

HORSTED KEYNES NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN



The comments below show the views expressed at the public consultation event held on 24th January 2015. They have been combined under general and site specific headings. 300+ people attended the consultation.

No or Minimal Development:

Discussed at public meeting on

- | | | |
|---|------------|--------|
| • Only small scale (1-9 units) | | 2/4/15 |
| • Within existing village boundary | | |
| • No building on agricultural land | | |
| • Preserve ANOB | | |
| • Preserve village/rural aspects | x 2 people | 2/4/15 |
| • No development needed | x 2 people | |
| • Lack of infrastructure | | |
| • Preserve recreational spaces | x 2 people | |
| • Leave HK as a small, rural community | x 2 people | 2/4/15 |
| • Grow 2 nd village elsewhere e.g. Birch Grove | | |
| • No housing estates | | |
| • Some affordable housing | | |
| • Infill building | | |
| • Need cycle tracks / footpaths | | |

No to Large Developments:

- | | | |
|---|------------|--------|
| • Policy should focus on fill in plots | x 2 people | |
| • 25+ houses would change the nature of the village | | 2/4/15 |
| • Stick to small plots built by local people for local people | | 2/4/15 |
| • Want to keep this close knit, rural community feel | | 2/4/15 |
| • Roads in and out of village are small | | |
| • Want safe roads | | |
| • Large development would change ethos of village | x 3 people | |

- Would create traffic problems
- Would lead to introduction of street lights
- Do not extend village boundary – this has led to constant development in other villages and loss of village character

Parking Issues:

- Any new development should have parking spaces x 3 people
- Bus service does not allow for commuters
- Not enough parking to sustain a significant increase in number of cars
- Improve parking for villagers
- Create area for off street parking for residents

Affordable Housing:

- Keep prices affordable 2/4/15
- Give priority to village people
- Threshold for affordable housing should be controlled
- First time buyers housing to ensure children populate the school – school central pillar of a lively village
- Without affordable housing village will die
- Affordable should mean affordable
- High need for 3 bedroom houses
- Essential for long term village life

General Development Support:

- Development should be small releasing housing at a rate to satisfy local demand for local people by local builders
- Positive development will benefit the whole village
- Should grow at rate that infrastructure can support
- The assessment criteria has worked out a good resolution

Process Issues:

- Questions not clear enough – yielded false answers
- Policies derived from opinions of biased subset giving false opinions – mums/children
- Questions poorly worded therefore results likely to be ambiguous
- Need “proper” consultation
- Law requires 2 x 6 week consultation periods – when and how will this happen? x 3 people
- Why has there been no consultation on how sustainability criteria has been applied in each case?
- Why does sustainability criteria refer to proximity to village yet objectives are to build on periphery?
- Limited opportunity to view the plans
- Limited opportunity to discuss in depth
- Agree/disagree options too simple for some of the proposals
- Few people in crowded room with inadequate and conflicting information is not consultation
- We cannot agree our plan until MSDC Plan is agreed
- Should ask if current proposals should be built outside existing boundary
- Many plans in direct contravention of aims and objectives agreed by villagers

Objective 3 :

- Include needs of the elderly
- Number of developments too high
- HK lack of affordable homes but not commercially viable in HK
- Developments should be on small scale 1-9 houses
- Comply with national policy in AONB
- Does not give a limit on number of new houses – should retain numerical limit of 100 homes / 5 per year
- New version implies unlimited building
- Wording should be rethought to avoid confusion
- Undermined by greedy landowners. Developers will not want to be involved in small developments.
- No affordable housing with less than 10 houses

Support for Excluded Sites / Non-submitted Sites:

- Catholic church site would allow access to 003 site x 2 people
- 003 site unnecessary as wealth of open countryside for dog walkers
- 003 would not impact on views
- 003 development in keeping with more modern surrounding properties
- 003 field in council land and would generate revenue for local council to reinvest in HK
- 008 – development of Martindale would benefit village
- 006 master planning could provide footpath connection to village and include 16 & 13

008 Cheeleys – No Development:

- Would destroy unique setting of church
- Too big for development on AONB
- No access x 3 people
- Used for hay crop, sheep, sledging and walking
- Scenic view x 3 people
- Area of ANOB x 2 people
- Does not comply with National Planning Policy

13,14,16,17 Not Suitable - Against:

- 13 impacts on local housing significantly
- 13 view affected from Tremains/ Lewes Road
- 17 potential for 100 houses. X 2 people
- Should limit to 20 – 25 in foreseeable future and then further development in 10+ years
- All – Sugar Lane, Lewes Road and Tremains impact on traffic. Speeding traffic. Pollution for children
- 80 houses along Sugar Lane a disaster
- Potential for a huge development on the 4 sites x 2 people
- Only 1 of the 4 sites should be developed
- Small development only
- Not in line with sustainability criteria of being close to the village centre
- Dangerous road conditions
- Would extend footprint of built up area

- Loss of green land
- Spoil landscape
- Zebra crossing would mean pedestrian crossing and street lights

13,14,16,17 Support:

- 16 fine on own but would enable proposed 100
- 16,14,17 developed together and create enough housing and green space and not affect view from 13
- 16 & 17 will blend well without swamping the rural character of HK
- 17 – best plot with easy access and minimal negative impact on rest of village x 2 people
- Least impact on population – good location x 5 people
- 14 would not affect views from existing houses
- All - most sustainable. Jeffries Farm needs cleaning up
- Good option x 4 people
- Sites slightly out of village and would have less impact on centre of village x 2 people
- Pedestrian crossing relatively straight forward

Issues raised for support:

- Do not over develop site x 3 people
- Ensure good visibility on access roads off Sugar Lane
- Area needs to be well shielded from existing properties x 3 people
- Residents may drive into village and have an impact on parking
- Roundabout at corner of Lewes Road for safer access

Police House Field – Against:

- Risk that housing would stretch to join Danehill
- Village should grow in compact shape and not strung out in many directions
- Too small and exclusive – large houses and private schooling which would not contribute to village life

Police House Field – Support:

- Ideal
- Access ok x 3 people
- In confines of village
- Less impact on village x 4 people
- Good location x 2 people
- Construction would not cause much disruption
- Current field serves no practical use x 2 people
- Continues trend of existing strip development
- Bounded by road junction to prevent “creep”
- Good option x 2 people

Issues relating to support:

- don't develop too quickly

The Old Rectory HK012 – Against:

- Access is an issue x 11 people 2/4/15
- Dangerous for school children/ residents/ walkers / church goers x 15 people 2/4/15
- HGVs and Deliveries x 2 people
- Detrimental to visual impact / country lane/ natural habitat x 8 people
- Increase of traffic x 5 people
- Development too big and unsustainable x 2 people
- Water drainage
- speeding

The Old Rectory HK012 – Support

- Provide for widening of the road
- Good size site x 2 people
- Additional recreational facilities x 4 people

- Well situated / within village x 8 people
- Has potential for café / after school clubs
- General support
- Does not extend village boundary
- Safe access to school

Issues to be addressed for support:

- Increased traffic
- Access x 4 people
- Danger to school children x 2 people
- No extensions allowed to houses

Issues raised at public meetings 5/3/15, 2/4/15:

- Do we have to have a Neighbourhood Plan? Is it statutory?
- Has zero housing development increase been put to the village?
- Process is flawed if we start by asking landowners.
- What are the numbers / facts?
- The facilities are declining in HK
- How many houses are in HK?
- When Village Plan was written in 2008 it identified need for development. 2nd home ownership must be stopped.
- Has the NP encouraged landowners to put forward land.
- Why are some of the sites acceptable now but rejected previously?
- How do we take this forward? There is a need for justification of numbers with MSDC.
- Can NP control how many houses are built each year?
- What is the definition of “local people”?
- We should have another survey now people are more aware of process.
- What are the criteria for deciding the size of houses?
- What role has the LPA taken in decisions the HKNPSG has made?
- But the Localism Act says the LPA must be involved at key stages?
- Where does it say the requirement of a 15% increase in housing?
- There is a letter from Mark Bristow (MSDC) saying that no particular development is required in HK (this letter was passed up but there wasn't any such clear statement in it)
- Why aren't villagers asked if they want a change in the village boundary?
- There seems to be the suggestion that we can't rely on the MSDC planners to protect HK?

- Want hard facts and figures on the numbers of houses built in HK
- Are we vulnerable in the 12 months period while process is taking place?
- MSDC plan is available for view. Will it influence our plan?
- How many houses planned for each site?
- Smaller sites would be better.
- Does social housing stay social housing?
- Has any extra consideration been given to all necessary services? 5/3/15, 2/4/15
- Why are we proceeding with plan when there is no consensus on policies?
- What numbers / levels would have a negative effect on village?
- What about Rural Exception Sites?
- It is hard to find housing in village and we shouldn't concentrate on the school which is over stretched.
- Expressed surprise at numbers of houses put forward. Better to put forward fewer houses.
- What advice have we got from High Weald Development Board?
- How can we get affordable housing without getting large swathes of supporting larger houses.
- Constance Wood Field still remains MSDC
- Access to Old Rectory site a major problem. There must be alternative access.
- Sustainability Scoping Report – other villages used research to set plan.
- We must treasure the rural character of the village and bear it in mind when deciding the size of developments. 5/3/15, 2/4/15
- Smaller housing not just for young people. Older people need smaller houses to downsize. 5/3/15, 2/4/15