is vital that Burwash has an NDP to control building. The right type of housing to meet local needs in the right areas	Thank you	No change
486	Y		Thank you	No change
487	N	Absolutely not. There is so much traffic already in the High Street and Shrub Lane, it is impossible to	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		drive at any time freely down the street. Burwash does not have the capacity for more residents		
488	Y	<p>Pleased to see the needs of the elderly are included</p> <p>If more homes are built, more public transport is essential and a zebra crossing is desperately needed now!</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking at the business case for a community bus service which could link up with all the major towns and stations.</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
489	Y	<p>I am pleased that in the summary it says there are no suitable development sites that meet requirements of six or more homes</p> <p>The High Street should remain pretty and yet there needs to be a crossing for children.</p> <p>The AONB should be respected.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Any development should be limited by the infrastructure inc road usage, safety, job availability, Drs and shops The top of Shrub Lane is dangerous – any new development should not be down Shrub Lane		
490	N	No more development	The Parish Council accepts the housing target of 52 homes but seeks through this Plan to ensure that the units provided meet our needs and aspirations.	No change
491	Y	More thought should be given to the traffic problems at the east end of the village. We have 3 nasty bends, large continual lorries cause gridlock and cars ignore the 30mph signs causing several near misses and accidents	The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street	No change
492	Y	Yes, I do support the plan	Thank you	No change
493	Y	I support the plan	Thank you	No change
494	Y	I'd like affordable houses for young people coming out of education that have low paid jobs		
495	Y	I support this plan	Thank you	No change
496	Y	I fully support the neighbourhood plan	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
497	Y	<p>There are a few things I would like to emphasize or amend:</p> <p>1. Section 1: No.9 - I think that only developments of 6 or more houses counting towards the housing target for a village is absurd. Every new house should count. As a village we are far more likely to support small developments dotted around so that the village doesn't appear to be changed too dramatically and therefore it can retain its character.</p> <p>2. Equally houses built in Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should count towards the housing quota as we are a joint Parish Council.</p> <p>3. Housing priorities should be for affordable housing as stated under Policy HO03</p> <p>4. Keeping dark skies is essential</p> <p>5. Amenities available should be improved e.g. school, sports options, doctors & village hall to ensure we have adequate facilities for a growing village</p> <p>6. Businesses need to be encouraged into the High Street to attract Tourism and businesses working from homes need to be actively publicised so that</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The Parish Council agrees with RDC that both Burwash Weald and Burwash Common should not be included within the housing target due to their lack of essential services.</p> <p>Policy HO03 applies</p> <p>Policy EN05 applies</p> <p>These are picked up in the Parish Council Rolling Plan</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		people (both local & "tourists") are aware of their services, too.	The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.	No change
498	Y	<p>I am emailing having read through the neighbourhood plan for the Burwash parishes.</p> <p>I am in favour of all points raised, especially pointing towards not accepting large housing estates and ensuring enough parking is provided for residents in future developments.</p> <p>If I were able to add anything I would encourage traffic calming on School Hill, which is often used as a rat run and vehicles do not comply with the 30mph speed limit. It is also a dangerous road to walk or drive along when parents are parked outside the school, often illegally. It would be</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street and</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>useful if provision could be made somewhere off road for school parking and perhaps encourage the use of a 'crocodile' walk to school.</p> <p>I applaud the idea of a safe cycle route or footpath between villages. This would encourage commuters to cycle to stations and decrease the amount of traffic and therefore parking needed in the village.</p>	<p>the introduction of a 20mph limit in the village</p> <p>This forms part of the Parish Council's Rolling Plan</p>	No change
499	Y	<p>I support this plan.</p> <p>I am very pleased that such detailed consideration has been given to environmental factors and to maintaining the characteristics of the AONB.</p> <p>My main concern is that no overall vision for how Burwash will reach the target of 52 new houses by the end of 2028 has been laid out.</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policies GP01 and GP02 apply</p> <p>The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivering new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan.</p> <p>We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			The BNDP does support growth and the housing target. It seeks to ensure that any new sites brought forward do meet the needs and requirements expressed by our community.	
500	N	<p>Having studied the Development Plan studiously I wish to make my objections and give my opinions on why I am not agreeing to the Plan in any form. Therefore, here they are in a nutshell.</p> <p>Burwash is a small pretty Village. It will lose its charm if housing estates of more than 5 or 6 houses are built in any one area.</p> <p>The Village cannot take more infrastructure taking into account sewage, water, roads, school, transport, parking, doctor's surgery, speed limit, access into and from Shrub Lane.</p> <p>The Village sewage system cannot take more without causing great upheaval and work with pipes being laid etc.</p> <p>The Water system is often not working properly and the road to Wadhurst has been closed for weeks at a time while the pipes were being repaired or replaced.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>There are pressures but the school and the surgery have confirmed that they have capacity to meet the potential increase from the housing target and the utilities have also indicated that they could cope given a lead in time.</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>There is no more room for further pupils at the small village school.</p> <p>Transport is at a premium. School buses take the children to and from Wadhurst and Heathfield. There is a very limited bus service to local shops in Heathfield.</p> <p>There should be a 20 mph speed limit through the Village at all times. Currently it starts at the hill leading up to the Village from Etchingham. It goes to 30 mph on the furthest edge of the Village beyond the defunct Oakley Garage. I personally think 20 mph should start at the approach to the Village from Etchingham and finish at the Petrol Garage further on the left after the entrance to Spring Lane. It is a case of being in danger every time coming out of my driveway, (and other people suffer in the same way) turning into the the main road from Spring Lane, into the Bear Car Park, and so on through the Village when huge transport lorries, huge farm tractors and trailers, and cars drive at 50 mph plus through the Village. Crossing the road at any point is dangerous as it is without further traffic from new homes. Burwash is not in danger from the rat run for schools but from railway commuters who park their cars in the Village then take one car to the railway car park saving at least 3 other cars parking fees. This creates more parking and problems within the Village.</p>	<p>The Parish Council is looking at the business case for a community bus service which could link up with all the major towns and stations</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street and the introduction of a 20mph limit in the village</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>There is only one doctors surgery which is stretched to its limit at the current time.</p> <p>If more houses were built off Shrub Lane, how would cars enter the Village - surely the current uphill to the main road would have to change and the whole layout would have to be destroyed. As it is the lanes are narrow at the best of times especially Shrub Lane.</p> <p>In essence I think I have covered the main points in the Development Programme. I am therefore, against the idea of further developments which would adversely affect the locality, the environment, the social structure.</p> <p>You mention Leisure and Tourism. I met a man yesterday walking through the Village who asked if there was anywhere to buy a cup of tea - the answer is no!!</p> <p>Your quote from Kipling's Village, 1934, is still apt today. And the whole area of High Weald and its ancient houses, Churches, farmland and ancient woodland and areas of outstanding beauty must be allowed to remain undisturbed.</p> <p>It goes without saying that no light pollution must be allowed to upset our darkened sky.</p> <p>All the aforementioned remain as they have for hundreds of years.</p>	<p>The Traffic survey shows that the Shrub Lane is a pressure point and any development would need to have clear proposals for how this would be managed</p> <p>The Bear and the Rose & Crown sell teas and coffees</p> <p>Policies GP01, GP02 and EN02 apply</p> <p>Policy EN05 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
501	Y	I agree wholeheartedly with the plan	Thank you	No change
502	Y	I support this petition, no more houses should be built	Thank you	No change
503	Y	100% agree to the plan	Thank you	No change
504	Y	<p>Vision Statement:</p> <p>Para 2. I think it should go further and say, “enhance and protect our environment including our rich AONB and heritage and reduce environmental impact whilst....”</p> <p>Para 3. I would recommend that it says, “To promote and support our existing and emerging village economy, we will seek the appropriate infrastructure...” as I suspect, as well as existing and new business and tourism, a significant proportion of our village economy derives from commuters to larger towns and London and home workers. Therefore better transport routes, road maintenance, internet and a hot-desking hub would be beneficial.</p>	<p>The Vision has been adopted and will not be altered</p> <p>The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman’s we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>Section 1. Points 8-15.</p> <p>The problem is stated but the way forward is not. Why can't we challenge the "6 or more" policy. This would allow smaller developments to count towards the requirement for 52 houses and allow us to stay in keeping with the village character. If there are no suitable sites where are we going to put the required houses?</p> <p>Section 2.</p> <p>Policy HO03 could be more robust. In my view, there's little permanence about a confirmed offer of employment and six months voluntary work is not comparable to 3 years residence and, again, has little permanence.</p> <p>Policy EN01</p> <p>I would like it to say "retain or enrich well-established features or of the environment, ecosystem and biodiversity". Including enrich with provide the scope to enhance what we have.</p> <p>Section 3</p> <p>I would like to see more imagination and ambition in this section. Perhaps include the effects we would like to achieve rather than the specifics of how we are going to achieve it.</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>These are in line with RDC criteria</p> <p>Policy EN01 will be amended to include this change</p> <p>The Rolling Plan is organic and any suggestion will be considered by the Parish Council for inclusion.</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>Policy EN01 has been amended</p> <p>No change</p>
505	Y	I support the plan.	Thank you	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		We don't want large developments that fail to meet the villagers' needs for properly affordable housing. Burwash is an historic village in an AONB and will be destroyed by large housing schemes that local workers can't afford. I support low key in-fill development in keeping with the surroundings.		
506	Y	I think more emphasis should be put on providing opportunities for residents to spend their money in the village, identifying and removing the obstacles to doing so, putting life back in the high street and consequently catalysing a more social community	The Parish Council supports local businesses as these provide employment and vibrancy to the Parish. It has undertaken a joint project with the National Trust to try to increase the footfall in the village and thereby improve business viability. The recent installation of the Kipling statue in the High Street and Village Tourist Maps in the High Street and at Bateman's we feel will have a positive impact on footfall. Further projects are planned within the Rolling Plan to encourage visitors to the Parish.	No change
507	Y	I agree with the importance of dark skies Keeping the three villages as separate entities and trying to keep housing to be in keeping with the many beautiful and historic houses that we are fortunate enough to have in the area.	Policy EN05 applies Policies GP04 and GP03	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		I am also concerned about the traffic on the A265, especially the speed at which it travels.	The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan. Part of this Plan is to look at the possibility of a safe crossing point in the High Street	No change
508	Y	I approve of the NDP	Thank you	No change
509	Y	<p>We have read the complete plan and find the details have need well investigated and evaluated.</p> <p>This must be maintained as prediction for the future is very difficult to assess</p> <p>Infrastructure, housing and employment should be high on the list as without this Burwash could become an urban holiday home</p>	Thank you	No change
510	Y	<p>Policy IN02 Parking – absolutely agree. Every new development must provide on-site parking for 2 cars per property. Boundary Close development in Burwash Common is a great example of not doing this – resulting in parking and congestion in Vicarage Lane</p> <p>Absolutely agree with wildflower hedges and black skies</p>	Policies EN03 and EN05 apply	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		<p>New developments need single story houses – caters for all needs, young and old. Lodge style in keeping with quality of housing in the area</p> <p>A265 traffic – this needs addressing as priority. Issue through whole neighbourhood but particularly through Common and Weald. Total disregard for 40mph limit. Seems to be an increase in lorries using A265 due to lorry park in Heathfield.</p> <p>We need average speed cameras through the whole neighbourhood- it will solve the problem and raise money through fines. Not only is it dangerous but it has a negative impact when trying to sell houses. Roads are in a terrible state because of it.</p> <p>We strongly support need for cycle path network, we will live in a beautiful area but its too dangerous to cycle around lanes</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
511	Y	I fully support the plan	Thank you	No change
512	Y	<p>We are fully supportive of the NDP and its vision for the future of Burwash Parish</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work</p>	Thank you	No change
513	Y	It is a pity that there is no promotion for social housing.	Policy HO01 applies	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		Burwash is a ridge top village in the AONB and building land is very hard to find. I am a life-long resident as is my wife.		
514	Y		Thank you	No change
515	Y	We regard as a high priority the protection of the rural character of surrounding lanes. Over use of road signage can detract from the rural nature of the area. We are grateful to all of those who have contributed to this plan which seems to be thorough and well considered	Thank you	No change
516	Y	I support the plan. This plan is fine. Development should reflect that it is a village and not a town so the overall size of any development should be limited and design of any development close to the centre should reflect the vernacular of the historical part of the village	Thank you	No change
517	Y	I support the NDP. I agree with this plan. Some traffic calming on Shrub Lane from the village to the bridge would be helpful to stop speeding around bends where there is no footpath and ensure villagers can walk safely to and from the village and help conserve the environment by not having to drive. People with children buggies and dogs at special risk, also older people	Thank you The Parish Council has made tackling speed and traffic calming a key item with its Rolling Plan.	No change No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
518	Y	Oakleys Garage site?	The Parish Council agrees and the Plan will be changed to reflect this	The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site
519	Y		Thank you	No change
520	Y	Preserve and protect our beautiful village. But remember the younger generation who will need their 'first homes' otherwise our village will die	Policy HO01 applies	No change
521	Y	<p>RDC does seem to be exerting its muscle in the 2 development issues.</p> <p>52 homes is an enormous number</p> <p>A housing target to be 6 homes seems quite prohibitive</p> <p>Section 6 – Aspirational projects considering that the NDP is only to cover the next 10 years the suggestions seem to be over ambitious eg childrens areas – we mustn't urbanise the village. Zip wires!</p> <p>Community café – a real need for this one</p>	<p>The requirement for developments to be 6 or more to count towards the Burwash housing target is set by Rother District Council (RDC).</p> <p>The aspirational projects are likely to span a greater period than this current Plan</p> <p>The Parish Council will be looking at this as part of its Rolling Plan</p>	<p>No change but the Parish Council will lobby RDC on this point</p> <p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
522	Y	<p>More affordable homes for young families plus homes for the elderly</p> <p>Free parking for local residents</p>	Policy HO01 applies	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. We have no plans to introduce parking charges.	
523	Y	Car parking – Could RDC buy Oakleys Garage site and make a car park for residents who do not have anywhere to park their cars and RDC ask for a small annual fee for a parking space. This hopefully making parking easier in the High Street and causing less traffic problems	<p>Following representations during this consultation period the Parish Council has agreed to include Oakleys as a development site in this Plan.</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. We have no plans to introduce parking charges</p>	<p>The Plan has been amended to include Oakleys as a possible development site.</p> <p>No change</p>
524	Y	<p>More starter homes</p> <p>Also retirement homes so that older people can stay in the village and their properties would be available for other families</p> <p>Current car park must be free to users.</p>	<p>Policy HO01 applies</p> <p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and</p>	No change

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
			looking at where it might increase parking provision. We have no plans to introduce parking charges	
525	Y		Thank you	No change
526	Y	<p>Two main issues facing us</p> <p>In Burwash village, there are too many cars and too few parking spaces</p> <p>We need more affordable homes, but the builders make most money from big homes. And they won't contribute to the schools, roads, etc needed but there is nothing we can do about that</p>	<p>The Parish Council is looking to take over the two public car parks in Burwash village from RDC and looking at where it might increase parking provision. We have no plans to introduce parking charges</p> <p>Policy HO03 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>
527	Y	<p>Having read the NDP I consider it to be a detailed, thorough and pragmatic case and above all 'non-nimbyism' and therefore fully support the plan.</p> <p>I would however add that I have always been a firm believer and advocate that villages and the rural community must live and thrive and I fully support genuinely affordable housing for people employed and working locally.</p> <p>All new housing be subject to a permanent occupancy condition restricting occupation to local</p>	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Policy HO01 applies</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>No change</p>

Ref	Support Y/N	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	PC response	Changes to the Plan
		employment. Villages must not be allowed to become dormitories for the super-rich working away and without an input and interest in the local community	This could only be imposed through planning conditions by the planning authority RDC and is outside of the powers of the Parish Council	No change
528	Y	Cycle path – brilliant idea	Thank you	No change
529	Y	We've seen many applications in the past, that should have been rejected early on grounds of unsuitable design, price (affordability) and plainly illegal. These should not have been passed for further consideration. I am personally thankful that we have such an active group looking after our village interests.	<p>The Parish Council has carried out a lengthy and detailed analysis of available and deliverable development sites while taking account of the conflicting pressures of delivery new homes while observing the need to protect the AONB. Protection of the AONB is a key concern for parishioners and this is borne out by the results of the various consultation events held during the production of this Plan.</p> <p>We believe the Plan provides a sensible way forward which delivers on the wishes of the majority of the community.</p>	No change

