



ROTHER DEVELOPMENT AND SITE ALLOCATIONS LOCAL PLAN

INITIAL RESPONSES TO REPRESENTATIONS

March 2019

Rother District Council
Town Hall
London Road
Bexhill-on-Sea
East Sussex
TN39 3JX

www.rother.gov.uk

28 March 2019

This document was updated to include an accessibility statement in the box below, as well as a contents page, footers and page numbers.

There have been no material changes to the document and its content.

This information can be available in large print, Braille, audio/CD or in another language upon request.

Please telephone: (01424) 787668

Email: planning.strategy@rother.gov.uk

Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction.....	5
Chapter 2: Resource Management.....	9
Chapter 3: Communities.....	12
Chapter 4: Housing.....	16
Chapter 5: Economy.....	27
Chapter 6: Environment.....	31
Chapter 7: Implementation.....	46
Chapter 8: Overview.....	49
Chapter 9: Bexhill.....	54
Chapter 10: Hastings Fringes.....	87
Chapter 11: Villages with site allocations.....	91
Chapter 12: Other Villages with Development Boundaries.....	No representations received
Chapter 13: Other Policies.....	134
Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA).....	136

Rother Development and Site Allocations Local Plan – Initial Responses to Representations

Chapter 1: Introduction

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
<i>Policies Map</i>	
<p>Housing allocation detail maps show indicative layouts but these may need to be adapted depending on the ecological constraints and opportunities (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Noted. Site allocation policies have been developed having regard to known ecological constraints and opportunities (e.g. proximity to designated sites, the location of existing trees, hedges and waterbodies). However, it is appreciated that at planning application stage, site specific surveys may reveal additional details such as use by protected species.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Detail Maps do not form part of the adopted Policies Map. The Detail Map show indicative layouts only, and any planning application would be assessed against the Local Plan as a whole, which includes policies that require the conservation of biodiversity (Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy, Policy DEN4 of the DaSA). Therefore, it is considered the current approach provides appropriate flexibility for any necessary layout changes.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Either the safeguarded minerals and waste sites should be included on the Policies Map, or reference to the Waste & Minerals Policies Map should be made on the Rother Policies Map (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary.</p> <p>Planning Practice Guidance confirms the policies map “<i>must illustrate geographically the application of policies in a development plan</i>” (Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 12-002-20140306).</p> <p>While the “Development Plan” (as defined in legislation) includes the Rother District Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plans and also the Waste and Minerals Plans, illustrating all of the Plans on one Policies Map is not the approach that has been taken by other Authorities, or indeed, the County Council (which has not included reference to Rother District Local Plan policies on the Waste & Minerals Policies Map). Instead, it is considered the correct approach that all the Policies Maps are read together, as all the Plans forming the Development Plan are read together.</p> <p>It is considered that including the safeguarded minerals and waste sites on the Policies Map, or reference to the Waste and Minerals Policies Map, would be likely to cause confusion. The Waste and Minerals Plans are, however, referred to at paragraph 1.16 of the supporting text, and as noted below, it is now proposed to add further text to refer to the safeguarding of</p>

	<p>minerals sites, wharves and railheads to the Introduction to the DaSA, as also requested by the County Council.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<i>Regard to other plans/ policies</i>	
<p>The DaSA excluding those areas subject to Neighbourhood Plans (NPs) means it is seriously flawed as it doesn't provide comprehensive Development Management or Site Allocation policies for the entire district and makes no contingency arrangements in the event a NP is not made.</p>	<p>Development policies in the DaSA apply to the whole district (with the exception of those that are location specific); this is confirmed at paragraph 1.26.</p> <p>Policy OVE1 applies in the situation before such time a Neighbourhood Plan is made (see also responses to representations received against Overview section and Policy OVE1).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Welcome the reference to the National Planning Policy for Waste (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Request reference is made to the safeguarding of minerals sites, wharves and railheads, or to relevant Waste & Minerals Plan policies in paragraph 1.16 (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>The purpose of this section of the Introduction is to give an overview of the relevant policy framework rather than detailing the implications of specific policies.</p> <p>Specific reference to safeguarding minerals wharves and waste management operations at Rye Harbour is now included within Policy RHA2 and ESCC has confirmed its support for that policy.</p> <p>However, in the interests of ensuring the Introduction provides key information, it is agreed that a sentence can be added to paragraph 1.16.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u></p> <p>Add the following text after the second sentence of paragraph 1.16:</p> <p><i>The Waste and Minerals Plan includes, inter alia, the safeguarding of minerals sites, wharves and railheads across the county, including some within Rother district.</i></p>
<p>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has engaged in joint discussions under the</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Duty to Cooperate and would welcome further discussion (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).	
<i>Layout</i>	
Page numbers should be provided for the individual policies and inset maps. Further references should be provided in the appendices for Core Strategy and 2006 Local Plan policies.	<p>While page numbers for the individual chapters and sections within those chapters are clearly given on the Contents page, it is agreed that to improve usability of the Plan, page numbers should be added to the lists of Development Policies, Site Allocation Policies and Policies Map Inset Maps.</p> <p>Appendix 1 clearly lists the Core Strategy Policies and Appendix 2 clearly lists the superseded Local Plan 2006 Policies and it is not considered further references are required. One change that has been made since the submission DaSA was drafted is the inclusion, in Appendix 1, of detail of those Core Strategy policies that have been modified by DaSA policies. This change was included in the Schedule of Minor Amendments, submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in January 2019.</p> <p><u>Proposed change</u></p> <p>Add page numbers to the lists of Development Policies, Site Allocation Policies and Policies Map Inset Maps on pages 5-8 of the DaSA.</p>
<i>Representation Form</i>	
Pre-populating the representations form in a way that is favourable to the Council is maladministration.	<p>The initial version of the PDF representation form, available at the start of the publicity period, had pre-selected, default options. Clearly, any respondent could select the relevant button.</p> <p>The intention was to ensure that those options regarding the tests of soundness and legal compliance were not left blank when submitting a representation, given that it is important to be able to efficiently highlight objections.</p> <p>Shortly after this, it was decided to make a minor amendment to the representation form to include a separate question in relation to whether a representation was one of support or objection. At this point, having pre-selected options relating to the tests of soundness and legal compliance questions were unnecessary and subsequently removed. This approach brought the representation form more into line with the format of the online representation system, which required the questions relating to the tests of soundness and legal compliance to be filled in.</p>

	<p>The first form was removed from the RDC website and the amended form was uploaded on 9 November.</p>
--	---

It is not considered that any interested party would have been at a disadvantage by having the pre-selected options as it was possible to amend them as necessary.

Chapter 2: Resource Management

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Policy DRM1 – Water Efficiency	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council, Northiam Parish Council).	Noted.
Requirements for water efficiency measures for industrial and commercial developments should be included. Commercial developments should be required to meet BREEAM “excellent” or “very good” (minimum). Other LPAs have included policies requiring such standards (Environment Agency, Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>The NPPF clarifies that the focus of the sustainability of buildings is on the Government’s technical standards, including the Building Regulations. There is no Optional Technical Standard for water efficiency other than for dwellings.</p> <p>In addition, it is clear that much industrial and commercial development in Rother is only marginally viable.</p> <p>BREEAM standards relate to a wide range of environmental efficiency measures, of which water efficiency is but one area where “credits” may be gained. Therefore, a requirement to meet a specific BREEAM standard may not lead to water efficiency.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the supporting text encourages water efficient measures in other developments at paragraph 2.10.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy is unnecessary as it will be implemented through the Building Regulations. It should be deleted.	<p>The policy is necessary in order for the standard to be implemented. All new homes already have to meet the mandatory national standard set out in the Building Regulations (125 litres/ person/ day). Planning Practice Guidance notes that where there is a clear local need, local planning authorities can set out Local Plan policies requiring new dwellings to meet the tighter Building Regulations optional requirement of 110 litres/person/day (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 56-014-20150327). Without the policy, the requirement is not mandatory.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Proposals do not go far enough, given existing water shortages and likely effect of climate change (Burwash Parish Council).	<p>The policy sets out a minimum requirement for all new dwellings to meet, in accordance with the PPG. The only method set out in the PPG for improving water efficiency in new homes is through the application of the optional requirement.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, paragraph 2.10 of the supporting text includes information on measures to</p>

	<p>contribute to effective water usage. Furthermore, Policy SRM2 of the Core Strategy sets out the general framework for ensuring the effective management of water resources.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DRM2 – Renewable Energy Developments	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council, Northiam Parish Council).	Noted.
Rye Harbour has potential for wind turbines and biomass. Solar panels could be fitted to large buildings (Rye Town Council).	<p>Noted. Policies DRM2 and DRM3 give general support for appropriate renewable and low carbon energy schemes and technologies, subject to other Plan policies.</p> <p>The Council’s Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Background Paper found that Rye is likely to be a problematic location for wind turbines due to the presence of international sites, particularly the Special Protection Area for birds.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<i>Wind turbines</i>	
Support Policy DRM2 but we are disappointed that no suitable areas for large-scale wind turbines have been identified (Hastings Borough Council).	<p>Noted. The reason that no suitable areas have been identified is explained at Paragraphs 2.15 and 2.16.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Support no large wind turbines in the Strategic Gap/ Combe Valley Countryside Park.	Noted.
<i>Biomass</i>	
There is insufficient local woodland to support sizeable biomass units.	<p>Noted. This is addressed at Paragraph 2.17.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
There should be positive encouragement for use of local biomass and wood fuel (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>Noted. This is addressed at Paragraph 2.18. Policies DRM2 and DRM3 give general support for appropriate renewable and low carbon energy schemes and technologies, subject to other Plan policies.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

Ancient woodland does have some potential as a source for biomass energy as it requires ongoing management (ESCC).	Noted. Paragraph 2.18 acknowledges small-scale biomass boilers may be viable using local wood fuel. No change proposed.
Policy DRM3 – Energy Requirements	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council, Northiam Parish Council).	Noted.
Policy is onerous and unnecessary. It could lead to best practice energy efficiency techniques being dismissed for not being renewable or low carbon.	Noted but not agreed. The policy is supportive of energy efficiency measures. No change proposed.
Core Strategy Policy SRM1 requirement for an energy strategy is onerous and should be reviewed.	The requirement has been reviewed and updated. As noted at paragraph 2.26, Policy DRM3 supersedes Core Strategy Policy SRM1 (i) insofar as it updates the thresholds provided for by that policy. The new requirement is less stringent than that previously required by Policy SRM1 (i). No change proposed.
The threshold should be lowered to 50 dwellings or 5,000 sqm of commercial space (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	Whilst different thresholds were considered, the identified figures are appropriate to ensure the requirements are not unacceptably onerous and most likely to realise the use of appropriate technologies. It should be noted that a number of renewable energy technologies work more effectively at a larger scale. Notwithstanding this, the policy notes that the extent to which all proposals incorporate renewable and low carbon energy technologies will be a factor weighing in their favour. No change proposed.
It is advantageous to site renewable technologies involving biomethane near existing gas infrastructure (Southern Gas Networks).	Noted. No change proposed.

Chapter 3: Communities

Views expressed in representation	RDC response including any proposed changes
Policy DCO1 – Retention of sites of social and economic value	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council, Northiam Parish Council)	Noted.
It is important that new housing developments do not lead to loss of amenities and job opportunities as these will be needed by the new occupants.	Noted. The policy seeks to retain sites of social or economic value, only allowing their loss if it is demonstrated there is no reasonable prospect of a continued use. No change proposed.
“Cultural facilities” should be added to the scope of uses to which the policy applies. This would be consistent with the NPPF (2018).	Noted. The general approach to retaining sites of social and economic value is established through Policy CO1 of the Core Strategy. The supporting footnote (no.38) explains that ‘community facilities; includes arts, culture and religious facilities. Furthermore, while DCO1 does not specifically refer to ‘cultural facility’, this use is covered by the term ‘community facility’ in line with paragraph 83 of the NPPF which includes cultural buildings as a community facility. Therefore, this addition is considered unnecessary. No change proposed.
Add wording to the end of part (i) of the Policy: “...at a realistic valuation of the site/premises for that use, <u>without development potential</u> ” to ensure that valuations are not unnecessarily inflated.	This addition is considered unnecessary. The criterion specifies that the marketing campaign must clearly indicate a lack of demand for the existing use (or as an alternative commercial or community facility, where appropriate). Paragraph 3.6 further clarifies the requirements. No change proposed.
Policy appears to also cover employment uses and as such unnecessarily duplicates Policies EC3 of Core Strategy and DEC3 of the DaSA. Policy should be refined or a cross-reference made to DEC3.	Policies DEC3 and DCO1 are considered to be complementary. Policy DCO1 is broader and includes the marketing requirements for employment sites covered by Policy DEC3. DEC3 provides clear support of economic growth in Rother which is a key part of the Plan’s Strategy. Policy DCO1 sets out the approach to be taken to demonstrate that a site of social or economic value is genuinely redundant. No change proposed.

Policy should refer to potential opportunities for achieving enabling development to secure the retention/ improvement of community facilities.	<p>The focus of the policy is on seeking to ensure that sites of social or economic value are not lost or diminished. Enabling development may exceptionally be justified but only if strict requirements of this and other relevant policies are met.</p> <p>Policy DEC3 sets out the approach for existing employment sites and includes provision in part (iv) for complementary enabling development where continued employment use is demonstrated not to be viable.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DCO2 – Equestrian Facilities	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Policy is too restrictive.	<p>Noted but not agreed. The policy provides support for equestrian developments while ensuring the protection of the character and amenities of the countryside, and the conservation of the AONB.</p> <p>The comment refers in particular to the reference in the supporting text (paragraph 3.19) that extensive access roads or excavations are not appropriate in the countryside. Such development would generally be contrary to the conservation of the locally distinctive rural character and landscape features of the countryside, as required through Policy RA2 of the Core Strategy, and consequently, the sentence is appropriate. DaSA Policy DEN1 provides further detail on how the siting, layout and design of all new development will be assessed. Clearly, equestrian developments can and do take place without the need for extensive access roads or significant excavations.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Equestrian developments should not be allowed where access for horse boxes will be along narrow lanes.	<p>Noted. Part (v) of the policy requires proposals to not adversely impact on road safety.</p> <p>The County Council as Highway Authority would be consulted on planning applications likely to have highway impacts.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
RDC should work with ESCC to	Noted, although this is outside the scope of the policy, which sets out a framework for assessing

<p>improve the public bridleway network (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>proposals for equestrian developments.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, where opportunities have been identified to make improvements (including additional connections) to the public right of way network as part of the development of site allocations, these have been included as policy requirements within the DaSA (e.g. Policies: BEX1-3, HAS3, CAT1, PEA1). This is in accordance with Policies TR2 and RA2 (vi) of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>A full Non-Motorised User policy, to include equestrians, should be added.</p>	<p>A particular need for a policy covering equestrian developments was identified due to the district being popular for these activities.</p> <p>General policies protecting and supporting the improvement of the pedestrian environment and cycle networks are contained within the Core Strategy (e.g. Policies TR2, TR3, CO3, CO6, EN4, BX1, RY1, BA1, RA1). There are also several site allocation policies within the DaSA that include such requirements.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The suggestion of one hectare per horse is overly cautious and doesn't accord with British Horse Society guidance.</p>	<p>Noted. The British Horse Society (BHS) guidance, on pasture management, also states that their recommendation is only a guide as it is subject to numerous factors including the size/type of horse and the quality of pasture. While the BHS guidance covers pasture management in detail, its main focus is on horse welfare rather than the potential effects on the appearance of the landscape from over-grazing.</p> <p>Other guidance, published by the Kent Downs AONB Partnership (referred to in the DaSA at footnote 7) considers horse welfare as well as the need to limit the potentially negative impacts of horse-keeping on the wider environment (including on the appearance of the landscape). This guidance suggests one hectare per horse is appropriate to avoid overgrazing and allow for some resting and rotation of land in order to maintain it in good condition (<i>Managing Land for Horses - a guide to good practice in the Kent Downs Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, 2011</i>). While this guidance is specific to the Kent Downs, it is of relevance, given the equally protected landscape of the High Weald and the thrust of Policy DCO2 which requires proposals to safeguard the locally distinctive character and amenities of the countryside, with particular regard to the conservation of the High Weald AONB.</p>

	<p>The High Weald AONB Unit has not published its own guidance on managing land for horses but includes links on its website to a number of Advice Notes published by the Horse Pasture Management Project which are specific to the county of Surrey. Advice Note no. 3 (<i>Grassland Management Advice Note, June 2003</i>) notes that horses and ponies can have an effect on the landscape, and that overgrazed paddocks not only look awful, but are also bad for the horses and ponies in them. This Advice Note suggests a good general aim on Surrey's clay soils should be for 1.2 hectare per horse. Given the similarities with the clay soils of the High Weald in Rother, the suggestion within the DaSA of a stocking density of one hectare per horse is considered appropriate.</p> <p>In any event, the standard is not a policy requirement and the supporting text provides some flexibility, noting that it depends on how the horses are kept and the nature of the land.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
--	---

Chapter 4: Housing

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Policy DHG1 – Affordable Housing	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council)	Noted.
The overall number of housing allocations should be increased, to enable the delivery of more affordable housing.	The overall housing target is set through the Core Strategy and is less than 5 years old, therefore in line with the NPPF (2018) is still considered up to date. The DaSA allocates sufficient sites to meet the identified housing need set out in the Core Strategy. No change proposed.
More detail should be provided on “in-lieu contributions” when part of an affordable housing unit is required.	Paragraph 4.14 sets out the Council’s approach to in lieu contributions where a part unit is triggered as part of a scheme. The Council has published a report to support this approach and it can be found on the website ¹ . No change proposed.
The NPPF (2018) states that no affordable housing should be sought for residential developments that are not “Major” (i.e. 10 or more dwellings), and the PPG confirms this. Therefore, the thresholds in the policy should be amended to comply.	This is incorrect. Paragraph 63 of the NPPF (2018) confirms that provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer). Designated rural areas include AONBs. Policy DHG1 fully accords with the NPPF requirement. No change proposed.
It is unclear why the minimum size of developments in rural areas requiring affordable housing has increased from 5 to 6 dwellings (Burwash Parish Council).	This is because paragraph 63 of the NPPF (2018) states that the “ <i>provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major developments, other than in designated rural areas (where policies may set out a lower threshold of 5 units or fewer)</i> ”, i.e. we cannot require on-site provision on sites of 5 units or fewer in the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, only sites of 6 or more units. Therefore the minor change to this policy has been made to align with the national policy. No change proposed.
The type of affordable housing	Policy LHN1 in the Core Strategy sets out an overall balance of 65% social/affordable rented:

¹ <http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=27206&p=0>

<p>provided through developments should be reviewed as currently they do not provide for young working families on low incomes (Burwash Parish Council).</p>	<p>35% intermediate tenure balance on sites. However, the Council's housing register of need also informs the size and type of affordable housing required on sites.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should reflect the new NPPF (para 57) and PPG on viability. All viability reports should be published with no redactions (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council, Burwash Parish Council).</p>	<p>The recommended approach set out in the PPG to making viability reports publically available is noted. The assessment which supports the DaSA is publically available.</p> <p>The Council's Validation Checklist states that viability statements will be made publicly available having regard to Para.: 021 Reference ID 10-021-20180724 of the National Planning Practice Guidance.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The wording "expect" is not strong enough (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>The policy does expect sites to provide on-site affordable housing in line with the provisions set out in the policy, as the Council's evidence demonstrates that affordable housing is viable, alongside the other policy requirements. However, where viability is a genuine issue, the policy is flexible enough to respond.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Figure 1 (House price to earnings ratio) should be further broken down into different parts of Rother to assess the problems of affordability better (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>Noted. However, the house price to earnings ratio is not available at a sub-district level.</p>
<p>Affordable housing should be for local people.</p>	<p>The Council's housing register applies a local connections test whereby to qualify to be on the register, the applicant must meet the local connection criteria. Social and affordable rented accommodation is prioritised by the banding level, with band A being the highest priority. The Council's allocation policy can be found on the website².</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

² <http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=22870&p=0>

Policy DHG2 – Rural Exception Sites	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council).	Noted.
The requirement for development to not significantly harm biodiversity should be added to point (vi) of the policy (East Sussex County Council).	Part (vi), which requires development to “meet other normal local planning and highway authority criteria, in line with other Council policies”, would include Policy EN5 of the CS and DEN4 of the DaSA relating to biodiversity, which apply to all development. No change proposed.
There shouldn’t be a need for market sales to enable exception sites as land is already coming forward at lower than market rate (Burwash Parish Council).	The inclusion to allow some market housing on exception sites is in line with the approach set out in the NPPF (2018) – paragraph 77. The policy states that only a modest amount of enabling open market housing will be acceptable (the minimum necessary). Any application submitted with market housing proposed on an exception site will be required to provide a viability assessment to demonstrate that it is necessary. No change proposed.
Criteria (iv) is welcomed but a “modest” amount of enabling open market housing may not be sufficient. AiRS notes examples of 70% market and 30% affordable (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	This approach is considered entirely appropriate as an exception to the normal planning policies and is in line with the provisions set out in the NPPF. The price paid for sites should reflect this in terms of its land value and therefore only a modest amount of market housing would be necessary. The policy states that only a modest amount of enabling open market housing will be acceptable (i.e. the minimum necessary). No change proposed.
Exception sites are too restrictive and biased towards affordable housing, thereby prejudicing developments without affordable housing such as appropriate infill developments outside development boundaries.	Rural exception sites are permitted specifically to meet local needs for affordable housing as set out in national policy. Allowing general market housing outside development boundaries (which is outside the scope of Policy DHG2) would be contrary to the overall spatial strategy set out in the Core Strategy, as well as Policy DIM2 of the DaSA. No change proposed.
Policy DHG3 – Residential Internal Space Standards	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Insufficient evidence that the standard is necessary.	The Council has a Space Standards background evidence paper to support the implementation of internal space standards. This evidence is required by the PPG. The introduction of the

	<p>Standards is based on the evidence of need and viability which is set out in the background paper supporting this policy.</p> <p>The evidence contains details on the size and type of dwellings currently being built in the area and the Viability Assessment indicates that the introduction of the policy would not have an adverse impact on viability. This is in line with the PPG guidance.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The standard could adversely impact on the deliverability of small starter homes.	<p>The introduction of the Standards is based on the evidence of need and viability.</p> <p>The Rother Local Plan Viability Assessment indicates that the introduction of the policy would not have an adverse impact on viability.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DHG4 – Accessible and Adaptable Homes	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Insufficient evidence that the adoption of the standards is necessary and insufficient evidence on the scale of the need in Rother. Many older people will find the higher accessibility standard in M4(1) sufficient.	<p>This policy applies to all tenures across the district. The Accessible and Adaptable Housing Background Paper (September 2018) sets out the evidence which supports the policy. The development of new dwellings in the district only accounts for a small proportion of the overall stock. The inclusion of this policy assists in the diversification of properties available. It allows people to stay in their homes for longer and makes future adaptations easier to implement in the future.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Allocations, particularly in rural areas, should be based on the actual need of those people who already live /work in the area, not for an influx of new residents.	This is based on existing population demographics and the ageing population. This policy applies to all tenures across the district. The Accessible and Adaptable Housing Background Paper (September 2018) sets out the evidence which supports the policy. The allocation of affordable housing is in line with Council’s allocations policy which can be found here ³ .

³ <http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=22870&p=0>

	No change proposed.
Some bungalow accommodation for older people should be a requirement on every scheme of 5 or more dwellings (Burwash Parish Council).	<p>There is no evidence to support that bungalows are required on all sites of 5 or more. M4(2) requirements will meet the housing needs of older people without having to move home and is more flexible than a specific requirement for bungalows, which may also not necessarily be an effective use of land, although bungalows still may come forward under existing policies. The Council did previously consult upon on option at Option and Preferred Options stage with regard to bungalows but there was not clear support for this approach.</p> <p>The provision of all new dwellings to be built to M4(2) will allow the market to bring forward varied dwelling types to meet the enhanced Building Regulation requirements. Policy DHG5 also refers to the requirements for specialist older persons housing within the district.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Access to new housing developments for all groups of people needs to be properly considered.	Noted. The policy applies across all housing and tenures (general needs and affordable housing).
Policy DHG5 – Specialist Housing for Older People	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
The policy should be more definitive and include specific criteria (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>The policy sets out that in conjunction with the higher accessibility standards which will be required for all new housing, this policy will meet the requirements for older people within the district. This policy sets out that primary factors in considering the location for schemes for older people’s housing include walkability to services and access to public transport. Some specific sites are identified as suitable for older persons housing at Fairlight, Northiam and Westfield.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DHG6 – Self-build and Custom-build Housebuilding	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.

<p>The policy is contrary to national policy. The PPG says local authorities should use their own land, engage with landowners and work with developers to maximise opportunities. It would be contrary to national policy to enforce a percentage of plots when guidance encourages a more co-operative process.</p>	<p>The PPG does not state that <i>only</i> the Council's own land should be used, rather this is a suggestion.</p> <p>When carrying out housing, planning and regenerative functions, the uses for Council owned land are considered as part of land allocations, disposals and acquisitions.</p> <p>The guidance states that authorities can develop policies to support self-build. Several other local planning authorities have implemented similar policies. Therefore, the policy is appropriate and in line with national guidance.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>There is insufficient evidence of demand to support the requirement.</p>	<p>The level of demand is established by the number of entries on the register. Consideration has been made to the self-build schemes that have come forward through individual schemes but this is unlikely to meet the demand established through the Register.</p> <p>The DaSA advises that up to 1 April 2018, there were 108 entries on the self-build register. This has increased to 136 up to 30 October 2018.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The requirement will lead to an over-provision of plots and slow the rate of site delivery, or prejudice sites coming forward at all.</p>	<p>The level of demand is established by the number of entries on the register.</p> <p>Paragraph three of the policy allows for the plot to be released for conventional market housing if it is not sold after 12 months. Therefore, if the demand such plots is lacking, the site can still be developed with conventional housing.</p> <p>The Rother Local Plan Viability Assessment (October 2018) found that the self-build policy would be cost neutral and as such, should not prejudice sites coming forward.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Council's evidence shows most people want a detached house in a countryside location, this will not be delivered through the policy.</p>	<p>There is a policy presumption against new residential development in the countryside. However consideration has been made to the individual self-build schemes that have come forward in a policy compliant way but this is unlikely to meet the demand established through the Register.</p> <p>59% of those on the register have a preference for the rural east and 52% for the rural west</p>

	<p>(those on the Register can opt to choose more than one area preference). The Council needs to look at other ways to bring forward self-build opportunities in the rural areas.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>How will the visual impact of a development be assessed if part of a site is left as serviced plots? No evidence that a design code would overcome the issue.</p>	<p>Where appropriate, a design code can be secured by way of condition. This can provide certainty for both the developer and the house builder in terms of the type and design of development that would be acceptable.</p> <p>A full planning application would still be required for the self-build dwelling(s) which would be judged on its own planning merits.</p> <p>New development will also still need to comply with Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy which requires development to be of high quality design.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>There is no policy commitment for a design code.</p>	<p>Where appropriate, a design code can be secured by way of condition. This can provide certainty for both the developer and the house builder in terms of the type and design of a development that would be supported.</p> <p>A full planning application would still be required for the self-build dwelling(s) which would be judged on its own planning merits.</p> <p>New development will also still need to comply with Policy EN3 of the Core Strategy which requires development to be of high quality design.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should be amended to include only the first paragraph.</p>	<p>The percentage requirement is based on the overall likely demand. It is not considered that the demand for self-build will be met without specific opportunities on larger development sites. However, should they not be sold within 12 months, the third paragraph allows for the plot to be released for conventional market housing.</p> <p>Where appropriate, a design code can be secured by way of condition. This can provide certainty for both the developer and the house builder in terms of the type and design of a development that would be supported.</p>

	No change proposed.
The threshold should be raised from 20 dwellings to 50, given the current market for self-build.	<p>There appears to be a preference for self-build plots within the rural areas of the district (59% of those on the register have a preference for the rural east and 52% for the rural west - those on the Register can opt to choose more than one area preference).</p> <p>There is a policy presumption against new residential development in the countryside. However consideration has been made to the individual self-build schemes that have come forward in a policy compliant way but this is unlikely to meet the demand established through the Register. The Council needs to look at other ways to bring forward self-build opportunities in the rural areas.</p> <p>The threshold of 20 or more dwellings means that there will be self-build opportunities spread across the district, rather than just in the built up areas/towns where most of the larger housing developments (50 or more) would mostly likely take place.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
It might be better to require a proportion of the site area (sqm) to be self-build (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>The policy requirement for 5-10% of dwellings of 20+ dwellings to be set aside for self and custom build is more directly related to the actual number of dwellings on a development site rather than a site area.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DHG7 – External Residential Areas	
Support the policy, including the requirements for cycle storage and waste and recycling storage (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council, Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council, East Sussex County Council).	Noted.
Part (i) of the policy should be strengthened to require external space to contribute positively to the district's green infrastructure network, in	The main focus of Policy DHG7 is to ensure residential developments are capable of accommodating the reasonable expectations of occupiers, including sufficient usable external amenity space.

<p>accordance with National Policy and Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>The potential effect on biodiversity and the district's green infrastructure network is covered by Policy DEN4 (iii) of the DaSA, which requires all developments to retain and enhance biodiversity in a manner appropriate to the local context, having regard to locally present Priority Habitats and Species, defined Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, ecological networks and further opportunities identified in the Council's Green Infrastructure Study Addendum. This is further detailed in the supporting text to Policy DEN4 (e.g. paragraphs 6.38-43).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Rather than require rear gardens to be at least 10m long, a minimum area figure should be used instead to allow developers more flexibility to deliver sufficient amenity space. A 10m long garden cannot always be delivered.</p>	<p>Background evidence has been prepared and supports the retention of the requirement. It includes an analysis of recent schemes, which has indicated that the provision of a 10m long garden is already being achieved in most instances.</p> <p>It also found that there is a far greater variety in garden size when measured in terms of area, than length, which remained fairly consistent across different sized dwellings.</p> <p>Therefore, while it is acknowledged that some local authorities do use a minimum area size for external amenity space, the proposed approach is preferred because the rear garden length is considered to be a more useful measure of the usable space available when considered in relation to the size of the dwelling, and may be easier to achieve than a minimum area.</p> <p>Additionally, setting a minimum length rather than an area will assist in achieving appropriate separation distances between dwellings where plots are "back to back".</p> <p>In any event, paragraph 4.65 of the supporting text advises that a rear garden of slightly less than 10m in depth may be accepted where a level of amenity space is provided to the side or front of the dwelling or there are particular reasons why the future occupier of the dwelling(s) will have a lesser requirement for amenity space. It is considered this provides an appropriate level of flexibility for developers.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy DHG8 – Extensions to Residential Gardens</p>	
<p>Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Policy DHG9 – Extensions, Alterations and Outbuildings	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council, Historic England).	Noted.
The size of extension allowed should be limited, this is particularly pertinent to smaller dwellings to ensure they remain in a lower price bracket and affordable for local people. There should be a policy requirement for extensions not to result in the loss of a small dwelling, as in the South Downs National Park Authority's policy (Burwash Parish Council, Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>The policy requires extensions to respect and respond positively to the scale of the dwelling (criteria ii); to retain sufficient usable external private space (criteria iv); and to be physically and visually subservient to the building, taking into account its original form and function (criteria vi).</p> <p>While the Council recognises the need to provide a supply of smaller dwellings (and this is addressed through Policy LHN1 of the Core Strategy which requires new housing developments in the rural areas to provide a mix of housing sizes and types, with at least 30% one and two bedroom dwellings), it would seem unreasonable to restrict a household in such a property from making extensions/ alterations to meet its changing needs, purely for overall supply reasons.</p> <p>It should also be noted that there are extensive permitted development rights which allow householders to improve and extend their homes without the need to apply for planning permission.</p> <p>The Council does not have specific evidence to justify a policy requirement to limit the size of extensions to a certain percentage of the existing house, for example, in the interests of retaining smaller, more affordable dwellings.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DHG10 – Annexes	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Policy DHG11 – Boundary Treatments	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council, Historic England).	Noted
The policy should be amended to	The policy is specific to a limited range of planning applications, which, due to their nature, would

<p>require boundary treatments to maintain/ increase permeability for wildlife.</p>	<p>not usually have significant implications for biodiversity. Therefore, it is considered appropriate to limit the scope of the policy to those issues which most commonly arise in planning applications. Nevertheless, any biodiversity issues that arose would be considered under Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DEN4 of the DaSA.</p> <p>It is noted that the supporting text makes clear that in many cases the most appropriate boundary treatment will be a hedge, or open post and rail fencing. In cases where solid enclosure is necessary, it is necessary to strike a balance between allowing wildlife access and containing pets and children to within gardens.</p> <p>Furthermore, there are extensive permitted development rights for boundary treatments and the policy only applies to those developments needing planning permission.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy DHG12 – Accesses and Drives</p>	
<p>Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The policy should include a requirement to manage rainwater run-off.</p>	<p>This is covered at paragraph 4.109 of the supporting text, which also refers to DaSA Policy DEN5 which applies to all developments. However, it is agreed that an additional policy criterion should be included for the avoidance of doubt.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Insert an additional policy criterion:</p> <p><i>(iv) either, they are constructed of permeable materials, or appropriate drainage is included to manage surface water run-off in accordance with Policy DEN5.</i></p>
<p>The policy fails to address the problem of the loss of on-street parking spaces caused by new accesses/driveways in areas of parking stress (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>It is appreciated that sometimes a new access can result in the loss of on-street parking space; however, at the same time, these developments increase car parking spaces off-street.</p> <p>Policy TR4 of the Core Strategy sets out general criteria for car parking.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

Chapter 5: Economy

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Policy DEC1 – Shopfronts, Signage and Advertising	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council, Historic England).	Noted.
The extent of permitted development rights for advertising/ signs could be at odds with the thrust of the policy.	It is recognised there are permitted development rights for certain advertisements and signs. The policy will apply to all relevant developments requiring planning permission/ consent.
No change proposed.	No change proposed.
Permitted development rights for advertising/ signs should be suspended in Conservation Areas.	<p>Noted but this is outside the scope of the policy, which sets out a framework for assessing applications involving signage, advertisements and shopfronts.</p> <p>The suspension of permitted development rights would require the Secretary of State (following an application from the Council) to make a Direction under Regulation 7 of the Town and Country Planning (Control of Advertisements) (England) Regulations 2007 (as amended). This is a separate process to the Local Plan and if justified, a Local Plan policy is not necessary to progress a Direction.</p> <p>Regulation 7 Directions should only be used in exceptional circumstances and require a compelling justification. The Advertisement Regulations already include some restrictions on advertisements in Conservation Areas, including illuminated advertisements, flags and hoardings. The Council is not in a position now to request the Secretary of State to make a Regulation 7 Direction.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that a Regulation 7 Direction would not mean that the Local Planning Authority could place an embargo on all advertisements. The Direction would simply require the submission of an application which will be judged on its merits. Consequently, it is not considered expedient to make a Regulation 7 direction at this time.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Highways England does not allow advertisements within the highway	Noted. It is agreed this information should be added to the supporting text to properly reflect the restrictions of Highways England.

<p>boundary; this is relevant to the A259 and A21 (Highways England).</p>	<p><u>Change proposed</u></p> <p>Add the following additional wording to the end of paragraph 5.2:</p> <p><i>(NB It should be noted that Highways England, which has responsibility for the Strategic Road Network, does not allow advertisements within its highway boundary. This is relevant to the A259 and A21.)</i></p>
<p>Policy DEC2 – Holiday sites</p>	
<p>Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council, Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Criteria (i) (first limb) should be amended to include reference to the High Weald AONB Management Plan (Natural England).</p>	<p>The addition is considered unnecessary. The AONB context is highlighted in the supporting text at paragraph 5.16. The AONB Management Plan is referenced in the Environment section (para 6.8) and in DaSA Policy DEN2, which will apply to all proposals within or affecting the setting of the High Weald AONB. The Local Plan will be read as a whole.</p> <p><u>No change proposed.</u></p>
<p>Criteria (ii) (first limb) should be amended to require habitats and species to be conserved <u>and</u> enhanced (Natural England).</p>	<p>It is agreed that, at present, this criterion presents some confusion when compared to Policy DEN4 (ii) (Biodiversity and Green Space), which applies to all development proposals and requires proposals to “seek to conserve and enhance” designated sites, habitats and species, including Priority Habitats and Species (as listed under the NERC Act) (although as noted under the representations for Policy DEN4 (below), it is now proposed to delete the words “seek to”).</p> <p>Therefore, to avoid a potential contradiction with Policy DEN4 (ii), it is proposed to change the wording of Policy DEC2 (ii) (first limb) to more generally refer to the requirements of Policy DEN4.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Delete policy criterion (ii) (first limb) and replace with:</p> <p><i>(ii) Support the conservation of biodiversity in accordance with DaSA Policy DEN4.</i></p>

	(ii) conserve or enhance sensitive habitats and species.
In criteria (iii) (b) (second limb), the meaning of the term “a natural boundary” is unclear.	It is considered the meaning is clear. A natural boundary could refer to, for example, a tree belt, strong hedge line, an edge of woodland or a ridge in the land. The term is also used in DaSA Policy DHG8 and Local Plan 2006 Policy HG9 (Extensions to residential gardens). No change proposed.
Policy DEC3 – Existing employment sites and premises	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
The policy should only relate to how existing employment sites can be used for employment purposes. Criteria (iv) should be deleted.	Criterion (iv) is integral to the ambition of making most effective use of existing employment sites. It addresses situations where a continued wholly employment use is not possible; in this event, it prioritises mixed-use schemes to support employment activity. This is consistent with the overall approach and the acknowledged need to retain employment sites, where practicable. It is noted that the representation is made in the context of a complex proposal to relocate businesses to other locations and redevelop existing sites in Rye for housing. That will be addressed through the Rye Neighbourhood Plan, currently at examination, taking into account the Council’s representations on the provisions being made for businesses. Indeed, paragraph 5.39 recognises the role of Neighbourhood Plans in bringing forward alternative proposals and paragraph 5.42 highlights such sites in the DaSA Local Plan. However, there is no need to be specific about sites in Neighbourhood Plan areas. No change proposed.
Sites allocated for residential-led redevelopment in Neighbourhood Plans should not be subject to the tests in Policy DEC3 and this should be noted in the DaSA.	On the basis that such allocations in made Neighbourhood Plans will have been found to be in general conformity with the Council’s strategic policies, including in relation to employment sites, it is accepted that, for those allocations, they would essentially supersede the provisions of policy DEC3, depending on the policy criteria of the relevant allocation. However, pending a Plan coming into force and for other schemes, criterion (iv) is necessary and appropriate, as set in the previous response. No change proposed.
The “cascade requirements” originally	The outstanding matter from the Core Strategy was the review of sites. The sequential approach

<p>in Core Strategy EC3 and repeated in part (iv) of this policy should have been reviewed. If employment use is demonstrated not to be viable it is unlikely that community use would be. Affordable housing should be deleted as this would be triggered in any event by Policy DHG1. Market housing should not have to be “subject to local needs”.</p>	<p>to alternative uses in Core Strategy policy EC3 need not be reviewed at this time. This said, it is accepted that viability will play a key part in considering the deliverability of the alternative uses, but it still correct that ‘local needs’ should be a critical consideration. Affordable housing need is relatively high in Rother and justifies a general prioritisation. It is noted that schemes for 100% affordable homes are increasingly coming forward.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy doesn’t relate to the supporting text. “Existing sites” are not shown on the Policies Map.</p>	<p>This is a generic policy relating to all employment sites. The background paper referred to in the supporting text identifies the range of sites on which the policy is based, but is not limited to those sites.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>A specific time period for marketing should be required, suggest 18 months (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 5.41 of the supporting text cross-refers to policy DCO1 in relation to marketing; that already requires a marketing period of ‘normally at least 18 months’.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The wording in criteria (ii) should be changed to require proposals to accord with other relevant Policies rather than “have regard to”.</p>	<p>This is a similar construction. ‘Regard’ may be viewed as potentially providing more flexibility for rural employment, but accordance with other policies is the normal expectation. The word ‘relevant’ is considered unnecessary, as will inevitably be applied.</p> <p>Proposed change: Amend criterion (ii) to read:</p> <p><i>(ii) Permitting intensification, conversion, redevelopment and/or extension having regard to where they accord with other policies of the Plan;</i></p>

Chapter 6: Environment

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Policy DEN1 – Maintaining Landscape Character	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Policy DEN2 – The High Weald AONB	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
It is important that development does not adversely affect the AONB through visual intrusion, noise or light pollution.	Noted. Policies DEN1 and DEN2, in conjunction with policy DEN7, as well as Core Strategy policy EN1, provide due protection for the AONB. No change proposed.
Reference should be made to the importance of maintaining the natural and historic character of the AONB.	Policy DEN2 and its supporting text does this. Paragraph 6.9 confirms that a proper understanding of the local landscape will include its historic characteristics, while policy DEN2 references the character components as set out in the AONB Management Plan, which states that it is an essentially medieval landscape, but with surviving features from human influences in many time periods. Therefore, consideration of the historic character of the AONB forms a fundamental part of considering impacts on its character, while the terminology of the policy ('landscape and scenic beauty') is, properly, consistent with the NPPF. The insertion of the word 'natural' before 'scenic' is not necessary. No change proposed.
The reference to "Valued landscapes" in paragraph 6.11 should be deleted as case law confirms that designated landscapes do not necessarily amount to "valued landscapes" having regard to the NPPF.	The reference relates to the NPPF (2018), which uses the term at paragraph 170: " <i>Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by: a) protecting and enhancing valued landscapes... (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan)</i> ". Paragraph 172 of the NPPF confirms that AONBs have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. As a statutory designation, it is clear that AONBs are 'valued landscapes' within the meaning of paragraph 170 of the NPPF (which is consistent with

	<p>para. 109 of NPPF 2012). The argument in case law appears to be more related to whether a non-designated landscape can be a 'valued landscape'.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
No definition of "small scale" is given.	<p>In this context, 'small scale' is taken to the alternative to 'major'. The assessment of whether development is major is for determination in the circumstances of the settlement, site and proposal, as indicated in the NPPF, 2018 at paragraph 172 and the Local Plan policy footnote 28. This is consistent with case law established in the context of the 2012 NPPF. The Council has considered this question for all sites allocated in the Local Plan.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy leaves unacceptable holes that will be exploited by developers and is contrary to the NPPF, in particular in terms of the definition of "major development" (Burwash Parish Council).	<p>National policy does not bar development in AONBs, but does state that its scale and extent should be limited. Policy DEN2 is regarded as a suitably robust policy that properly reflects this approach, with specific reference to the AONB Management Plan and the area's defining characteristics. See above response regarding the scale of development.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy should be amended to refer to "scenic natural beauty" as the term "scenic beauty" does not encompass the biodiversity element of natural beauty.	<p>The current wording (landscape and scenic beauty) is the same as that within NPPF 2012 (para. 115) and, latterly, the NPPF 2018 (para 172); therefore, the policy is consistent with national policy.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The words "seek to" should be deleted from the policy. (Natural England).	<p>The policy wording is consistent with the the CRoW Act, which requires local authorities to make sure that all decisions have regard for the purpose of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB. While a number of policies may enhance the AONB, it not a requirement of development. At the same time, the policy and decisions in line with it should meet NPPF expectation that 'great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing' AONBs.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DEN3 – Strategic Gaps	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council).	Noted.
The policy should be expanded to	The particular objectives of a strategic gap are set out in paragraph 6.14, where the principal

<p>refer to the contribution the strategic gaps do and could make to green infrastructure and natural capital.</p>	<p>focus of the policy is to ensure that these gaps are enhanced and development is carefully controlled to ensure the specific objectives are met. Whilst strategic gaps do contribute to the key functions of 'green infrastructure', such a purpose is not an inherent criterion for open land between settlements to be a 'strategic gap'.</p> <p>Policy DEN4 (ii) and (iii) of the DaSA requires all developments to conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of locally designated sites, having regard to Priority Habitats and Species, defined Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, ecological networks and further opportunities identified in the Council's Green Infrastructure Study Addendum. This is further detailed in the supporting text to Policy DEN4 (e.g. paragraphs 6.38-43). Therefore, this policy covers the role of green infrastructure.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>What constitutes "exceptional circumstances" should be clarified (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>'Exceptional circumstances' would be assessed on a case by case basis and each application would be judged on its own planning merits. The main focus of the policy is to carefully control development and 'exceptional circumstances' for development proposals within the strategic gaps would need to be clearly justified.</p> <p>It would be too prescriptive to specifically outline what would be acceptable and what would not.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Text should be added to acknowledge the existing strategic waste facilities within the strategic gap between Bexhill and Hastings/ St Leonards, as identified in the adopted Waste & Minerals Plan (WMP). The policy as drafted could undermine the ability of the WMP to make the most efficient use of these waste sites (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>It is noted that there are existing waste facilities located within the Strategic Gap. The Background Paper which supports the policy highlights that <i>"the existing waste uses do intrude into the gap, however these uses are generally concentrated in the central corridor and do not detract from the generally open character of the strategic gap which is important in maintaining the perception of the gap between the built up areas"</i></p> <p>The Assessment further highlights that the corridor is particularly vulnerable to expansion of potential waste developments. As such, it is proper to carefully consider any new/expanded proposals for waste uses within the Gap in terms of any impact upon the objectives of the Gap. There is no inconsistency with the Waste and Minerals Local Plan in this regard.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Bexhill and Hastings/ St Leonards</p>	<p>Noted. Changes to the Gap have been made in line with the recommendations within the</p>

<p>Gap should be extended.</p>	<p>Strategic Gap Background Paper (March 2016) and there are no other extensions to the gap proposed.</p> <p>The Strategic Gap has been extended to include the field to the east of the roundabout at Ravenside Retail Park, which was a previous (unintended) omission in the Rother Local Plan (2006). The land adjacent to the east and south-east falls within Hastings Borough Council's administrative boundary.</p> <p>The strategic gap has also been extended between Combe Valley Way and the western edge of Hastings to ensure the retention of the open landscape between the two towns. The construction of the Combe Valley Way and its associated landscaping has created a physical and visual link between north east Bexhill and the western edge of Hastings. The designation of the Combe Valley Countryside Park is a further unifying influence on this area. The area between the built up edge of Crowhurst and the Hastings to London railway line has also been included in the strategic gap boundary.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p>The Strategic Gaps severely restrict the potential for sustainable development, having regard to the increasing housing need.</p> <p>A review of strategic gaps should form part of the review of the Core Strategy, using up to date housing needs figures, rather than the DaSA.</p>	<p>The DaSA is part 2 of the Local Plan and is in general conformity with the overall development strategy as set out within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Broad locations of Gaps were identified within Core Strategy Policy HF1 and RY1, although the boundaries of these Gaps were not defined. The need to review the extent of the Gaps is appropriately within the DaSA, as these were previously defined within the 2006 Local Plan (Policy DS6) and will be superseded by this Policy.</p> <p>The Strategic Gaps were reviewed in the Strategic Gap Background Paper (March 2016)...and the DaSA has proposed amendments to some of these gaps.</p> <p>The objectives of the gaps (outlined in paragraph 6.14 of the DaSA) are to maintain the separate identity and distinctiveness between settlements; maintain the strategic settlement pattern; and to prevent the coalescence of settlements. Development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances; residential development within these gaps would not meet these objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

<p>There is no justification to delete the gap between Battle and Telham.</p>	<p>Justification for the removal of this area from the Strategic Gap is provided in the Strategic Gap Background Paper (March 2016).</p> <p>Paragraph 11.14 states: <i>It is suggested that the western gap boundary is reviewed to follow an alignment along Forewood Lane to be more specific to the core gap between Hastings and Battle. The current SG area to the west of Forewood Lane is more closely associated with the open High Weald countryside to the south and west of Battle. In this context the extension of the gap west of Forewood Lane does not contribute to the three particular objective of the SG, as set out in 1.2 in relation to the built up areas of Hastings and Battle.</i></p> <p>This area remains countryside, is outside the development boundary and would therefore be protected by countryside and AONB policies.</p> <p>The removal of this area would not compromise the effectiveness of the gap between Battle and Hastings.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should include important gaps between villages in the rural areas (Burwash Parish Council).</p>	<p>In very limited circumstances there may be a genuine need for a local gaps protection policy where there is a real threat of creeping coalescence which would harm the separate identity, character and/or landscape setting of settlements (or distinct parts of settlements).</p> <p>No other gaps, other than those strategic gaps identified in principle through the Core Strategy, were identified as necessary within the DaSA. However it will be for Neighbourhood Plans to give further consideration to the need for any local gaps.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>There is no justification to enlarge the gap between Hastings and Fairlight.</p>	<p>Noted. However, the justification to enlarge the strategic gap is explained in the Strategic Gaps Background Paper (March 2016).</p> <p>Paragraph 8.16 advises: <i>The area between the current northern edge of the gap and Battery Hill is outside the built up edges of the two settlements. The area of large gardens and small paddocks is potentially vulnerable to pressure for infill development, including ancillary development and loss of trees.</i></p>

	<p><i>The open character of the area between the road at Battery Hill and the edge of the gap, including the hamlet of Fairlight, contributes to the perception of the gap between Hastings and Fairlight Cove.</i></p> <p>Paragraph 12.2 concludes that: <i>The area currently outside the strategic gap, between the gap boundary and Fairlight Road including The Close is vulnerable to incremental change and development around the edges of the settlements. The exclusions of the houses and gardens on the south side of Battery Road (Hill) could leave this area vulnerable to infill development.</i></p> <p>Therefore, this area is included in the strategic gap to conserve the open character of the gap between Fairlight and Fairlight Cove.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Council's position in relation to householder development and replacement dwellings within strategic gaps needs to be clarified.</p>	<p>Development will only be supported where the open character of gaps is not compromised. Paragraph 6.15 advises: <i>Development within these Gaps has been strictly limited to maintain their openness, although does allow for agricultural buildings, conversions and the replacement of an existing building.</i></p> <p>This supporting text outlines the policy position in terms of new agricultural buildings, conversions and replacement buildings. A replacement dwelling would be a 'replacement building' which is permitted by this policy, subject to other relevant Core Strategy and DaSA policies.</p> <p>Any development proposed within the Gap would be assessed against this policy and other relevant Core Strategy and DaSA policies, and should not compromise the open character of the gap. It is unlikely that the policy will affect minor householder applications.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Object to the land between NBAR and Combe Valley being in the strategic gap as this is suitable for employment and development is already restricted by Combe Haven SSSI, the AONB</p>	<p>The Strategic Gaps Background Paper supports the inclusion of this area within the Gap.</p> <p>The NBAR provides a clear edge between the urban area and the countryside to the north. The strategic gap has been amended to protect the open landscape between Bexhill and Hastings.</p>

and Pevensey Levels SAC. ¹	No change proposed.
¹ This representation previously appeared under BEX1.	
Policy DEN4 – Biodiversity and Green Space	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Wording should be added to confirm that development will not be permitted (included in allocated sites) if it would adversely affect the integrity of an internationally designated site. At present the SARMS gives insufficient protection as it has not been adopted and there is no implementation plan. Effects from development on the Pevensey Levels cannot be determined until project-specific stage.	<p>The protection of internationally designated sites is a statutory requirement and therefore, it is not necessary to repeat it in the Policy. The role of the Local Plan is to show how it is to be applied, and this is covered in paragraph 6.27 of the supporting text and part (ii) of the Policy.</p> <p>The necessary assessments under the Habitat Regulations may be required at respective stages of both plan-making and planning application. Appropriate references are made in relation to site allocations within the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy wording should be strengthened to require development to produce net gains for biodiversity. The wording “seek to” should be deleted from criteria (ii). Part (iv) should require smaller developments to deliver towards the green infrastructure network. Part (v) is unclear in its requirements. It should require all developments that will increase residents within the Strategy area to contribute towards delivery of the SARMS.	<p>Part (ii): It is agreed the wording “seek to” can be deleted from part (ii) as this part of the policy relates to key sites and species. The change would accord with paragraph 170 of the NPPF (2018) which notes that planning policies and decisions should (a) protect and enhance sites of biodiversity or geological value (in a manner commensurate with their statutory status or identified quality in the development plan).</p> <p>It should be noted that part (iii) of the policy provides to retain and enhance biodiversity in accordance with the principles of net gain. How this will be achieved will follow the outcome of the Government’s recent consultation on Net Gain (December 2018).</p> <p>Part (iv): Larger developments will generally provide more scope for biodiversity gains including improvements/ additions to the Green Infrastructure (GI) Network which is why the threshold for the submission of a Masterplan has been set at 50 dwellings. However, smaller scale developments will still be required to accord with the requirements of part (iii) of the policy, which requires all development to retain and enhance biodiversity in a manner appropriate to the local</p>

	<p>context (which may involve contributing to the local GI network) and with Policies EN5 and CO3 of the Core Strategy. It is considered these measures will ensure development produces net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>(v) This section of the policy has arisen from the requirement, identified in the Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) of the Core Strategy, to mitigate the potential impacts of recreation policies on the European sites, rather than development per se. The SARMS is being developed to provide an effective strategy to support these sites and maintain their integrity, having regard to existing ongoing activities as well as the impacts of recreational activities and developments. Pending its approval, there is still a statutory requirement to maintain the integrity of the European sites.</p> <p><u>Change proposed</u></p> <p>Delete the words “seek to” in the first line of part (ii) of the policy, i.e.</p> <p><i>(ii) development proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of...</i></p>
<p>Item (ii) could be even stronger (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).</p>	<p>As noted above, it is proposed to delete the words “seek to” in the first line of the policy.</p>
<p>The policy should require ecological surveys and reports for all developments.</p>	<p>This requirement is not necessary or reasonable. Planning Practice Guidance confirms:</p> <p><i>Local planning authorities should only require ecological surveys where clearly justified, for example if they consider there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by development. Assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity.</i> (Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 8-016-20140612).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>A 15 metres buffer between development and ancient woodland should be a policy requirement.</p>	<p>The 15 metres buffer (minimum) is a measure contained within guidance for planning authorities published by Natural England and the Forestry Commission, which is referenced at paragraph 6.31 and footnote 33 (<i>Ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees: protecting them from development</i>, updated 2018). It is also contained as a policy criterion for site allocations within the DaSA that adjoin ancient woodland (e.g. Policies BRO1, NOR2).</p>

	<p>The Guidance notes that the size and type of buffer zone may vary depending on the scale, type and impact of the development, and where assessment shows other impacts are likely to extend beyond 15 metres, a larger buffer zone is likely to be needed.</p> <p>Consequently, it is considered the policy requirement of DEN4 (ii), which requires development proposals to conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of ancient woodland, is appropriate because it provides for the planning authority to use the most up to date guidance and ecological advice in determining relevant applications.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Minor wording changes requested to paragraph 6.43 to confirm surveys will be required where the development <u>may</u> have impacts, including on notable species (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Noted. However, Planning Practice Guidance confirms:</p> <p><i>An ecological survey will be necessary in advance of a planning application if the type and location of development are such that the impact on biodiversity may be significant and existing information is lacking or inadequate...</i></p> <p><i>Local planning authorities should only require ecological surveys where clearly justified, for example if they consider there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected species being present and affected by development. Assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity.</i> (Paragraph: 016 Reference ID: 8-016-20140612).</p> <p>It is considered the wording should be changed to more closely align with the PPG.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Amend and add to the first sentence of paragraph 6.43 of the supporting text, as follows:</p> <p><i><u>Ecological surveys and reports will be required to be submitted with planning applications for major development; or where the development impacts on any designated site, Priority Habitat or protected species; proposals which impact on a designated site or Priority Habitat; and proposals where there is a reasonable likelihood of a protected or Priority species being present and affected by the development. Assessments should be proportionate to the nature and scale</u></i></p>

<p>Minor wording changes requested to refer to Habitats and Species of Principal Importance (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p><u>of development proposed and the likely impact on biodiversity.</u></p> <p>The representation notes that the lists of these habitats and species are used to guide decision-makers in implementing their statutory duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in England. It then lists Priority Habitats and Species found within Rother.</p> <p>The definition of Priority Habitats/Species and Habitats/ Species of Principal Importance is already explained at paragraph 6.23 and footnote 29.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that a further explanatory paragraph should be added to the supporting text to give further information on these habitats and species, particularly as they are specifically referred to in the policy itself.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Add the following text underneath paragraph 6.37:</p> <p><u>Priority Habitats and Species</u></p> <p><i>6.38 As noted above, Priority Habitats and Species (also referred to as “Habitats and Species of Principal Importance”) are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006. Those habitats and species on the list are conservation priorities and are used to guide decision-makers in implementing their statutory duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity when carrying out their normal functions. Priority Habitats within Rother include woodland, maritime cliff and slopes, hedgerows and lowland meadows, and Priority Species include hedgehog, common toad, house sparrow, brown-banded carder bee and pennyroyal.</i></p>
<p>Minor wording changes requested to delete reference to East Sussex County Council from paragraph 6.34 as it is incorrect (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>It is agreed this should be changed to ensure the information within the DaSA is correct.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Delete the reference to East Sussex County Council from the second sentence of paragraph 6.34, i.e.</p> <p><i>Information on locally designated sites is available from the Sussex Biodiversity Records Centre.</i></p>

	<i>and East Sussex County Council.</i>
Reference to protected species should be included in part (ii) of the policy (Environment Agency).	<p>It is agreed this should be added for completeness and to ensure the policy, which currently refers to Priority Species, also covers those species protected under specific legislation.</p> <p><u>Change proposed</u></p> <p>Additional wording to be added to the first sentence of part (ii) of the policy as follows:</p> <p><i>(ii) development proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of international, national, regional and local designated sites of biodiversity and geological value; irreplaceable habitats (including ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees); <u>protected species</u> and Priority Habitats and Species, both within and outside designated sites.</i></p>
Policy DEN5 – Sustainable Drainage	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Parts (v) and (vi) of the policy should be strengthened to ensure no significant effect on the Pevensey Levels SAC in terms of hydrology, including in the event of failings in the management of the SuDS. Part (v) should require a specialist management company to be in place prior to occupation with step-in rights for the Local Authority for schemes within the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment Area (PLHCA). Part (vi) should require one of the two stages of suitable treatment to be a source control feature.	<p>The requirement for 2 stages of suitable treatment within the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment Area (PLHCA) is consistent with the HRA of the Core Strategy and has been supported by Natural England. Details of how SuDS would be implemented and managed for schemes in the PLHCA would be addressed through the Appropriate Assessment of any relevant planning application.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Welcome the wording within part (iv) to include multi-functional delivery of objectives, however it should be	The inclusion of more detailed examples/ prompts within the wording are considered unnecessary. Part (iv) is clear which policy objectives are being referred to, and the box following paragraph 6.50 of the supporting text contains a number of references for further

strengthened through the inclusion of more detailed examples/ prompts within the wording.	information on SuDS. No change proposed.
SuDS should be linked up wherever possible to achieve greater benefits for water management and wildlife, to contribute to green infrastructure and support robust ecological networks (Natural England).	Noted. Part (iv) of the policy requires SuDS to be designed and implemented to be multi-functional and deliver other policy objectives such as the provision of habitats, support for biodiversity and provision of open space/ recreation. Furthermore, all development will be expected to comply with Policy DEN4 of the DaSA which supports green infrastructure and ecological networks. A policy requirement to require SuDS to be linked up is unlikely to be achievable in all cases but it is agreed the suggested wording can be added to the supporting text. <u>Change proposed</u> Add the following wording after the first sentence of paragraph 6.54: <i>... potential for wider benefits. <u>SuDS should be linked up where possible to achieve greater benefits for water management and wildlife.</u> CIRIA's SuDS Manual C753 and the latest guidance from the LLFA will be key references.</i>
Supports the policy but all new watercourses should be required to be open, and "daylighting" existing culverts should be a policy requirement (Northiam Parish Council).	Paragraph 6.56 of the supporting text makes it clear that these measures should be included wherever possible and practical. However, it may not always be practicable for culverts to be reinstated to an open channel and consequently, a policy requirement would be unreasonable. No change proposed.
Highways England has strict controls on rainwater run-off into its highway drainage systems (Highways England).	Noted. It is agreed this can be added to the supporting text to provide additional guidance. <u>Change proposed</u> Add the following sentence to the end of paragraph 6.56: <i>... will require consent from the LLFA. <u>It is noted that the highway authorities (including Highway England in respect of the SRN) have strict controls on water run-off into the highway drainage</u></i>

	<u>system.</u>
Under item (i) a developer should be required to provide 12 months' groundwater monitoring data (Salehurst & Robertsbridge Parish Council).	<p>While it is noted that developers often omit adequate groundwater monitoring and soakage testing, the introduction of a blanket requirement is not justified. Guidance and advice on drainage design requirements is provided by the LLFA (and in Source Protection Zones, the Environment Agency), and the SuDS manual covers this also, as detailed in the supporting text.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.55 of the supporting text covers ground conditions and notes the requirement for ground investigation. The precise requirements of the investigation will vary depending on the nature of a particular site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy should include specific reference to the need to protect the Combe Valley Countryside Park.	<p>This is not considered necessary. Policy HAS1 relates specifically to the Countryside Park and the Local Plan will be read as a whole.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The Lead Local Flood Authority recognises it is not a requirement for the DaSA to be supported by an updated Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but would wish to state that this will be required when the Core Strategy is reviewed (East Sussex County Council).	<p>Noted. The Strategic Flood Risk Assessment will be updated when the Core Strategy is reviewed.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DEN6 – Land Stability	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
While we warmly welcome the policy, it fails in one respect: the policy should remove Permitted Development rights for householder development near the cliff edge at Fairlight (Fairlight Parish Council).	The possibility of removing permitted development rights in areas at risk of land instability is recognised at paragraph 6.65 of the supporting text. However, an Article 4 Direction should only be used in exceptional circumstances and requires a compelling justification. In the Fairlight situation a significant degree of work would be necessary to demonstrate that it was expedient that an Article 4 Direction should be made to prevent, essentially small scale permitted development in the locality of the cliff without planning permission.

	<p>The Council is not in a position now to make an Article 4 Direction and in any event, a Local Plan policy is not necessary to progress an Article 4 if this is justified.</p> <p>Furthermore, it should be noted that an Article 4 Direction would not mean that the Local Planning Authority could place an embargo on all development. The Article 4 Direction would simply require the submission of an application which will be judged on its merits and in accordance with the Local Plan. Consequently, it is not considered expedient to make an Article 4 direction at this time.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DEN7 – Environment Pollution	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
References to “contaminated land” in the policy and supporting text should be changed to “Land Contamination” as the former has a specific definition under Regulations (Environment Agency).	<p>Noted. It is noted the NPPF refers to the definition of “contaminated land” under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 (paragraph 178). This is also referenced at paragraph 6.96 of the supporting text to Policy DEN7.</p> <p>It is agreed the change should be made to ensure the correct terminology is used.</p> <p><u>Changes proposed</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Delete the wording “contaminated land” in the second sentence of paragraph 6.78 and replace with “land contamination”. 2. Delete the heading “Contaminated Land” above paragraph 6.96 and replace with “Land Contamination”. 3. Delete the wording “contaminated land” in the first sentence of the policy and replace with “land contamination”, i.e.: <i>... as a result of lighting, noise, odour, contaminated land <u>land contamination</u>, hazardous and non-hazardous substances...</i>
Explicit reference should be made the	The policy relates to all areas of the District. It is not considered necessary to specifically refer to

need to avoid disturbance to underlying waste and the associated potential hazards in the Combe Valley Countryside Park area.	the Combe Valley Countryside Park. No change proposed.
---	---

Chapter 7. Implementation

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Policy DIM1 – Comprehensive Development	
Support the policy (Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Policy needs to be clarified as to where and how it is applied (Northiam Parish Council).	<p>The supporting text notes at paragraph 7.7 that the policy is to be applied in all cases where a comprehensive approach to development is necessary, including allocations and “windfall” sites. The policy will be particularly relevant where a site is in multiple ownerships, as noted at paragraph 7.4 and in the policy itself. The third paragraph of the policy lists those considerations that may be relevant, e.g. appropriate land uses, affordable housing, access, etc.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy DIM2 – Development	
Support the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Rye Town Council).	Noted.
Development boundaries are already out of date due to the District’s shortfall in housing supply and therefore, development boundaries across the whole district should be reviewed with a view to increasing land available for housing.	<p>All development boundaries (other than for those villages subject to Neighbourhood Plans) have been reviewed through the DaSA and changes made where necessary, e.g. to include new allocation sites or to remove areas now considered unsuitable for development. The housing allocations in the DaSA and Neighbourhood Plans will be expected to meet or exceed the housing targets identified in the adopted Core Strategy.</p> <p>Policy DIM2 simply applies the principles set out in Core Strategy Policy OSS2, which confirms that development boundaries will continue to differentiate between areas where most forms of new development would be acceptable and where they would not.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The final paragraph of the policy should be deleted and replaced with a criteria based policy for edge of settlement development, similar to that within the emerging Ashford Local Plan.	<p>Policy DIM2 is in general conformity with the approach set out in Core Strategy Policy OSS2. A criteria-based policy for edge of settlement development would not be in general conformity with Policy OSS2.</p> <p>Paragraph 7.8 notes that development boundaries differentiate between those areas where further development would be acceptable in principle and the countryside, where it would not.</p>

	<p>This is consistent with the NPPF as noted at paragraph 7.13. Through the DaSA, all development boundaries (other than for those villages subject to Neighbourhood Plans) have been reviewed, and where new locations (e.g. on the edge of settlements) have been identified that are now considered acceptable for development, they have been included in the revised development boundaries. The housing allocations in the DaSA and Neighbourhood Plans will be expected to meet or exceed the housing targets identified in the adopted Core Strategy. Consequently, there is no need for a policy specifically for edge of settlement development and it would be inappropriate in the context of the principle of the continued use of development boundaries, as set out in the Core Strategy (Policy OSS2). Notwithstanding this, there are specific Local Plan policies supporting the rural economy and rural needs for facilities and affordable housing.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The DaSA is seriously flawed as it does not make it clear that Development Boundaries are removed from around some settlements. There is no justification for removing the Boundaries from around Pett Level or Winchelsea Beach.</p>	<p>The removal of and changes to development boundaries formed part of the DaSA Local Plan Options & Preferred Options consultation (Dec 2016 – Feb 2017). The reasons for removing the development boundaries from Pett Level and Winchelsea Beach were explained in detail at paragraphs 16.19-16.24 and 16.33-16.39 (respectively) of that document, and were subject to formal consultation.</p> <p>Policy DIM2 is in general conformity with the approach set out in Core Strategy Policy OSS2 and supersedes Local Plan 2006 Policy DS3, as detailed in Appendix 2 (Superseded Local Plan 2006 Policies). The DaSA as submitted presents the Local Plan as it is now, with the new development boundaries as listed in the first column of Figure 14 (page 104).</p> <p>As noted in the DaSA Local Plan Options & Preferred Options (Dec 2016), the Pett Level development boundary had three separate areas in the 2006 Local Plan. The “hub” of the village is almost entirely surrounded by internationally protected Ramsar and SPA, and is within an area of Flood Zone 3 where analysis within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates a risk of particularly deep flooding in the event of a breach in the defences. The western and northern sections of the development boundary have a notably different character and are more visually exposed, well-treed, lack pedestrian footways and have virtually no services and a sense of rural seclusion and tranquillity. Consequently, none of the areas are considered suitable for intensification or a continued development boundary.</p>

	<p>The main reason for removing the development boundary at Winchelsea Beach relates to flood risk. The settlement is almost entirely in Flood Zone 3 and analysis within the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates a potentially high level of flood hazard in the event of a future breach of the sea wall. In accordance with the national 'exception test' for flood risk, it is considered there are other locations within the District where it is more appropriate to promote more intensive development, while there would be no over-riding sustainability benefits to the community in doing so in Winchelsea Beach.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
--	--

Chapter 8: Overview

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
Overview: Policy OVE1	
<i>Development targets</i>	
Support the development targets identified (Rye Town Council).	Noted.
With reference to the margin of over-provision of homes proposed, the transport evidence should examine the maximum that sites can be developed to without unacceptable impacts on the strategic and local road networks or the points at which there is a requirement for mitigation to bring about a “nil detriment” (Highways England).	<p>Noted. The transport modelling that has been carried out for Bexhill and the edges of Hastings, where potential issues were identified, considers actual capacity of sites. This shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments.</p> <p>Elsewhere also, consultations have related to estimated site capacities.</p> <p>The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
Based on the strategy presented it is considered there would be no overall significant or direct effect on the area comprising Tunbridge Wells borough (Tunbridge Wells Borough Council).	Noted.
Geographical and economic analysis should be used in deciding where to build new houses rather than leaving it to a system of arbitrary targets (shown by Figure 17). The current system ends up targeting rural or semi-rural areas resulting in new car-based estates, contrary to the NPPF’s promotion of healthy lifestyles and active travel. Allocating sites while taking no account of local infrastructure, employment	<p>The distribution of development, including housing, was determined through the adopted Core Strategy, itself based on extensive work and subject to independent examination.</p> <p>Regard was given to infrastructure and services, amongst other planning considerations, in setting housing targets; similar assessments are done for individual sites.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

<p>opportunities and services is wrong.</p> <p>Figure 17 includes a reference to 58 dwellings from large sites in Northiam, however this planning permission is not coming forward and therefore the figure should be 0.</p>	<p>There is a planning permission for 58 dwellings on 'Land south of The Paddock/Goddens Gill'. However, footnote 54 acknowledges that the planning permission for 58 dwellings is a specialised scheme which is not progressing. Consequently, 52 units is regarded as a more reasonable estimate for the site, meaning the residual requirement for Northiam is calculated at 6 dwellings.</p> <p>This site is reallocated in the Plan for 52 age-restricted dwellings, or 36 houses (Policy NOR2). The former number, together with the other allocation of 6 dwellings, would meet the outstanding requirement, although it is accepted that if built out for 36 houses, then there would be a shortfall against the Northiam housing target of 16 dwellings. The relative prospects of the respective options coming forward will be further assessed prior to the Examination.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p>In Figure 17 the figure for large site requirements should be increased by 20% to address the historic undersupply and the properly assessed housing need for the District.</p>	<p>There will be an element of over-provision relative to the Core Strategy's housing requirement, of some 10%, by virtue of the allocations in this Local Plan, together with the 'made' and submitted and assuming that the emerging Neighbourhood Plans meet their minimum requirements.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is achieved without any allowance for large windfall sites (of 6+ dwellings). These are shown, through AMRs, to contribute materially to total supply and, while many such sites may now be identified through the respective Plans, it is inevitable that some such sites will continue to come forward in line with relevant policies, providing some additional buffer.</p> <p>It is noted that there is a high number of permitted dwellings relative to completion rates, suggesting that the issue of under-delivery relates more to wider market conditions. In any event, the Council is preparing an Action Plan to identify reasons for under-delivery and to promote an increase in build rates of identified sites.</p> <p>An arbitrary increase in housing allocations by 20% is not warranted; there is no sound basis for distributing such an increase, which would likely take the DaSA out of general conformity with the Core Strategy and conflict with other policies, notably to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>[As an aside, it is noted that a 20% buffer has been applied to the 5-year housing land supply</p>

	<p>calculation since April 2016.]</p> <p>While it is appreciated that housing needs may well increase going forward, the DaSA is prepared as a “part 2” Local Plan to the Core Strategy; as such, it is required to be in general conformity with that strategic Local Plan. A Review of the Core Strategy, which will take into account the new ‘standard methodology’ for identifying housing needs is already underway. It would be premature to make assumptions about the outcome of that process through the DaSA.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The plan should acknowledge that in avoiding areas of flood risk and ensuring appropriate drainage, the quantum of growth set within individual allocation policies may need to be reduced in some instances, therefore, suggest the terms “approximately” or “circa” are used prior to the stated amount of residential development (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Account has been taken of flood risk from all sources and made due allowance for SuDS in considering site capacities.</p> <p>The terms suggested in relation to development quantum are not materially different from ‘some’ which is already used.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The reliance on Neighbourhood Plans to deliver the “balance” of development required and a buffer is not sound.</p>	<p>The progress of Neighbourhood Plans is highlighted at paragraph 8.10. This can be updated in due course. However, it would undermine neighbourhood planning to allocate sites for development where Neighbourhood Plans are in preparation. Paragraph 185 of the 2012 NPPF states: <i>‘Local planning authorities should avoid duplicating planning processes for non-strategic policies where a neighbourhood plan is in preparation.’</i></p> <p>This Local Plan, together with the made, submitted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans, identifies sufficient sites to enable the Core Strategy housing requirement to be met, and likely exceeded by some 10%, within the Plan period – the “flexibility buffer” suggested in one representation.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy OVE1 – Housing supply and delivery pending plans</i></p>	
<p>Support the policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

<p>The section which suggests planning applications will be favourably considered until such time a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is in force could encourage developers to rush through planning applications in order to pre-date NPs, and should be deleted (Burwash Parish Council).</p>	<p>This policy provision is essential as full Neighbourhood Plan coverage is not yet in place. Appropriate safeguards are included, notably in terms of references to other Plan policies, to resist wholly inappropriate schemes.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy creates a degree of uncertainty. RDC should seek to plan for the full Core Strategy requirements, with a sufficient overprovision to account for the historic undersupply and for sites that do not come forward or under-deliver. Further sites should be allocated in the DaSA.</p>	<p>The policy actually removes some potential uncertainty regarding the approach to development in areas where Neighbourhood Plans are not yet in place. This Local Plan, together with the made, submitted and emerging Neighbourhood Plans, identifies sufficient sites to enable the Core Strategy housing requirement to be met, and likely exceeded by some 10%, within the Plan period.</p> <p>Furthermore, this is achieved without any allowance for large windfall sites (of 6+ dwellings). These are shown, through AMRs, to contribute materially to total supply and, while many such sites may now be identified through the respective Plans, it is inevitable that some such sites will continue to come forward in line with relevant policies, providing some additional buffer.</p> <p>It is further noted that there is a high number of permitted dwellings relative to completion rates, suggesting that the issue of under-delivery relates more to wider market conditions.</p> <p>It would undermine neighbourhood planning to allocate sites for development where Neighbourhood Plans are in preparation. Paragraph 185 of the 2012 NPPF states: <i>'Local planning authorities should avoid duplicating planning processes for non-strategic policies where a neighbourhood plan is in preparation.'</i></p> <p>For the above reasons, there is no need to allocate further sites (subject to the suggested main modifications proposed elsewhere).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Objectively Assessed Need (OAN) for housing that the Core Strategy is based on is out of date.</p>	<p>It is the Core Strategy that sets the housing requirement for Rother district over the period up to 2028. This is still an up-to-date Local Plan and the DaSA Local Plan is prepared to be in general conformity with it.</p>

<p>The housing requirement has not been kept under review, as required by the Core Strategy Inspector. It is clear the LPA is supplying a significant amount of dwellings below their current OAN. Housing provision needs to significantly increase in all settlements across the district and a 20% buffer onto the 5 year housing land supply is required due to the persistent under-delivery of housing, meaning the total in Policy OVE1 should be increased from 5,700 to 6,840. Policy OVE1 is unsound as it does not meet the development need, is contrary to national policy, and the evidence base is out of date.</p>	<p>Hence, it is not accepted that the housing requirement is out of date.</p> <p>It is nonetheless accepted that there is a need for an urgent review of the Core Strategy; this is underway.</p> <p>This Review will further consider the capacity of the district for further housing, and the infrastructure necessary to support it.</p> <p>It is premature to put forward an arbitrary increase in housing allocations by 20% ahead of that Review; there is no sound basis for distributing such an increase, which would likely take the DaSA out of general conformity with the Core Strategy and conflict with other national and local policies, notably to conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
--	--

Chapter 9: Bexhill

Views expressed in representation	RDC response including any proposed changes
Context	
Limited retail investment and high business rates do not support town centres.	Noted, however this is outside the remit of the planning system. No change proposed.
<i>Development Provisions and Development Boundary</i>	
Land at Clavering Walk should be allocated for up to 99 homes and the settlement boundary revised to include the site.	<p>This site was assessed for the DaSA Options and Preferred Options (2016) and the SHLAA (2013) – site reference BX51.</p> <p>This site is not considered suitable for development. The site has multiple environmental and on-site constraints, including being adjacent to international and national nature conservation sites (Ramsar and SSSI). In addition, a significant proportion of the site is subject to flood risk. The site is predominantly rural in character and development would be an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside, out of character with the surrounding area, contrary to Policies OSS4 and EN1 of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Consideration has been previously made to the inclusion of a smaller area of development outside of the area of flood risk, however this was still considered to be an unacceptable intrusion into the open countryside and out of character with the surrounding area. Therefore, this site is not considered suitable for development.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Support the policy as it is important that Sidley sports ground is retained for recreational use and not for housing.	<p>The DaSA does not allocate this site for housing.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Support para. 9.14 as it acknowledges the importance of facilities in Sidley	Noted.
Land at Sandhurst Lane, Bexhill (Pond Field) should be allocated for residential development.	<p>This site was assessed in the Council’s Consultation Statement and in Sustainability Appraisal – BX134.</p> <p>Sandhurst Lane is a narrow country lane which is rural in character, the site is located on a bend</p>

	<p>in the lane and it would be difficult to achieve a satisfactory access for the scale of development promoted. Sandhurst Lane would not be suitable for large scale development and such intensification of the Lane would not be appropriate. The site forms part of the pleasant rural fringes of Bexhill and is more associated with the adjacent countryside. Pond Field is not considered suitable for residential development.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Paragraphs 9.18 and 9.19 should be modified to reflect appeal decision APP/01430/W/17/3191063 which granted outline planning permission for residential development south of Barnhorn Road. Sites granted permission beyond the base date of the DaSA are included as allocations (e.g. BEX1), so this site should also be included as a housing site and within the development boundary.</p>	<p>It is noted that the site 'land south of Barnhorn Road' was granted outline planning permission on appeal (All matters reserved except for access).</p> <p>The outline permission includes a condition which requires that details of a surface water drainage scheme (Sustainable Drainage Systems - SuDS) be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. This requirement is necessary to prevent adverse effects, both during construction and during the normal operation of the development upon completion. It is not possible to determine at this point the extent of built development on the site and what area will be set aside for the SuDS (although it is assumed that they would be located on the southern end of the site).. Any proposed extension would be arbitrary given that the extent of built development on the site is now known.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy BEX1: Land at Levetts Wood and Oaktree Farm, Sidley, Bexhill</p>	
<p>Support criteria (iv) and (vii) but the policy should require a buffer of at least 15 metres between the development and ancient woodland.</p>	<p>It is accepted that some policies have varying references to Ancient Woodland buffers, essentially reflecting their context. In this case, criterion (v) refers to '<i>... woodland belts and buffers ... as indicated on the Detail Map;</i>' The Detail Map (Figure 19) identifies the 'Ancient Woodland Buffer'. Therefore, while an additional criterion may be included, it is not regarded as necessary to protect the Ancient Woodland and would overlap the existing criterion. A minor amendment to the text is preferred:</p> <p><u>Proposed Change:</u> Add the following sentence at the end of paragraph 9.25: '<i>A buffer of at least 15m should be retained between development and the adjacent Ancient Woodland.</i>'</p>
<p>BEX1,BEX2, BEX3a, BEXb and</p>	<p>As noted in the supporting text, sites BEX1 and BEX2 have been the subject of planning</p>

<p>BEX3c should be considered holistically to take account of the ecosystems being provided by these areas.</p>	<p>permissions granted a little after the base date of the Local Plan. It was not considered reasonable to add more wide-ranging requirements into those policies. However, insofar as the sites covered by BEX1 and BEX2 were considered together in the 2006 Local Plan and the subsequent SPD, their overall relationship to ecosystems has been addressed already. Policy BEX3 draws together three sites in order to ensure full regard to overall infrastructure needs – see responses to BEX3.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>BEX1, BEX2, BEX3a, BEXb and BEX3c should be considered in terms of green infrastructure provision and a green infrastructure strategy for these sites should be developed.</p>	<p>The above response applies similarly to this matter. In fact, it is pointed out that the ‘green corridor’ provision in criterion (v) of policy BEX3 (which is also reflected in policies BEXa-c) highlights that it is seen as part of a wider, integrated approach to GI extend to the policy BEX1 site and beyond.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Development boundary drawn too tightly to the northern side of NBAR which would create a number of constrained fields too small for commercial or agricultural use.</p>	<p>Noted, although agricultural accesses have been generally provided to these fields. Smaller fields are fairly typical of the High Weald. It is doubted that there is no agricultural value of the fields. There is also the potential, subject to planning permission, for equestrian uses in accordance with policy DCO2.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Development boundary is in conflict with policies GD1 and DS1 of the Local Plan and Policy OSS2 of the Core Strategy.</p>	<p>Initially, it should be noted that policies GD1 and DS1 referred to were saved policies from the 2006 Local Plan which were superseded upon adoption of the Core Strategy.</p> <p>It is not accepted that the development boundary conflicts with Core Strategy policy OSS2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criterion (i) requires regard to the existing pattern of settlements and important gaps between them. <p>The development boundary reflects the existing and approved pattern of development as well as the Strategic Gap between Bexhill and Hastings/St Leonards, as defined by policy DEN3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Criterion (ii) refers to the setting of individual towns, while criterion (viii) indicates that development boundaries should normally follow physical features. <p>These criteria lend clear support to the containment of the urban area in this locality by the new North Bexhill Access Road. [NB The adopted Local Plan similarly defined the road as the</p>

	<p>outer edge of development; hence, there is no legitimate expectation of development to the north.]</p> <p>- In relation to criterion (iv), it is noted that sufficient land has already been identified to meet development needs, including for business development and that much of this is yet to be built out.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Should be noted that the NBAR is the natural gravity drainage corridor for Southern Water’s foul drainage.</p>	<p>Noted. Southern Water is currently undertaking an assessment of the most appropriate route for a new strategic drainage scheme to serve the north of the town, including land at BEX1, the findings of which are due shortly.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Land north of NBAR should be identified for mix of employment, leisure and sports facilities.</p>	<p>The NBAR provides a clear edge between the urban area and the countryside to the north, as stated in the Local Plan (para. 9.17). The new road is regarded in the Plan to be an effective defensible limit to further development, with the pastoral and wooded landscape to the north offering a valuable, attractive rural setting to the town itself (para 9.41).</p> <p>Furthermore, some of the land suggested for development also falls within the Strategic Gap between Bexhill and Hastings/St Leonards. An overlapping part is also set aside as an ‘ecological mitigation area’ for NBAR.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the land performs poorly in terms of conserving and enhancing biodiversity and conserving the natural environment, although the provision of new sports facilities would assist in promoting the health and well-being of those in the local area.</p> <p>The 2006 Local Plan similarly contains the allocated business area south of the new road. While the NBAR follows joins Combe Valley Way a little further south than envisaged in the 2006 Local Plan, the amount of employment land provided under policy BEX1 is actually more than previously identified.</p> <p>The land to the north of NBAR relates more to the countryside beyond. It is considered that development north of NBAR is not appropriate as it lacks the containment which will be achieved with the proposed allocation and results in an increased negative landscape impact.</p>

	No change proposed.
Object to the land between NBAR and Coombe Valley being in the strategic gap as this is suitable for employment and development is already restricted by Combe Haven SSSI, the AONB and Pevensy Levels SAC.	This objection is addressed in the Environment chapter under policy DEN3.
Policy seeks to impose restrictions beyond those already determined at outline planning permission stage- (RR/2017/2181/P).	<p>This appears to be a reference to criterion (vi) of the policy and paragraph 9.27, which refer to contributing to the development of an overarching foul drainage strategy for the area.</p> <p>The need for this has been recognised by Southern Water, which is currently developing a scheme, as well as be all local landowners and developers who have come together with the Council and Southern Water to promote this.</p> <p>While temporary solutions have been accepted, such as under the outline permission referred to, in order to avoid delays to economic growth, this does not detract from the need to achieve a strategic drainage solution, for the proper infrastructure planning of the area.</p> <p>In the light of the acceptance of temporary solutions, it is agreed that paragraph 9.27 should be amended to omit reference to the introduction of this scheme prior to occupation.</p> <p><u>Proposed Change:</u> Delete the words '<i>prior to occupation</i>' from paragraph 9.27.</p>
Policy places unrealistic obligations on the developer. Suggest removal of all obligations to work with Southern Water to deliver sewerage infrastructure - there is no planning justification to rely on this provider.	<p>See above response. Southern Water is uniquely placed to deliver a strategic drainage scheme.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The planning permission includes B2 use but the policy states that development will be predominantly falling within Class B1.	The opportunity for some B2 development is allowed within the scope of the planning permission RR/2017/2181/P, but it is nonetheless expected that the majority of development will fall within class B1, in line the business floorspace needs of the locality.

	No change proposed.
Policy BEX2: Land at Preston Hall Farm, Sidley, Bexhill	
Support criteria (iv) and (vii) but the policy should require a buffer of at least 15metres between the development and ancient woodland. New policy wording suggested.	<p>It is accepted that some policies have varying references to Ancient Woodland buffers, essentially reflecting their context. In this case, criterion (iv) refers to ‘... <i>existing landscaped boundaries around the site, as indicated on the Detail Map ..</i>’ The Detail Map (Figure 20) identifies the ‘Ancient Woodland Buffer’. Therefore, while an additional criterion may be included, it is not regarded as necessary to protect the Ancient Woodland and would overlap the existing criterion. A minor amendment to the text is preferred:</p> <p><u>Proposed Change:</u> Amend the Last sentence of paragraph 9.34 to read:</p> <p><i>In addition, a central greenspace incorporating the pond with a children’s play space should be provided for, as well as landscaping throughout the site, including the provision of buffer zones of at least 15m to the ancient woodland to the north and south, and ecological mitigation will also be required.</i></p>
We are satisfied that there are sufficient references in BEX2 (v), alongside Core Strategy Policies, to protecting and enhancing historic character and heritage assets. (Historic England)	Noted.
Policy BEX3: Land at North Bexhill – Infrastructure	
Support the policy	Noted.
BEX3 should also refer to Policies BEX1 & BEX2 as they are functionally linked to BEX3a, b & c.	<p>Whilst it is acknowledged that these sites are adjacent to the North Bexhill Access Road (NBAR) and existing/proposed footpaths, these are not functional requirements for BEX3. Connections with green networks between BEX1, BEX2 and BEX3 are considered complementary. In any event, both BEX1 & BEX3 have received planning permission post 1st April 2018 (base date of the DaSA)</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

<p>The strategic approach to the creation of ecological networks and green infrastructure should be included within the policy and applied more widely.</p>	<p>Criteria (v) of Policy BEX3 sets out the need for an integrated approach to establishing a multi-functional 'green corridor' through the entire North Bexhill allocation.</p> <p>In addition, Policy DEN4 (Biodiversity and Green Space) would require this site to produce a Green Infrastructure masterplan as part of proposals due to their size.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy context should be re-worded to ensure that it is clear that 'nil detriment' (no worse than otherwise) is provided where the cumulative impact is 'severe' i.e the network is taken or is already over capacity (Highways England).</p>	<p>Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments.</p> <p>The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>It should be noted that works to the SRN will be via a Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 agreement and not a Section 106 of The 1990 Town & Country Planning Act agreement (Highways England)</p>	<p>Noted. Clarification will be added to the final paragraph of Policy BEX3:</p> <p><i>The above shared infrastructure requirements shall be implemented by a combination of direct provision and legal (s106 and s278) agreements attached to the respective development proposals.</i></p>
<p>Policy BEX3c imposes a traffic calming requirement (criteria iii b) but Policy BEX3b doesn't. A minor modification should be made to Policy BEX3 and BEX3c, in that the criteria in Policy BEX3c (iii) (b) regarding traffic management is deleted from BEX3c and is instead written into the shared infrastructure policy (Policy BEX3). (East Sussex County Council)</p>	<p>Noted. The requirements for traffic management relate specifically to sites BEX3b and BEX3c. Therefore, it is proposed to amend Policy BEX3b to clarify – see proposed amendments below.</p>
<p>Policy BEX3a: Kiteye farm and adjoining land</p>	
<p>Land west of Ninfield Road should be included within the allocation – no</p>	<p>Land to the west of Ninfield Road is not considered appropriate for inclusion within the allocation. The Sustainability Appraisal details how development to the west of the A269 would erode the</p>

clear justification for its removal.	<p>countryside setting of this part of Bexhill and the green gap to The Thorne.</p> <p>The area west of Ninfield Road is considered part of the rural gap on the fringes between Bexhill and Lunsford Cross/The Thorne. Development in this location would expand built development and increase the size of the settlement at Lunsford Cross/The Thorne. This would compromise the purposes of RA2 and EN2 to seek to protect the rural character and open landscapes between defined settlements, substantially changing the character of the area in this location. In landscape terms, this area forms part of the countryside rural fringe between settlements and is an important location gap to which paragraph 107 promotes protection. It should also be noted that development in location was previously dismissed on appeal (APP/U1430/W/16/3163559 refers).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The policy should specifically require a 15m buffer to the adjacent ancient woodland.	<p>There is not any ancient woodland in close proximity to development proposed within BEX3a.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The land proposed to be allocated for playing fields would be better utilised as additional housing within the policy area.	<p>The level of development proposed across BEX3 triggers a requirement to provide just under two playing pitches for outdoor sport. The area identified to accommodate this requirement not only has the scope to physically accommodate these playing pitches but the area identified is not considered suitable for housing given its exposure in the wider landscape.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy BEX3b: Land west of Watermill Lane	
The policy should specifically require a 15m buffer to the adjacent ancient woodland.	<p>Noted. A 15m buffer is shown on the Detail Map which accompanies the Policy, however it is considered appropriate to explicitly state in the policy that this buffer is required. Therefore it is proposed to amend policy criteria (iv):</p> <p><i>(iv) trees on the western boundary are retained and safeguarded, <u>alongside a buffer to protect the Ancient Woodland of at least 15m depth;</u></i></p>
Policy BEX3c imposes a traffic calming requirement (criteria iii b) but Policy BEX3b doesn't. A minor modification should be made to Policy	<p>Noted. The requirements for traffic management relate specifically to sites BEX3b and BEX3c. Therefore it is proposed to amend Policy BEX3b to clarify:</p> <p><i>iii) access is from Watermill Lane, the details of which will be subject to a findings of a Transport</i></p>

<p>BEX3 and BEX3c, in that the criteria in Policy BEX3c (iii) (b) regarding traffic management is deleted from BEX3c and is instead written into the shared infrastructure policy (Policy BEX3). (East Sussex County Council)</p>	<p><i>Assessment, with the expectation that:</i> <i>(a) A single access will be provided where appropriate sight lines can be achieved;</i> <i>(b) <u>traffic management measures are introduced on Watermill Lane to calm traffic, with specific regard to the short section north of Mayo Lane and to ensure the safe movement of pedestrians and cyclists between the site and Sidley in association with the provision of a new footway/cycleway</u> Provision is made for a new footway/cycleway along most of the length of the Lane from the Mayo Lane junction to the stream (to dovetail with requirements under Policy BEX3c);</i></p>
<p>The land proposed to be allocated for playing fields/open space would be better utilised as additional housing within the policy area.</p>	<p>The level of development proposed across BEX3 triggers a requirement to provide just under two playing pitches for outdoor sport. The area identified to accommodate this requirement not only has the scope to physically accommodate these playing pitches but the area identified is not considered suitable for housing given its exposure in the wider landscape.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The proposed footpath crosses Mayo Rise which is privately owned and would require the removal of some trees. Mayo Rise onto Ninfield Road is an accident blackspot.</p>	<p>It is our understanding that there are rights of access over Mayo Rise to access the site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The amount of housing proposed will have an impact on horse owners in the area through the loss of grassland.</p>	<p>However the land is considered suitable for housing and required to meet the identified housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Sidley does not have the infrastructure to cope with the proposed housing.</p>	<p>The infrastructure providers (CCG, schools etc) have not indicated that existing local infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed allocations at North Bexhill.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy BEX3c: Land east of Watermill Lane</p>	
<p>Policy BEX3c imposes a traffic calming requirement (criteria iii b) but Policy BEX3b doesn't. A minor modification should be made to Policy BEX3 and BEX3c, in that the criteria in</p>	<p>Noted. The requirements for traffic management relate specifically to sites BEX3b and BEX3c. Therefore it is proposed to amend Policy BEX3b to clarify as detailed above.</p>

Policy BEX3c (iii) (b) regarding traffic management is deleted from BEX3c and is instead written into the shared infrastructure policy (Policy BEX3). (East Sussex County Council)	
Sidley does not have the infrastructure to cope with the proposed housing.	The infrastructure providers (CCG, schools etc) have not indicated that existing local infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed allocations at North Bexhill. No change proposed.
Loss of wildlife and countryside is detrimental to wellbeing of those in the area.	However the land is considered suitable for housing and required to meet the identified housing requirements set out in the Core Strategy. No change proposed.
Object to the siting of a traveller site in this location.	Noted.
The traveller pitch area is needed for NBAR landscape mitigation.	It is the Council's understanding that this land is not land set aside for mitigation from the North Bexhill Access Road, as the balancing pond which was previously identified here has been moved further west over the other side of Watermill Lane. No change proposed.
Movement of caravans will affect traffic flow.	However, the issue of caravan movements have not been raised as an issue by ESCC. The southern end of Watermill Lane is now severed by the North Bexhill Access Road meaning there is no through traffic north bound. Any impact of caravan movements would be minimal. No change proposed.
The traveller site is bounded on three sides by separate land ownership.	However, land ownership plans show that there is an existing highway access via a field gate access from Watermill Lane to the field to the rear of Preston Cottage. No change proposed.
The allocation does not give a timescale for provision and as such there is no commitment to provide a 5 year supply of traveller pitches.	The site is identified to meet the outstanding requirement for Gypsy and Traveller pitches as set out in the Core Strategy (taking into account what has been granted planning permission in the interim). No change proposed.

Watermill Lane is unsuitable for use by large vehicles and caravans.	No objections have been raised by the Highway Authority in this regard. No change proposed.
The siting of a traveller site here would not meet the needs of travellers.	The site is identified as suitable for site Gypsies and Travellers, as part of the wider allocation for housing and open space, as part of a sustainable urban extension. No change proposed.
Public consultation has been inadequate.	The consultation process adheres to the relevant regulations which detail how the consultation process should be carried out. The consultation is also carried out in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement.
The plans are very poor.	Whilst it is appreciated that the North Bexhill Access Road is not shown on the relevant maps, the new road does not yet been included on the Ordnance Survey base mapping. However, the relevant maps are proposed to be updated to show the indicative route of the North Bexhill Access Road. The following maps will be updated to show the route of NBAR – Figure 19: Policy BEX1 Detail Map, Figure 21: Policy BEX3a Detail Map, Figure 23: Policy BEX3c Detail Map and Policies Map Inset Map 1b: Bexhill North.
If the site will have no visual impact why would planting be required?	It is typical that development of any type is screened from wider views by planting. No change proposed.
The site is too close to existing and proposed housing and will cause conflict with residents.	The site is proposed as permanent site for Gypsies and Travellers, rather than a transit or emergency stopping place. Therefore, like other sites within the District, will be a permanent base for Gypsies and Travellers to travel from. The sites proximity to existing and future residents is not considered inappropriate.
Clearing rubbish would be a burden on the Council's finances.	
Possible anti-social behaviour and crime.	
The site will put extra strain on schools and health services.	The infrastructure providers (CCG, schools etc) have not indicated that existing local infrastructure will not be able to cope with the proposed allocations at North Bexhill. No change proposed.
Allocating a traveller site to cover the entirety of a single ownership would be	It is the Council's understanding that this land is not land set aside for mitigation from the North Bexhill Access Road, as the balancing pond which was previously identified here has been

detrimental to viability of delivery of the development.	<p>moved further west over the other side of Watermill Lane.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Support the allocation, although land to the north of NBAR should also be included for a further 25 units and a cricket pitch/pavilion.	<p>The NBAR provides a clear edge between the urban area and the countryside to the north, as stated in the Local Plan (para. 9.17). The new road is regarded in the Plan to be an effective defensible limit to further development, with the pastoral and wooded landscape to the north offering a valuable, attractive rural setting to the town itself (para 9.41).</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the land performs poorly in terms of conserving and enhancing biodiversity and conserving the natural environment, although the provision of new sports facilities would assist in promoting the health and well-being of those in the local area. The adjacent residential development would result in an isolated enclave of housing which is car dependent and some distance from local services.</p> <p>In summary, the land to the north of NBAR relates more to the countryside beyond, while development north of NBAR lacks the containment which will be achieved with the proposed allocation and results in an increased negative landscape impact.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The accompanying map is incorrect, does not show the access road and roundabout. The farm track is unclear.	<p>Whilst it is appreciated that the North Bexhill Access Road is not shown on the relevant maps, the new road does not yet been included on the Ordnance Survey base mapping. However, the relevant maps are proposed to be updated to show the indicative route of the North Bexhill Access Road.</p> <p>The following maps will be updated to show the route of NBAR – Figure 19: Policy BEX1 Detail Map, Figure 21: Policy BEX3a Detail Map, Figure 23: Policy BEX3c Detail Map and Policies Map Inset Map 1b: Bexhill North.</p>
A transport assessment should have been undertaken as part of the process.	<p>A transport assessment has been undertaken and was published alongside the Proposed Submission DaSA.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The map should include NBAR.	<p>Whilst it is appreciated that the North Bexhill Access Road is not shown on the relevant maps, the new road does not yet been included on the Ordnance Survey base mapping. However, the relevant maps are proposed to be updated to show the indicative route of the North Bexhill</p>

<p>The proposed access points are not appropriate.</p>	<p>Access Road.</p> <p>Access to land at Kiteye Farm should be via Ninfield Road where the modern farmhouse fronting Ninfield Road may be demolished to widen the existing farm access, although access to the bulk of the site north of the stream course may alternatively be gained directly from NBAR.</p> <p>Towards Sidley, the area between Ninfield Road and Watermill Lane (three grazed fields situated between properties on the west side of Mayo Lane and the Allotment Gardens) need to be off Watermill Lane, with the use of Mayo Rise restricted to cycle and pedestrian use, which should be facilitated through the development to Watermill Lane.</p> <p>The area east of Watermill Lane between NBAR and the valley. Whilst this area may be possible to be directly accessed off NBAR, this would produce a relatively isolated development, especially in terms of access to local services. Therefore, preference is for access to be off Watermill Lane, although this will need to be assessed in more detail as part of a planning application.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The pedestrian/cycleway links are not appropriate.</p>	<p>It is not clear why the proposed footpath/cycleways are considered inappropriate but it is clear that good connectivity for pedestrians and cyclists is important for new residents in the locality. The developments should provide new and enhanced routes from the built-up area to main destinations, notably Sidley, the new business developments, larger recreational areas, the Countryside Park further to the east and the wider countryside. The green corridor along the valley bottom will be the main artery for sustainable travel, with playing pitches, natural amenity spaces and play areas accessible from it.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy BEX4: Land at Former High School Site and Drill Hall, Down Road, Bexhill</p>	
<p>Agree with point (v) regarding transport assessment. We recommend that there should be a master plan/design brief as the uses are specific. Sustainable transport/connectivity should be a key</p>	<p>The final paragraph in the policy confirms the requirement that development of the site should be through a comprehensive masterplans for the site.</p> <p>Policy criteria (v) sets out that the need for a transport assessment considering the proposed vehicular access and linkages to the wider transport infrastructure that supports local accessibility for both cyclist and pedestrians are</p>

feature. The main impact will be on the trunk road. (East Sussex County Council)	incorporated No change proposed
We are satisfied that there are sufficient references in BEX4 (vi), alongside Core Strategy Policies, to protecting and enhancing historic character and heritage assets. (Historic England)	Noted.
The need remains for recognition that there is limited waste water capacity at this site at the “practical point of connection” and this could lead to an increased risk of flooding. Proposed amendment to policy BEX4 in line with NPPF and PPG to include “(ix) occupation of the development is phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in liaison with the service provider”. (Southern Water)	<p>Noted. This issue was not identified by Southern Water at the ‘Options and Preferred Options’ stage (and is an issue which is newly raised). However, it is acknowledged that as wastewater capacity is limited, a new policy criteria and supporting text should be included. Therefore the following changes are proposed:</p> <p>New paragraph at between 9.60 and 9.61 (and subsequent consequential paragraph number amendments):</p> <p><i>“Additional reinforcement of the sewerage network will be required to serve the development and therefore, the developer will need to work with Southern Water to ensure necessary infrastructure is provided prior to occupation”</i></p> <p>Additional policy criteria added between (ii) and (iii) to the policy BEX4 (and subsequent consequential criteria number amendments):</p> <p><i>“Provision is made for an acceptable connection to the local sewerage system, in agreement with the service provider”</i></p>
A hotel in the Bexhill seafront cultural area or south of the railway line would be more appropriate.	<p>Whilst the cultural area identified within the DaSA is a focus for cultural activities, it is recognised that there are limited opportunities for a budget hotel within the town centre. The Council’s Hotel & Visitor Accommodation Futures Report recognises this.</p> <p>The Former High School site is considered an appropriate allocation for leisure and associated facilities, involving the redevelopment of the existing leisure centre alongside the relocation of the swimming pool from Ravenside. A hotel in this location is considered an appropriate complementary use to create this leisure destination.</p>

	No change proposed.
The size of the hotel should take into consideration the impact on existing holiday accommodation.	<p>Policy EC7 of the Core Strategy only requires an impact assessment where retail sites are more than 500sqm, therefore this would not apply to hotel use (C1 use class). The NPPF requires an impact assessment on town centre uses (which includes hotels) on developments of over 2,500sqm. If a scheme was brought forward of that scale then an impact assessment would be needed.</p> <p>In any event, it is likely that a budget hotel in this location will appeal to a different market than those of hotels and B&Bs along Bexhill seafront and within the town centre.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Will there be doctors' surgeries available for new residents?	<p>The 'NHS Hastings and Rother CCG' have not raised any objections or concerns with regard to new developments in Bexhill. They have advised that there are no particular capacity problems for GP surgeries in Rother.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Access on Downs Road is very narrow and is a safety hazard to school pupils and vehicles, particularly during construction.	<p>Any planning application will require a transport assessment to consider the vehicular access along with wider transport infrastructure in line with the Policy requirements to ensure safety is appropriately considered. If necessary, a planning condition can be included within any permission, requiring the use of a traffic management or construction management plan to be agreed prior to commencement of any scheme to ensure safety is adequately considered.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Policy BEX5: Land at Gullivers Bowls Club, Knole Road, Bexhill	
We are satisfied that there are sufficient references in BEX5 (v), alongside Core Strategy Policies, to protecting and enhancing historic character and heritage assets. (Historic England)	Noted.
It is not clear why this is allocated for sheltered housing. Policy BEX8 is	The overall aim for the Core Strategy is to achieve mixed and balanced communities providing for a range of housing types and tenures. Sheltered housing is one element of providing a

<p>more suitable.</p>	<p>diverse housing market. The ESCC Bedded Care Strategy identifies a need for housing for older people, of which sheltered is one such product.</p> <p>The site is allocated for sheltered housing based on the previous planning application which was submitted for that use. The site is well related to the town centre and other associated services such as doctors. The walking routes to the town centre are flat. There are also nearby bus services connecting to the town and wider transport network within walking distance. The train station is also within a reasonable walking distance. It is therefore reasonable that the site is allocated for sheltered housing.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy is not robust and should be altered to read “(i) some 40 flats are provided of which 30% are affordable (v) the design of the scheme with a maximum of 4 storeys should be of the highest architectural quality.”</p>	<p>The current figure of some 39 sheltered dwellings is based on a scheme that was previously considered appropriate for this quantum of development. Some 39 units are considered a realistic figure based on the previous planning permission (although now quashed).</p> <p>Development here would need to have regard to its surrounding context and it is not considered necessary to specifically refer to a maximum height of buildings, which may be too prescriptive. Part (v) of the Policy requires the design of the scheme to not adversely affect the character of the area or the setting of the listed terrace. In addition, other existing Core Strategy policies would be also be relevant in this regard (such as BX2 (v), OSS4 (iii) & (v), EN2 and EN3) in applications for new buildings.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The inclusion of the only open green space to the east of the town should not be considered for residential development.</p>	<p>The previous planning permission (RR/2014/235/P) now quashed, accepted that the disused bowling green was surplus to requirements and that upgraded facilities would be of public benefit. In addition, the Rother and Hastings Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) also acknowledges that one of the greens has been disused for over 10 years and that residential development on the site would enable the provision of an enhanced indoor bowls facility on the site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>RDCs 2006/2007 Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation study highlights Knole Road Bowling Greens as having high value to the district and the Bexhill</p>	<p>The Open Space, Sport and Recreation study recognises the quality and value of the facilities provided here. The Rother and Hastings Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) also acknowledges that one of the greens has been disused for over 10 years and that residential development on the site would enable the provision of an enhanced indoor bowls facility on the site.</p>

Local Action Plan was incorporated into the Core Strategy.	No change proposed.
With regard to 9.67, the NPPF seeks to ensure flood risk is not increased as a result of development and the suggestion that Knole Road could be developed with a number of hereditaments opposite the listed terrace with basements is a contradiction. Loss of green space would impair surface water drainage in an area with frequent cellar flooding.	<p>Criteria (vi) of the Policy requires that effective drainage is required as part of any planning permission. The previous planning application (RR/2014/235/P), now quashed, has previously accepted that whilst there has been surface accumulation of water from time to time that the site is not within a flood zone. Planning conditions were imposed which required details of water drainage works to be agreed prior to any commencement of development in consultation with Southern Water.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Paragraph 9.64 fails to state that the land is greenfield and therefore, it should be removed from the DaSA. The club is financially viable. During 2018, repairs and improvement works have been carried out.	<p>It is noted that this site is classified as greenfield land. However, it would not be possible to meet the housing targets solely on brownfield land sites in the town.</p> <p>Consultation with Gullivers Bowls Club as part of the Rother and Hastings Playing Pitch Strategy (2016) indicates that the club and indoor facilities are out of date and are in need of replacement. Criteria (ii) of Policy BEX5 sets out development of this site will be permitted where an improved bowls facility comprising of an outdoor bowls green, an indoor rink and associated clubhouse and maintenance facilities is provided.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Paragraph 9.68 is factually wrong and misleading – the Judicial Review did not remit the decision back to the council. The sentence in brackets should say “although following a successful Judicial Review the decision was quashed”.	<p>Noted, although the decision was quashed, the application currently remains ‘undecided’. For clarity, the wording of this sentence can be amended.</p> <p>Amendment proposed to the second sentence at paragraph 9.68:</p> <p><i>The Council subsequently granted a revised scheme in 2014 (although following a successful Judicial Review the decision was remitted to the Council <u>quashed</u>: to date no further decision was been made).</i></p>
Inclusion of the site contradicts policy EN5 of the Core Strategy.	<p>Core Strategy Policy EN5 refers to biodiversity and green space and is not directly relevant here.</p> <p>Criteria (i) of Policy CO3 – Improving Sports and Recreation Provision - promotes enhancements</p>

	<p>to existing facilities and states that ‘safeguarding existing facilities from development, and only permitting their loss where it results in improved provision (in terms of quantity and quality) as part of a redevelopment or elsewhere within the locality’. Therefore the allocation is compliant with the provisions set out in Policy CO3.</p> <p>No change proposed</p>
<p>Policy BEX6: Land adjacent to 276 Turkey Road, Bexhill</p>	
<p>We are opposed to the demolition of Cemetery Lodge and seek the deletion of the final sentence of para. 9.72.</p>	<p>Paragraph 9.72 states that regard should be made to the potential future redevelopment of the Cemetery Lodge Site in development layout plans. However it is considered that this reference is not necessary and should be removed.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 9.72 as follows:</p> <p><i>The site is partially contained from wider views by the boundary trees but there are more localised views into the site. There is an existing Tree Preservation Order (TPO 312) along the western and southern boundaries. Development of the site would require the protection of existing trees and hedgerows, including suitable buffers and provide for additional landscaping. Regard should be made to the potential future redevelopment of the Cemetery Lodge site, to the east of the allocation, in development layout plans.</i></p>
<p>Policy includes requirements to provide off-site highway works to make the development acceptable in highway terms. Should be noted that combined, BEX6, BEX9, BEX10 and BEX11 may have a cumulative impact of the SRN and may be required to contribute toward improvements on the wider road network. (Highways England)</p>	<p>Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments.</p> <p>The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>With regard to the Pevensey Levels, the requirement to carry out an AA that demonstrates beyond reasonable</p>	<p>Noted. Given that the site is within the Pevensey Levels hydrological catchment area, this should be required as part of the policy.</p>

<p>scientific doubt that proposals can be delivered without harming the integrity of the Pevensey Levels should be applied to this site (as done with Policy BEX9 and BEX10).</p>	<p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Additional wording to part (v) of the policy:</p> <p>(v) at least two forms of appropriate ‘Sustainable Drainage’ are incorporated in accordance with Policy DEN5 ‘Sustainable Drainage’ <u>and an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations demonstrates beyond reasonable scientific doubt that these can be delivered on the site without harming the integrity of the Pevensey Levels Special Area of Conservation/RAMSAR site.</u></p>
<p>Policy BEX7: Land at Moleynes Mead, Fryatts Way, Bexhill</p>	
<p>With regard to the Pevensey Levels, the requirement to carry out an AA that demonstrates beyond reasonable scientific doubt that proposals can be delivered without harming the integrity of the Pevensey Levels should be applied to this site (as done with Policy BEX9 and BEX10).</p>	<p>The policy already sets out the requirement for at least two stages of appropriate SuDS, which reflects the outcome of the HRA. Notwithstanding this, in light of the recent “People Over Wind” judgement and in the interests of ensuring consistency with other DaSA allocation policies, it is agreed that it is appropriate for this issue and requirement to be identified.</p> <p><u>Proposed changes:</u></p> <p>Add the following to the end of the supporting text at paragraph 9.81:</p> <p><i>‘In accordance with Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) work undertaken to inform the Core Strategy and DaSA, a minimum of two types/ stages of Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) treatment will be required to address the possible negative effects from surface run-off and hydrological pathways on the water quality in the Levels, in accordance with DaSA Policy DEN5. It will be necessary for any planning application for the site’s development to be accompanied by a site specific Appropriate Assessment to ensure that the required SuDS mitigation can be achieved and any adverse impact on the integrity of the Levels can be avoided.’</i></p> <p>Amend policy criterion (vii) to read:</p> <p><i>(vii) in accordance with Policy DEN5 ‘Sustainable Drainage’, at least two forms of appropriate SuDS are incorporated <u>and an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations demonstrates beyond reasonable scientific doubt that these can be delivered on the site and that the development can otherwise proceed, with mitigation if necessary, without harming the</u></i></p>

<i>integrity of the Pevensy Levels Special Area of Conservation/ Ramsar site.</i>	
Policy BEX8: Land south of Terminus Road, Bexhill	
Support the policy.	Noted.
RDC and potential developers should be made aware of and consider Network Rail's standard guidelines and requirements when developing sites located adjacent to or in close proximity to Network Rail's land, assets and operational railway infrastructure. (Network Rail)	Noted.
Policy BEX9: Land off Spindlewood Drive, Bexhill	
Policy includes requirements to provide off site highway works to make the development acceptable in highway terms. Should be noted that combined, BEX6, BEX9, BEX10 and BEX11 may have a cumulative impact of the SRN and may be required to contribute toward improvements on the wider road network. (Highways England)	Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments. The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.
For BEX9, the existing access onto Barnhorn Road should be upgraded and an access provided on the local road network. This is necessary to avoid 'severe' impact to Little Common Roundabout. (Highways England)	Noted. Criteria (ii) of Policy BEX9 states that access should be provided from both Spindlewood Drive and Barnhorn Road along with offsite highways works to make the development to make the site acceptable in highway terms. No change proposed.
Insufficient space at the existing access off Barnhorn Road to reduce traffic at the roundabout.	In response to the current planning application, Highways England have advised that the proposed highways improvements can be provided. Highways England have also indicated that the draft highway works design can be accommodated within highway land and/or land in control

Space from front gardens would be needed from other properties along Barnhorn Road to construct the roadway.	of the applicant. Therefore, the necessary highway improvements required under the policy are demonstrated to be achievable. No change proposed.
The plans and details submitted under RR/2017/1705/P are inaccurate in terms of the new entrance.	
Danger around the site entrance together with the ghost lane and S bend for cars, pedestrians and cyclists. In particular, these properties' driveways would be affected causing clear highway safety issues. High volumes of traffic would exacerbate this.	Criteria (ii) of Policy BEX9 states that access should be provided from both Spindlewood Drive and Barnhorn Road alongside offsite highways works to make the development acceptable in highway terms. In response to the current planning application, Highways England have indicated that they are satisfied that the proposals do not pose highway safety issues to road users, having proper regard to their own guidelines.
The Highways own guidelines have been ignored. In terms of (ii), Highways England should not relax their guidelines.	No change proposed.
The proposal to re-align the Meads Road Entry reduces the sight line, making this more dangerous.	In response to the current planning application, the highway authority is satisfied that the highway modifications will not have a harmful impact on the Meads Road junction. No change proposed.
Surrounding roads including unadopted roads are unsuitable for heavy traffic. Who will pay for their upkeep?	The surrounding roads are used by general traffic at present. Whilst any future residents may use these roads to undertake some journeys, they are not considered to be principal routes from the development (for the avoidance of doubt these unadopted roads are still public highway).
Development will create a rat-run for traffic along narrow/unadopted roads with no footpaths/verges.	No change proposed.
The proposal should not be considered until all other current developments have been completed so the full highway implications can be	This is not reasonable. Both Highways England and ESCC Highways are satisfied that both the Strategic and local Road Network can accommodate traffic from this development. No change proposed.

taken into account.	
There will be increase in traffic and associated noise and air pollution.	<p>The increase in traffic will be marginal. Noise associated with the development will be residential in nature and therefore in-keeping with the adjoining development. Currently, there are no areas in Rother where the public are exposed to levels of air pollution in excess of UK Air Quality objectives and therefore no Air Quality Management Areas have been declared.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
In terms of 9.102, figure 29 should reflect the actual application area including land either side of the access road.	<p>The Detail Map supports Policy BEX9 and shows how access would be gained from the highway from Spindlewood Drive and Barnhorn Road.</p> <p>The consideration of sight lines and any necessary works within the highway would be more appropriate to be assessed as part of a planning application.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The effect of the development on Pevensey Levels RAMSAR SSSI SAC is inevitable, long term and mitigation measures will fail.	<p>There is no reason to assume that this is the case. The Council as the competent authority has undertaken a HRA screening exercise to support the DaSA, which, after further consideration of the site through an Appropriate Assessment (AA), concludes that an adequate protective framework exists (from Policy DEN5) to ensure that the development site would not lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of any internationally designated sites. Both Natural England (NE) and Environment Agency (EA) have not raised any objection to this site's inclusion within the DaSA.</p> <p>The policy recognises that a further AA is required at application stage.</p> <p>In terms of the current planning application a full AA has been undertaken by the Council in consultation with NE and the EA, also taking into consideration public comments received, which concludes that with mitigation, the project will not have an adverse effect on the integrity of the European protected site. Natural England's view is that sufficient mitigation measures are set out and can be secured by planning conditions and/or planning obligations. The detailed design will then need to be tested again under the Habitat Regulations to ensure that the scheme continues to avoid adverse effects on the Pevensey Levels.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Regarding (xi) a competent authority must take account measures intended to avoid or mitigate harmful effects of a plan as part of an appropriate assessment. The Environment Agency and Natural England state that there is insufficient information to infer that there will be no likely significant impact.	
In light of the People over Wind Court of Justice European Union (CJEU) judgement, reliance on mitigation measures at the likely significant stage is now vulnerable to legal challenge.	
The site should not be included as an	

appropriate assessment has not been provided or approved in accordance with the Habitats Regulations.	
In terms of (xii) a road should not run through the wildlife corridor.	This part of any proposal will be subject to detailed design; however it is not considered that a road over this wildlife corridor is inappropriate in principle and a track already exists. No change proposed.
Specific steps are needed to enforce lighting guidance in areas such as the Pevensey Levels and bordering areas.	Policy DEN7 ensures that proper consideration is made to any lighting scheme submitted in support of a planning application. In any event, this is a detailed matter which would be considered at the full or detailed planning application stage. No change proposed.
Concerns regarding how the pond would be affected without rainfall and after rainfall, including overflow and impacts on surrounding water courses, Cole Stream, and fluvial ecosystem of the Pevensey Levels.	The policy requires suitable SuDS and an Appropriate Assessment. Details will be considered at the full or detailed planning application stage, in partnership with the Local Lead Flood Authority, NE and the EA. No change proposed.
SuDS scheme insufficient as advised by the EA and does not take into account climate change.	This representation appears to have been made in relation to the current planning application. The EA has subsequently withdrawn their objection. The policy includes a criteria (xi) requiring at least two forms of appropriate SuDS are incorporated into any scheme. Natural England, Environment Agency and the Local Lead Flood Authority have not raised any objection to this site's inclusion within the DaSA. No change proposed.
Policy does not specifically include binding legal agreements for maintenance of SuDS over the lifetime of development.	This is a matter which would properly be considered and addressed within a planning application and then secured through a legal agreement. No change proposed.
The site and surroundings regularly flood.	Flooding has not been identified as an issue by the relevant agencies and it is noted that the site is located within Flood Zone 1 which is the area at lowest risk of flooding. No change proposed.

<p>In terms of point (xiii) it would be visually obtrusive and overbearing and result in overlooking/loss of privacy. Loss of view is unquestionably a material planning consideration.</p>	<p>The policy sets out the requirements for residential development on the site at criteria (xiii) and regard has been made to other planning policies set out in the Local Plan, including but not limited to, Policies OSS4 and DHG7.</p> <p>In any event, this is a detailed matter which would be considered at the full or detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Lack of space between properties and roads means minimal planting/screening.</p>	<p>Whilst this appears to be a comment in reference to the current planning application, specific reference is made in the Policy at criteria (v), (vii), and (viii) with regard to boundary planting, and areas for ecological and public recreational use, ensuring that planting open space are satisfactorily achieved through any application. Policy OSS4 of the Core Strategy will also be a relevant consideration. In any event, this is a detailed matter which would be considered at the full or detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>This will increase pressure on all services eg schools, doctors, waste, water, roads.</p>	<p>Infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the consultation process in developing the Plan.</p> <p>ESCC has not indicated the need for additional school facilities (primary or secondary) as a result of this allocation. In terms of new doctor's surgeries, the Clinical Commissioning Group has not indicated that new facilities are required as a result of this allocation. However it should be noted that Barnhorn Green (Rosewood Park) includes provision in its outline planning permission for a new doctor's surgery for up to 10 GPs. Southern Water have not made representations to the DaSA which highlight that there are waste water capacity issues in this location.</p> <p>Both Highway Authorities have indicated that they raise no objections specifically to this policy or the detailed proposals which are being brought forward through the current planning application.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy does not specifically include ensuring that no pollution leaves the site during construction.</p>	<p>It is not expected that there will be any significant pollution issues on this greenfield site. However, this matter can be dealt with by an appropriate condition on any planning application granted.</p>

	No change proposed.
Adverse impact on the setting of the historic medieval farm complex Barnhorn Manor.	Given the very limited visibility of Barnhorn Manor Farm within the wider landscape, particularly from the site, and the lack of legible historic functional compositional relationship of the site with the heritage assets, it is not considered that the site is significant to the setting of the various identified heritage assets. It is not considered that the significance is dependent on the retention of the site as open agricultural land. No change proposed.
The land should be retained as farmland.	The site is considered suitable for housing. The site is well located in terms of access to services and sustainable transport methods. Development of this site would be in line with development strategy set out in the Core Strategy. No change proposed.
BEX9 is not required as the DaSA exceeds the required housing target, especially given that large windfall sites are excluded.	Whilst windfalls have made a significant proportion of completions historically, no allowances have been made for large site windfalls, as it is expected that most large sites will be identified in the Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan, as well as in the various Neighbourhood Plans However, an allowance for small windfall sites is made in the Core Strategy. Whilst there would be a small element of over provision if all the sites were built out, the NPPF encourages flexibility in Local Plans. In any event, BEX9 is considered a sustainable site for housing in accordance with the relevant planning policies. No change proposed.
We need smaller sites and to provide more housing suitable for over 65s.	The DaSA allocates a mix of sites of differing sizes. Policy DHG5 supports schemes for specialist housing for older people within the District. Policy DH4 (Accessible and Adaptable Homes) seeks all dwellings to meet higher accessibility standards allowing people, including older people, to stay in general needs housing which can be easily adapted in the future for additional mobility needs. No change proposed.
The development would be unsustainable.	Land at Spindlewood Drive is located relatively close to bus services on Barnhorn Road and Cooden Sea Road and to local shops and services at Little Common district centre. Nor is it

	<p>found to be unsustainable in other planning respects.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply to this site.</p>	<p>The Council as the competent authority has undertaken a HRA to support the DaSA, which, after further consideration of the site through an Appropriate Assessment (AA), concludes that an adequate protective framework exists (from Policy DEN5) to ensure that the development site would not lead to an adverse effect on the integrity of any internationally designated sites. Neither Natural England nor the Environment Agency have raised any objection to this site's inclusion within the DaSA. A further AA has been undertaken at outline application stage that has concluded that subject to mitigation that can be secured by conditions and/or legal obligations the project would not adversely affect the integrity of the habitats site.</p> <p>As such, it is considered that the policy positively contributes to meeting development needs of the area in line with paragraph 11a of the NPPF.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>All aspects of the allocation have been addressed in the application and it is fully deliverable.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Policy BEX10: Land at Northeys (Former UAE Technical Training Project), Bexhill</p>	
<p>While this allocation is not considered to be sustainable, we do not object to the principle of the allocation. We wish the development to make improvements to sustainable transport measures as well as seeking measures that minimise private car use.</p> <p>Request modification to the policy to require a travel plan to be submitted and approved by ESCC.</p> <p>Request amendment to (vii) as we would wish to see bus stop</p>	<p>Noted. Policy BEX10, by virtue of criteria (iii) and (vii), makes provision for the bus stop improvements, footway widening and improving crossing points as suggested. Therefore, this is regarded as sufficient to reflect the issues raised.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

<p>improvements, widening of footways and an improved crossing point. (East Sussex County Council)</p>	
<p>Policy includes requirements to provide off site highway works to make the development acceptable in highway terms. Should be noted that combined, BEX6, BEX9, BEX10 and BEX11 may have a cumulative impact of the SRN and may be required to contribute toward improvements on the wider road network. (Highways England)</p>	<p>Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments.</p> <p>The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>Loss or prejudice of the use of a playing field would be strongly resisted. The potential for a cricket or football pitch should be justified by a Playing Pitch Strategy as it is often the case that single pitch sites are unsuitable and there can be issues finding clubs/tenants to take them on.</p>	<p>Noted. The policy supports the retention of the playing pitch in line with Core Strategy Policy CO3 and the Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p>Perhaps the land should be returned to its original purpose as it was separated from Barnhorn Farm Estate in 1944 or would the UAE reopen their training school?</p>	<p>Noted. However, the landowner has previously advised that they have no plans to bring the site back into training use. The supporting text at paragraph 9.104 advises this.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Assuming that a 'no development' option may not be acceptable, we would favour a tourism or institutional led development as least intrusive to the peace of the area. Recreational areas can create a lot of noise.</p>	<p>Noted. Paragraph 9.110 advises that the Landscape Assessment of Northeye concludes that the brownfield part of the site could be suitable for housing, employment, tourism or a mix of those uses. However, there appears to be limited commercial interest for tourism or employment uses here.</p> <p>It is noted that the area identified for recreational use is some distance from existing residential properties. However, whilst recreational use can result in some noise; planning conditions can be included on any planning permission to limit impact, where necessary.</p>

	No changes proposed.
There is nothing about the effect on close neighbours or potential noise and air pollution which are the real problems.	Where a planning application is submitted for consideration for a proposed residential and playing pitch scheme in line with the policy requirements, the impacts on neighbouring properties would be considered when assessing the application. The provisions in Policy OSS4 of the Core Strategy (General Development Considerations) are considered to be sufficient to ensure that development does not unreasonably harm the amenities of adjoining properties. No change proposed.
It should be demonstrated that there will never be any damage to the integrity of the Pevensey Levels and traffic will be limited.	Noted. Policy criteria (iv) already sets out the need for an Appropriate Assessment that will need to demonstrate that the integrity of the Pevensey Levels SAC/RAMSAR will not be harmed No change proposed.
Another road from Northeye to Ninfield or North Bexhill should be constructed	Noted. No provision for such as road is identified within the Core Strategy as a strategic requirement to meet development plan targets set out up to 2028. No change proposed.
Policy BEX11: Land at Sidley Sport and Social Club, Bexhill	
Fully support this allocation which is backed up by evidence in the most recent Playing Pitch Strategy. A stage E review should be undertaken to ensure the evidence base is up to date.	Noted. The Council is working on Stage E (Step 10) of the PPS guidance in updating the Action Plan in the PPS. The Steering Group will be meeting shortly to review the Plan.
Support the allocation.	Noted.
Support policy as sports facilities are lacking in the Sidley Area.	Noted.
Policy includes requirements to provide off site highway works to make the development acceptable in highway terms. Should be noted that combined, BEX6, BEX9, BEX10 and	Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments. The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy

<p>BEX11 may have a cumulative impact of the SRN and may be required to contribute toward improvements on the wider road network. (Highways England)</p>	<p>provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>Policy is unsound in terms of paragraph 35 of the NPPF as there is no evidence that the policy is deliverable. Object to para 9.130 as the Playing Pitch Strategy is internally inconsistent and does not form a sound evidence base and while a feasibility study was commissioned by the council the site owner was not invited to engage. Modifications to the policy are suggested to provide for up to 54 dwellings and an artificial 3G pitch alongside associated ancillary uses and parking facilities.</p>	<p>The Study also identifies an existing deficiency of outdoor sports facilities of almost 50% compared to the adopted local standard for Bexhill. The Planning Pitch Strategy identifies that there is a deficit of enclosed playing fields within the District. The PPS identifies that the site should be protected as a playing field in the Local Plan. The inclusion of this site for housing is contrary to Policy CO3 (i) of the Rother Local Plan Core Strategy, Policy E4 of Sport England's Playing Fields Policy and Guidance (March 2018 and paragraph 97 in the NPPF.</p> <p>Sidley Sports Ground has previously been identified within the top three most accessible outdoor sports facilities in the District whilst also being within the top three sites for highest value (Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study).</p> <p>The feasibility study (August 2018) which supports the DaSA, seeks to establish the most appropriate use/s for the site and sets out these options whilst establishing whether they are economically viable and sustainable over an extended period of time.</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to modify the policy to include up to 54 dwellings as part of any scheme, as it is not considered that the site can adequately accommodate an enclosed playing pitch and associated ancillary facilities in line with Sport England requirements and set out part of the site for housing.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Policy BEX12: Bexhill Town Centre</p>	
<p>Policy BEX12 should be strengthened and re-worded to include the term 'social zones'.</p>	<p>Noted. Supporting text contained in paragraph 9.154 refers to social zones alongside other potential forms of accessibility and public realm improvements within the Town Centre.</p> <p>The policy and supporting text outline what would be supported through development of town</p>

	<p>centre focussed strategies including the forthcoming review of the Town Centre Strategy and the Town Centre Traffic Management Strategy. The policy sets out what improvements are encouraged rather than what <i>will</i> be implemented.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should include reference a maximum height of buildings in the town centre.⁴</p>	<p>Noted. However, including a reference to the maximum height of buildings in the town centre would be too prescriptive. In addition, this is not considered to be necessary and falls outside the scope of the policy.</p> <p>Other existing Core Strategy policies would be relevant (such as BX2, OSS4, EN2 and EN3) in applications for new buildings or extensions, as will the Bexhill Town Centre Conservation Area Appraisal.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
<p>Policy BEX13: Bexhill Town Centre Primary Shopping Area</p>	
<p>No representations received.</p>	
<p>Policy BEX14: Land south-east of Beeching Road, Bexhill</p>	
<p>BEX14 requires junction improvement works. It should be noted that combined, BEX6, BEX9, BEX10, BEX11 and BEX14, may have a cumulative impact of the SRN and may be required to contribute toward improvements on the wider road network. (Highways England)</p>	<p>Noted, but the Council has undertaken traffic modelling which shows that the cumulative impact on the SRN from proposed allocations is within its capacity, subject to detailed site-specific transport assessments.</p> <p>The dialogue with HE is on-going to provide confidence in the modelling and in the policy provisions for relevant sites and through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>
<p>The proposed retail area appears constrained and there are concerns that a viable scheme cannot be</p>	<p>This representation covers a number of points made and the response covers each of these points below.</p>

⁴ This representation was recorded under Policy BEX13 in the consultation statement, however, it should have been under BEX12.

delivered. Policy re-wording is suggested.

The Retail Capacity Study for Bexhill-on-Sea (September 2018) clearly notes that the case for additional floorspace is not urgent or acute and is instead directed towards a modest amount of additional floorspace with qualitative factors pointing towards new provision being used to support Bexhill town centre. The elements set out in the policy are considered necessary in order to achieve a retail development which can be considered edge of centre and supports the town centre.

The identified need for convenience retail floorspace is 1,623sqm (based on a 5% uplift in market share). It is not agreed that the policy should be amended to refer to reference of the 2,000sqm to be a minimum floorspace requirement. Although it is agreed that the policy should refer to the floorspace as a net figure, which is in line with the findings of the Retail Capacity Study for Bexhill-on-Sea Report.

Proposed change:

(i) provides 2,000sqm of convenience floorspace (net) and provides only food ancillary retail sales, and excludes a pharmacy and any other form of service outlet which might undermine the vitality and viability of the town centre;

It is noted that there are two culverts which run through the site, the policy and supporting text will be amended to reflect this.

Proposed change:

9.162 There are significant level differences across the site, falling from Beeching Road in the west towards the eastern boundary. ~~There is a~~ are two culverts which runs through the site which would have a bearing on the siting of new buildings, requiring an 8 metre easement from each side of the culverts. A large proportion of the site suffers from surface water flooding and therefore Sustainable Drainage (SuDS) would need to be incorporated in a redevelopment scheme.

(xi) an 8 metre built development exclusion zone from either side the main river culverts which ~~passes~~ through the site, is achieved to allow access to the existing outfall;

	<p>In order for any convenience retail development to be considered acceptable here, the policy sets out the need for a direct, high quality pedestrian link in line with the detail map which supports the policy – the minimum that would likely be needed to provide such a route. No changes are proposed in terms of amending policy or textual references to pedestrian links.</p> <p>The displacement of existing businesses will need to be re-provided for as part of any redevelopment. The expectation is that they can be provided for within the northern part of the allocation. No changes proposed in this respect.</p>
Policy BEX15: Bexhill Cultural Area	
Support policy.	Noted.
Policy BEX16: London Road - Sackville Road Enhancement Area	
Please take into consideration the disabled during and post construction. There should be no shared spaces for vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians.	<p>Noted. The Policy indicates that the area shown on the Policies Map is identified as a focus for townscape improvements in line with the policy sub-elements identified. The policy also sets out that improvements will be supported in terms of the safe and convenient movements of pedestrians, cyclists, public transport and vehicles.</p> <p>No changes proposed.</p>
Policy BEX17: Little Common and Sidley District Centres	
Paragraphs 9.186 and 9.187 do not define “high concentration of takeaways” and these are linked to deprivation and health and wellbeing without any evidence. Additional wording and re-wording of text suggested.	<p>Sidley is the most deprived areas within the District. Local consultation has highlighted the concerns regarding the number of takeaways in Sidley and the impact on its function to perform as a shopping area in the daytime.</p> <p>It is noted that a ‘high concentration of takeaways’ is not defined by a number; however, this statement reflects the existing concentration of takeaways within the District Centre. The policy seeks to resist a further concentration of takeaway uses (A5 uses) within Sidley District Centre. To include the ‘acceptable’ number of takeaways or any other use in this area would be too prescriptive.</p> <p>There is evidence from Public Health England that local authorities with higher deprivation have a greater density of fast food outlets. (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/</p>

	<p>attachment_data/file/578041/Fast_food_map_2016.pdf)</p> <p>The approach set out in the policy is supported by Paragraph 91 of the NPPF states that <i>“planning policies and decisions should aim to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which... enable and support healthy lifestyles, especially where this would address identified local health and well-being needs – for example through... access to healthier food...”</i></p> <p>No changes proposed</p>
<p>Why are so many takeaways allowed and why are the shutters necessary - a Sidley plan should be worked on.</p>	<p>Noted. Local consultation has highlighted the concerns regarding the number of takeaways in Sidley and the impact on its function to perform as a shopping area in the daytime and the impact of external shutters on the shop facades.</p> <p>This policy seeks to resist further takeaway uses.</p> <p>Policy DEC1 of the DaSA covers proposals for new shop fronts and alterations to existing shop fronts. This includes external shutters.</p> <p>No changes proposed</p>

Chapter 10: Hastings Fringes

Views expressed in representation	RDC response and any proposed changes
<i>Context</i>	
<p>The ESCC Walking and Cycling Strategy should be mentioned within the opening text of the Hastings Fringes chapter. (East Sussex County Council)</p>	<p>Noted. A minor amendment is proposed at paragraph 10.5.</p> <p>Proposed change - Add new sentence onto the end of the paragraph:</p> <p><u><i>ESCC is in the process of developing a County wide Cycling & Walking Strategy, which will aim to deliver cycling and walking infrastructure on key corridors of movement between residential areas (including new developments) and key trip attractors, including education, employment, retail and leisure activities.</i></u></p>
Policy HAS1: Combe Valley Countryside Park (CVCP)	
<p>Support the Policy – particularly in relation to requirements to the Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Local Wildlife Site (LWS). Although the term, ‘where practicable’ should be removed from the policy. (Natural England)</p>	<p>The approach set out in the Policy (net gains, where practicable) is considered reasonable at present, given the approach set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Crowhurst Parish Council Recreation Ground should not be included. (Crowhurst Parish Council)</p>	<p>Crowhurst Recreation Ground makes a valuable contribution to the Countryside Park and has always been included within its boundary. It is shown within the boundary of the former Pebsham Countryside Park as adopted on the Local Plan (2006). In addition, the boundary of the Park is supported by the CVCP Community Interest Company (CiC) Board.</p>
<p>The supporting text to Policy HAS1 incorrectly refers to waste collection rather than waste management. (East Sussex County Council)</p>	<p>Noted. A minor amendment is proposed at paragraph 10.3 to refer to waste management rather than waste collection.</p> <p>In the eighth line, change the word “disposal” to “management”, i.e.:</p> <p><i>The Park will provide access to the countryside, whilst balancing the need to proactively manage wildlife habitats with the scope for a wide range of informal and formal leisure uses. Central to the Park is the restoration of the former land-raise operation for waste disposal management....</i></p>
<p>Support the continued development and maintenance of the CVCP which</p>	<p>Noted</p>

is an important part of the shared approach for Hastings and Bexhill. (Hastings Borough Council)	
Support the open landscape at the entrance of the Park and it would be adversely affected by any significant built structures in this location.	Noted.
HAS2: Land at Michael Tyler Furniture, Woodlands Way, Hastings	
Support the allocation (Hastings Borough Council)	Noted.
Criteria (iii) in the Policy should recognise the watercourses which flow north into gills within Park Wood and therefore reflected in the site's design. Amended text is suggested.	<p>Noted. The Policy criteria and supporting text will be amended to reflect the issue of surface water flooding.</p> <p>Add additional clarification text at paragraph 10.22:</p> <p><i>The site is adjacent to the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Residential dwellings to the north are few and set within large plots, thereby representing low density development and maintaining a rural context. Any development would need to be mindful of the AONB countryside to the north and appropriate landscape buffers would need to be incorporated within any potential scheme to respect wider views from the north. <u>There are watercourses which flow north into gills within Park Wood which are vulnerable to changes in water quality and quality. Any impact on the gills will need to be considered within site design.</u> Care should also be taken to respect the relationship with residential properties on the periphery of the site.</i></p> <p>Amend policy criteria (v):</p> <p><i>(v) provision is made for an acceptable connection to the local sewerage system in agreement with the service provider <u>and surface water drainage proposals do not adversely impact on the watercourses which feed into Park Wood.</u></i></p>
Policy HAS3: Land North of A265, Ivyhouse Lane, Hastings	
The detail map shows that the site lies	Noted. The site is located within the High Weald AONB and the supporting text (at paragraph

<p>within the AONB, the policy wording should recognise this designated landscape. (Natural England)</p>	<p>10.28) will be amended to clarify this.</p> <p>The Development Plan should be read as a whole and Policy DEN2: The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in the DaSA is also relevant.</p> <p>Proposed change to insert a clarification within the first sentence of paragraph 10.28 to indicate that the site is located within the High Weald AONB:</p> <p><i>This north-east sloping and undulating area of vacant scrubland is located adjacent to the existing well-established and fully occupied Ivyhouse Lane industrial estate located within Hastings borough <u>and is in the High Weald AONB.</u> The existing industrial estate <u>to the south</u> presents a very “raw” edge to the openness of the adjacent High Weald AONB beyond.</i></p> <p>Amend policy criteria (iii) & (iv) due to a presentational error and to clarify that the proposed allocation is located within the AONB:</p> <p>(iii) access is provided off Ivyhouse Lane in Hastings Borough;</p> <p>(iv) development does not intrude into views from the <u>wider</u> Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty to the north; and (iv) provision is made for enhanced landscape planting, as indicated on the Detail Map, as part of <u>the wider</u> landscape management of this part of the wider valley, including new and enhanced green infrastructure of the north of the employment site;</p>
<p>Support the allocation (Hastings Borough Council)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>This allocated is located adjacent to operational railway land and infrastructure. RDC and potential developers should be aware of the relevant Network Rail standard guidelines and requirements when developing sites located adjacent to such land. (Network Rail)</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Policy HAS4: Rock Lane Urban Fringe Management Area	
Support the Policy – concern is raised about urban sprawl on the edges of Hastings and improvements to biodiversity is welcomed.	Noted
Support the policy. However, as the site is located in the AONB, this should also be reflected in the policy wording. Also consider clarifying the aims of multifunctional greenspace to prevent inappropriate development in the area. (Natural England)	<p>Noted. The urban fringe management area is located within the High Weald AONB and this is stated within the supporting text.</p> <p>The Development Plan should be read as a whole and Policy DEN2: The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, in the DaSA is also relevant.</p> <p>It is considered that paragraph 10.40 adequately defines what appropriate development in this locality would be acceptable in terms of improving landscape quality and formal access.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Support the policy and HBC will work with Rother on any guidance which will support the policy approach. (Hastings Borough Council)	Noted

Chapter 11: Villages with site allocations

Views expressed in representation	RDC response including any proposed changes
Beckley Four Oaks: Policies BEC1 & 2	
<i>Development provisions and development boundary</i>	
Object to the development boundary, it should be enlarged to include site FO10 (Land at Kings Bank Lane) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016), which should be allocated for circa 10 units.	<p>Not agreed. Site FO10 is not considered appropriate for development. It would occupy an open field, poorly related to the pattern of development in the village. It would adversely affect views from Main Street and Kings Bank Lane, harming the rural setting of the village and the landscape and character of the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). There have been no significant changes to the proposal and consequently, no significant changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Site FO2 (Former Vineyard site, Whitbread Lane) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated for housing.	<p>Not agreed. Site FO2 is not considered appropriate for development. Such development would represent a significant intrusion outside the settlement boundary. Whitbread Lane is rural in nature and to extend and intensify development in a northerly direction, as proposed, would cause harm to the rural setting of the village and represent inappropriate development in the countryside, causing harm to the landscape and character of the High Weald AONB. Whitbread Lane has no footways at this point and the site has poor connectivity to the village and accessibility to services.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). There have been no significant changes to the proposal and consequently, no significant changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<i>Policy BEC1 – Land east of Hobbs Lane</i>	
The allocation should be reduced in size to consist solely of the brownfield portion of the site for a lower quantum of development, circa 7 units. Given its location on the edge of the village,	Not agreed. It is acknowledged that the site includes a proportion of greenfield land; however, its inclusion is necessary to accommodate the required number of dwellings. Furthermore, the greenfield land forms only a small part of a field, already enclosed between existing housing and the factory site, and its inclusion within the development site provides a logical “rounding off” to this part of the village.

<p>separated from services, allocation of the greenfield portion extending into the open countryside is not appropriate.</p>	<p>Subject to the requirements of the policy, including screen tree and hedgerow planting, the development of this small section of field can be achieved without causing harm to the wider landscape of the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The allocation is not appropriate. The brownfield portion of the site is an important asset that should be safeguarded for employment development.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The factory has been vacant since 2011 and despite marketing it has failed to find another occupier. The building is in a dilapidated state and is too bespoke in its layout to suit another occupier, and the cost of stripping it out and making good would not be financially viable. Similarly, the redevelopment of the site for continued business use has been found to be not financially viable given the cost of demolition and the cap on rental and capital values realistically achievable, having regard to the site's location and limited public transport access.</p> <p>On this basis, it is accepted that the site cannot realistically be retained for employment uses. Its residential redevelopment offers an opportunity to significantly improve its appearance, and that of the streetscape, while meeting the village's housing requirements in a sustainable location.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy BEC2 – Land south of Buddens Green</i></p>	
<p>No objection to allocation.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Development of this greenfield site would be an unwelcome extension into the AONB countryside. Visually the site is an important gap to be protected from development, as identified in a 2005 appeal decision.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The proposed allocation is for a modest number of dwellings that would extend an existing development at Buddens Green southwards, to an existing strong treed boundary which provides enclosure of the site and screening from the wider AONB countryside. A mature tree belt also forms the site's eastern boundary, screening views from that direction.</p> <p>While development would be visible from Main Street to the north and through the trees from the public footpath to the east, it would appear as a logical extension of existing development. Open fields would remain to the south, east and west and consequently, it is not considered that the allocation as proposed would significantly diminish the gap.</p> <p>The 2005 appeal decision (application ref. RR/2004/498/P) does not relate to the site subject of the current allocation but to land to the west of Buddens Green, which would be unaffected by the current allocation. The continued exclusion of this larger area from the development boundary, as well as more recent dismissed appeals (e.g. application ref. RR/2016/3286/P,</p>

	<p>appeal decision dated 29/11/18) demonstrates the Council's commitment to protecting this open area from development.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Development would harm the amenity of adjoining residents and users of the public footpath.</p>	<p>While development of the site would be visible to existing residents, the allocation is for a modest number of dwellings and it is considered a scheme could be sensitively designed to minimise impacts on amenity. The particular details of a scheme and its impacts on existing residents would be considered as part of any future planning application. Policy OSS4 of the Core Strategy sets out the general development criteria which all developments are required to meet, including: (ii) it does not unreasonably harm the amenities of adjoining properties.</p> <p>New dwellings would be visible from a short length of public footpath. However, they would be viewed against the backdrop of existing development at Buddens Green, and would appear as a logical and limited continuation of existing development and would not have a significant visual impact.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Affordable housing could be provided at alternative sites instead (Sites FO2/ FO8 as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016)).</p>	<p>These sites are not considered suitable for development. The land is rural in nature and visible from adjoining fields and roads. Development of the sites would be out of keeping with the largely linear pattern of development in the village and would cause harm to its character and rural setting and the landscape of the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>The two allocation sites subject to Policies BEC1 and BEC2 are considered appropriate and will accommodate the village's housing target set out in the Core Strategy, including a proportion of affordable housing as required under DaSA Policy DHG1 (Affordable Housing).</p> <p>In sustainability terms, sites FO2 and FO8 were assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). There have been no significant changes to the proposals and consequently, no significant changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Broad Oak: Policies BRO1 & 2</p> <p><i>Policy BRO1 – Land west of the A28, Northiam Road</i></p>	

Support the requirement for a 15 metres buffer to protect the ancient woodland.	Noted.
<i>Policy BRO2 – Land at the Rainbow Trout Public House</i>	
Additional land within the site, south of the public house itself, should be allocated for housing rather than public house use as it is currently surplus to the public house’s requirements.	<p>Not agreed. The land in question forms part of the car parking area for the public house. The public house is currently closed and there is no evidence that this area of car parking is or would be surplus to future requirements. In protecting sites of social or economic value, DaSA Policy DCO1 notes that proposals should not result in the loss of facilities or features which may undermine the viability of the use, including car parks, gardens and function rooms.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the proposed change would not result in any significant changes to the scoring against the Objectives within the Sustainability Appraisal, although it may reduce the positive effects on accessibility to services, facilities and leisure uses due to the potential adverse effect on the viability of the public house use.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The site includes land in two separate ownerships and should not be combined.	<p>Not agreed. The allocation relates to a logical site area and the two sites are available, suitable for development and achievable. In order to ensure proper planning of an area and effective use of land, DaSA Policy DIM1 notes that comprehensive proposals for the development of sites will normally be required, including where sites are in multiple ownerships. In exceptional circumstances, proposals for part of a site may be permitted but only where it demonstrably has regard to, and facilitates, an integrated scheme for development of the entire site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
By virtue of the current consented uses there is no need to include the public house in the allocation. The housing element is justified on a stand-alone basis.	<p>Not agreed. The site includes the public house and its former garden and it is not logical to divide the two. The inclusion of the public house within the site and its retention as a policy requirement is in accordance with DaSA Policy DCO1 (Retention of sites of social and economic value) and paragraph 92 of the NPPF (2018).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
Southern Water has assessed the capacity of the local sewer network to accommodate anticipated foul flows from the development and has	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In light of the revised capacity assessment undertaken by Southern Water (in response to the increase in the size of, and number of dwellings at, this site compared to the site put forward at</p>

<p>determined that network reinforcement will be required prior to occupation to ensure there is no increased risk of flooding. Therefore, an additional policy criterion should be included to require occupation of the development to be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure (Southern Water).</p>	<p>Options and Preferred Options stage), it is agreed that a policy criterion should be added along the lines of part (vi) of Policy BRO1 and supporting text added along the lines of paragraph 11.38 (to which Southern Water have not objected).</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Insert wording at the beginning of paragraph 11.45:</p> <p><i>Additional reinforcement of the sewerage network will be required to service the development and therefore, the developer will need to work with Southern Water to ensure necessary infrastructure is provided prior to occupation.</i></p> <p>Insert an additional policy criterion:</p> <p><i>(vi) provision is made for an acceptable connection to the local sewerage system, in agreement with the service provider.</i></p>
--	---

Camber: Policies CAM1 & 2

Development boundary

Support the development boundary.	Noted.
-----------------------------------	--------

Policy CAM1- Land at the Former Putting Green, Old Lydd Road

<p>Criterion (vii) needs to be clarified in terms of what “contribute towards implementation” of the Dungeness Complex Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) actually means.</p>	<p>The SARMS is currently in draft form, so specific “contributions” are uncertain, while the principal issues raised through the Core Strategy HRA related to the impacts of tourism policies.</p> <p>Even so, developments in close proximity to the Natura 2000 Sites may have a direct impact in terms of run-off, access and other activity, as well as loss of functionally-linked land; hence, they can legitimately be expected to be compatible with, and potentially contribute to, ensuring that the integrity of the designations are maintained.</p> <p>Relevant measures are set out in the SARMS and may be considered in terms of their applicability to particular schemes on an individual basis.</p> <p>More generic implications of increased population within the overall catchment will be addressed through a programme of measures (with strategic oversight involving the District Councils and</p>
--	---

	<p>Natural England) funded via CIL/other sources.</p> <p><u>Proposed Change:</u> Amend criterion (vii) of Policy CAM1 to read:</p> <p><u><i>(vii) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</i></u></p>
<p>As the site is situated only 130 metres from the Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA and Ramsar site, the policy should include a requirement to ensure no adverse impact upon it (as with Policy CAM2).</p>	<p>Accepted. Criterion (vii) already refers to implementation of a Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS), which flows from the need to maintain the integrity of the Natura 2000 Sites.</p> <p>Even so, developments in close proximity to the Natura 2000 Sites may have a direct impact in terms of run-off, access and other activity, as well as loss of functionally-linked land; hence, they can legitimately be expected to be compatible with, and potentially contribute to, ensuring that the integrity of the designations are maintained.</p> <p>Relevant measures are set out in the SARMS and may be considered in terms of their applicability to particular schemes on an individual basis.</p> <p>More generic implications of increased population within the overall catchment will be addressed through a programme of measures (with strategic oversight involving the District Councils and Natural England) funded via CIL/other sources.</p> <p><u>Proposed Changes:</u> Amend criterion (vii) of Policy CAM1 to read:</p> <p><u><i>(vii) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</i></u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 11.67 to read:</p> <p><i>In view of the proximity of the site to the international wildlife designations and the potential for</i></p>

	<p><i>additional recreational impacts, the development should <u>ensure that there is no adverse effect on contribute to achieving the SARMS strategy, which may also include financial contributions.</u> the integrity of the SPA/ Ramsar site, with mitigation if necessary, in line with the provisions of the SARMS.</i></p>
<p>The Detail Map (Figure 46) should include the location of the SSSI.</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary as it is shown on the Policies Map Inset Map 7 (Camber) on page 212. Showing it on the Detail Map would be inconsistent with other Detail Maps which do not show designations (e.g. those at Rye Harbour).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The allocation will result in the unacceptable loss of 70 pay and display car parking spaces and should be deleted. The Council should instead consider opportunities to extend much-needed public parking in the area to help reduce unauthorised roadside parking in Old Lydd Road during peak summer months.</p>	<p>This is addressed at paragraph 11.70, which acknowledges that while the site's redevelopment will result in a small reduction in public car parking capacity, there is a significant amount of alternative car parking provision in Camber, and the benefits of redeveloping this prominent site are considered to outweigh the loss.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the site has not always been a car park; planning permission only being granted for a change from its former use as a putting green in 2009 (reference RR/2009/1948/P). When a further permission was granted for the car park use in 2010 it was noted that it was to be hoped that there would be aspirations to develop the site in the future but, in the interim, the parking use was considered acceptable (reference RR/2010/2061/3R).</p> <p>In any event, the Council is trialling methods to reduce congestion caused by parking problems in Camber at peak times, including changes to how visitors pay for parking.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy CAM2 – Land at the Central Car Park, Old Lydd Road</i></p>	
<p>Criterion (vi) needs to be clarified in terms of what “contribute towards implementation” of the SARMS actually means.</p>	<p>The SARMS is currently in draft form, so specific “contributions” are uncertain, while the principal issues raised through the Core Strategy HRA related to the impacts of tourism policies.</p> <p>Even so, developments in close proximity to the Natura 2000 Sites may have a direct impact in terms of run-off, access and other activity, as well as loss of functionally-linked land; hence, they can legitimately be expected to be compatible with, and potentially contribute to, ensuring that the integrity of the designations are maintained.</p> <p>Relevant measures are set out in the SARMS and may be considered in terms of their</p>

	<p>applicability to particular schemes on an individual basis.</p> <p>More generic implications of increased population within the overall catchment will be addressed through a programme of measures (with strategic oversight involving the District Councils and Natural England) funded via CIL/other sources.</p> <p><u>Proposed Changes:</u> Amend criterion (vi) of Policy CAM2 to read:</p> <p><u><i>(vi) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</i></u></p> <p>Replace the last sentence of paragraph 11.75 with:</p> <p><u><i>In view of the proximity of the site to the international wildlife designations and the potential for additional recreational impacts, the development should ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/ Ramsar site, with mitigation if necessary, in line with the provisions of the SARMS.</i></u></p>
<p>The Detail Map (Figure 47) should include the location of the various environmental designations in the vicinity of the site.</p>	<p>This is not considered necessary as the environmental designations are shown on the Policies Map Inset Map 7 (Camber) on page 212. Showing it on the Detail Map would be inconsistent with other Detail Maps which do not show designations (e.g. those at Rye Harbour).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The allocation will result in the unacceptable loss of 170 pay and display car parking spaces and should be deleted. The use of an existing overflow car park will be inadequate compensation. The Council should instead consider opportunities to extend much-needed public parking in the area to help reduce unauthorised roadside parking in Old Lydd Road</p>	<p>As noted at paragraph 11.73, given its prime position, the redevelopment of the site is an opportunity to act as a catalyst for the regeneration of the village by enhancing the tourist offer, and this benefit is considered to outweigh the loss of parking spaces, of which there are a considerable number in Camber.</p> <p>The effect of the site's redevelopment on traffic and parking is addressed at paragraphs 11.78 and 11.79, which note that the traffic implications of the site's redevelopment, including the reduction in car parking capacity, will need careful consideration including through a traffic management plan. An opportunity to mitigate the reduction in car parking spaces exists in the formalisation and increased use of the "overflow car park" to the north-east of the site, which is</p>

<p>during peak summer months.</p>	<p>not currently formally laid out and is currently only used on the busiest days. There may also be an opportunity to form a one-way through-route along Old Lydd Road which would ease traffic congestion experienced on the busiest days, as noted at paragraph 11.79.</p> <p>Part (iii) of the Policy therefore requires a traffic management scheme to be submitted as part of the planning application.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council is trialling methods to reduce congestion caused by parking problems in Camber at peak times, including changes to how visitors pay for parking.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should require the provision of public (including disabled) access to the beach for residents and visitors, as this is the only area which currently has level access onto the beach.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>It is not anticipated that the proposed redevelopment of the site will remove the existing accessible route to the beach. Indeed, the adopted Camber Village Supplementary Planning Document (2014) lists one of the objectives for the site’s redevelopment as “providing an accessible path to the beach” and notes that pedestrian movement through the space should be prioritised. Part (i) of the policy requires regard to be given to the SPD in relation to the form of development.</p> <p>However, it is agreed that the need to retain this provision should be added to the supporting text.</p> <p><u>Proposed change:</u></p> <p>Add text to the end of paragraph 11.73:</p> <p><i>An accessible route to the beach for pedestrians should be retained.</i></p>
<p>Catsfield: Policy CAT1</p>	
<p><i>Development provisions</i></p>	
<p>Site CA8 (The Brooks, Church Road) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and</p>	<p>Site CA8 is not considered appropriate for development.</p> <p>While site CA8 is not within the AONB, it is a large swathe of open countryside, important to the</p>

<p>Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) is more appropriate than the site subject to Policy CAT1 and should be allocated for housing. It would not encroach on the AONB and could also accommodate facilities such as a doctor's surgery, car park, play areas, village green and biodiversity features.</p>	<p>setting of the village. It is visible from many key points in the village. Any development, even of a limited portion of the site, would have a detrimental visual impact and cause significant harm to the rural setting and landscape character of the village. The Market Towns and Villages Landscape Assessment (2009), found the area to be vulnerable to change due to loss of landscape structure. It noted that the compact village character needs to be retained and development should not encroach on the open stream valley which should be retained as a setting for the village and AONB buffer.</p> <p>In contrast, the allocated site (Policy CAT1), while within the AONB, is well-contained and screened from the wider landscape by mature trees. The Market Towns and Villages Landscape Assessment (2009) found that this wider area, while within the AONB, is not of high quality, being an enclosed area of mixed uses where there has been some loss of landscape structure due to the loss of field pattern and hedges.</p> <p>Furthermore, site CA8 is less well-related to the village than the allocated site, being on its southern fringe and further from key services including the village shop, recreation ground and public house.</p> <p>Surface water flooding issues are also likely to be present at site CA8 as the site is crossed by a stream.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is double the size of the site subject to Policy CAT and would represent a disproportionate level of growth for the settlement, even in the event of CAT1 not being allocated.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, site CA8 was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018) but this was for a solely residential use. While the inclusion of additional facilities, if these were to materialise, improves the scoring against some objectives relating to accessibility to services, the site continues to score poorly against environmental objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy CAT1 – Land west of the B2204</i></p>	
<p>An additional policy criterion should be included that states that proposals will</p>	<p>The site is located on the very edge of the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment Area (PLHCA). The actual area within the PLHCA falls partly within the retained boundary planting</p>

<p>only be permitted where an Appropriate Assessment (AA) under the Habitats Regulations demonstrates beyond reasonable scientific doubt that these can be delivered on the site without harming the integrity of the Pevensey Levels Special Area of Conservation/ Ramsar site. This criterion is already included for Policies BEX9 and BEX10.</p>	<p>and partly within the residential area, although in reality this area is highly likely to be used as garden land only, rather than developed with buildings. Furthermore, the site slopes down towards the village to the south-east, so it is unlikely that any water draining from the site would affect the PLHCA. Natural England has not raised any objection to this approach or made any other comments on this policy.</p> <p>However, the DaSA HRA did identify a risk that surface water discharge from the site may reach the SAC/Ramsar, given the well-connected ditch network, although it also found that compliance with Policy DEN5 would ensure there is adverse effect on the integrity of any internationally designated sites.</p> <p>Further advice has been sought from Natural England on whether additional policy criterion is necessary.</p>
<p>As the site is within the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment Area (PLHCA), an additional policy criterion should be included to require at least two forms of appropriate Sustainable Drainage in accordance with Policy DEN5. This would be consistent with other allocations within the PLHCA.</p>	<p>As noted above, further advice has been sought from Natural England on whether additional policy criterion is necessary.</p>
<p>Development of this greenfield site will be an unwelcome extension into the AONB countryside.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Paragraph 11.92 acknowledges the site is within the AONB but notes that it is well-contained and screened from the wider landscape by mature trees. It is centrally located within the village.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site is inappropriate as it is on the opposite side of a dangerous road to the main part of the village including the school and church. It contravenes Core Strategy policies and the NPPF.</p>	<p>Not agreed. The site is centrally located within the village in close proximity to services and bus stops, on the same side of the road as the public house, village shop and recreation ground. It is close to the existing pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>Paragraph 11.96 acknowledges that some street lighting or improved road markings may be necessary to meet highway safety requirements and this would be for consideration with the Highway Authority at planning application stage.</p>

	No change proposed.
The site is inappropriate as it is a floodplain.	The site is not in a flood risk zone, and there are no records of surface water flooding. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that the development of a greenfield site has the potential to impact on drainage. Any planning application for the site's development will need to accord with relevant policies of the Local Plan including Policy DEN5 of the DaSA which requires sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) to be utilised unless demonstrated to be inappropriate.
Development would harm bird populations.	The site is not within a site designated for its nature conservation value. Notwithstanding this, the policy includes requirements that will help to safeguard wildlife using the site, including the provision of a sizeable area of open space and the retention and reinforcement of boundary trees and hedgerows. Furthermore, any planning application will be required to accord with DaSA Policy DEN4 and Core Strategy Policy EN5 which seek to ensure biodiversity is retained and enhanced. No change proposed.
The village services are insufficient to accommodate an increase in its population.	Infrastructure providers have been consulted and no issues have been raised about inadequate facilities. The village has a good range of services and it is considered the scale of the proposed development, which accords with the adopted spatial strategy of the Core Strategy, can be appropriately accommodated. Furthermore, the allocation includes an additional area of public open space which would be available for use by all village residents. No change proposed.
Fairlight Cove: FAC1 & 2	
<i>Development provisions and development boundary</i>	
There is no justification for extending the development boundary to include the site subject to Policy FAC2 (Fairlight Parish Council).	Not agreed. The site subject to Policy FAC2 is considered appropriate for the development detailed in the Policy. Its allocation is necessary to meet the village's housing target set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Therefore, the development boundary should be extended to include it. No change proposed.
Additional land should be allocated for residential development, a doctors surgery, shop and open space at land	Not agreed. Site FC2a is not considered appropriate for development The extent and position of the site means its development would have a significant and adverse landscape impact, detrimental to the character and appearance of the High Weald AONB, which could not be

<p>south of Pett Level Road (site FC2a as referenced in the DaSA Sustainability Appraisal (Sept 2018)).</p>	<p>satisfactorily mitigated.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). There have been no significant changes to the proposal and consequently, with the exception of those changes detailed in the Sustainability Appraisal section below, no significant changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy FAC1 – Land at the Former Market Garden</i></p>	
<p>Support the policy/ parts of the policy (Historic England).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>The contribution the site makes to the area’s green infrastructure network has not been fully considered.</p>	<p>Not agreed. Parts (iii) and (iv) of the policy require measures to protect and enhance trees and biodiversity. The retention of boundary tree belts in particular will help maintain connectivity with other green infrastructure features.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Reference should be made to the need to create safe pedestrian routes to and from the site, which is particularly important given the lack of footway on the unadopted highway (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>It is noted that the short stretches of road immediately adjoining the site (Lower Waites Lane and Smugglers Way) are not adopted public highway and are of a narrow width with no footways.</p> <p>Planning application RR/2017/457/P (which has been delegated to approve) includes a new pedestrian footway alongside Lower Waites Lane along the site’s south-western boundary, within the boundary of the site itself. This will improve the pedestrian environment and the Highway Authority has not objected to the application.</p> <p>The amount of traffic using the roads immediately surrounding the site is likely to be relatively low and it is evident that pedestrians already use Lower Waites Lane and Smugglers Way. Having regard to this, together with the limited number of houses within the allocation (16) and the short stretches of road involved, the approach that has been accepted through the planning application is appropriate.</p> <p>It is therefore considered appropriate to add wording to the supporting text to align with the planning application.</p>

	<p><u>Proposed change</u></p> <p>Add the following text to the end of paragraph 11.116:</p> <p><i>A new pedestrian footpath should be provided on the site's south-western boundary alongside Lower Waites Lane. It would be advantageous for additional pedestrian infrastructure on adjoining roads to be provided/improved although this may not be possible due to width and ownership constraints.</i></p>
<p><i>Policy FAC2 – Land east of Waites Lane</i></p>	
<p>Support the policy/ parts of the policy.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>We have always resisted development of this site and our position remains unchanged, however it is recognised there is no alternative site in Fairlight, only if a local need is demonstrated (Fairlight Parish Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>The Core Strategy identified Fairlight Cove as a village suitable for a modest level of growth, in accordance with the overall settlement strategy. The site's allocation is in accordance with that and is appropriate, having regard to the lack of alternative sites.</p> <p>The allocation includes a level of affordable housing in accordance with DaSA Policy DHG1. The Council's housing register applies a local connections test whereby to qualify to be on the register, the applicant must meet the local connection criteria and only applicants in the relevant local cluster group would qualify for affordable housing in Fairlight (with the exception of those people of highest need who have been accepted to be homeless).</p> <p>The allocation also includes a level of age-restricted housing for older people, for which a local demand has been identified through work undertaken for the (now abandoned) Fairlight Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The number of houses should be</p>	<p>While the number of dwellings identified (30) slightly exceeds the residual requirement for the</p>

reduced (Fairlight Parish Council).	village identified at Figure 17 (21), it is considered an appropriate figure having regard to the size and nature of the site. The density of the site remains low, which is appropriate given its location on the edge of the village and within the AONB. No change proposed.
Development would need to show how all planning issues including drainage and safe access would be managed (Fairlight Parish Council).	Noted. These matters are covered by requirements (v) and (vii) of the policy. No change proposed.
The development will cause harm to the AONB including dark night skies/ the Landscape Assessment is flawed.	The Landscape Assessment has robustly assessed the capacity of the site to accommodate a level of development and has concluded that a modest development, including appropriate mitigation, would not cause harm to the AONB. This is reflected in the allocation. The potential effect of any external lighting would be for consideration at planning application stage, having regard to the requirements of DaSA policies DEN1, DEN2 and DEN7 with which a scheme would be expected to comply. No change proposed.
The development would be out of keeping with the character of the locality.	The site adjoins existing development on 2 boundaries and represents a logical extension to the village, which is accepted having regard to the need for housing; the lack of suitable or available sites within the existing village envelope; and other environmental constraints. The particular design details of a scheme would be for consideration at planning application stage. No change proposed.
The development will harm residents' amenity.	While development may be visible by adjoining residents, it is considered it will not unreasonably harm amenity. Proposed planting on the boundaries will offer screening. Furthermore, the size of the site and the density proposed will allow a scheme to be appropriately designed with suitable separation to existing houses. The effect of a particular scheme on residential amenity will be for consideration at planning application stage. Any application will be expected to comply with Policy OSS4 of the Core Strategy which requires all development to (ii) not unreasonably harm the amenities of adjoining properties.

	No change proposed.
Local residents do not support the allocation.	It is appreciated there is a level of public objection to development on this site. However, the village has a housing need which has been accepted through the Core Strategy, the site is considered appropriate and an alternative site has not been identified. No change proposed.
The site access is inappropriate/hazardous and the road network is poor.	This is addressed at paragraph 11.124. The Highway Authority has indicated an access in this location would be acceptable in principle although the details would be for approval at planning application stage. No change proposed.
The development would be poorly integrated with the village; pedestrian access into the village is poor and not suitable for disabled people.	This is addressed at paragraph 11.124 and policy criterion (v) which requires improvements to pedestrian infrastructure. No change proposed.
The village's infrastructure cannot support 30 additional houses, local services are already limited.	It is appreciated that local services are limited and consequently, the Core Strategy identifies the village for only a modest amount of growth. While the allocations somewhat exceed this, the additional number of houses compared to the residual requirement (9) is small and would not have any significant additional impact on services. No change proposed.
There is no need for additional housing in Fairlight Cove, existing houses do not sell quickly.	The Core Strategy identifies the village for a modest amount of growth and the allocations in the DaSA takes this forward. Policy FAC2 includes provision for appropriately designed age-restricted housing for older people, for which there is a particular demand in the village. No change proposed.
There are serious drainage issues on the site; its development will advance coastal erosion. There is a lack of capacity in the public sewerage system.	Drainage issues in the village and surrounding area are recognised at paragraph 6.59 and DaSA Policy DEN5 (vii), with which all proposals are required to comply. Coastal erosion issues are addressed through DaSA Policy DEN6 and paragraphs 6.71-76.

	<p>An appropriate SuDS will be required as part of the development under part (vii) of Policy FAC2 which will also need to take account of any effects on drainage and water flow outside the site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The proposed GP surgery is unlikely to materialise due to its cost, difficulties in recruiting staff and the need for support from the NHS.</p>	<p>Paragraph 11.120 acknowledges that the provision of a doctor's surgery is subject to business case support from the Clinical Commissioning Group; however, there is a demand, and evidence of interest from an existing GP's practice in the form of a current planning application for the development of the larger site (FC2a) (reference RR/2018/2726/P).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Requirements for a GP surgery and long access road will prompt proposals for a larger scale development to finance the development, which would be inappropriate in the AONB.</p>	<p>It is agreed a larger scale development would be inappropriate at this location within the AONB. The policy identifies the scale of development considered to be appropriate.</p> <p>The site comprises undeveloped agricultural land and it is considered a development of 30 dwellings, together with a doctor's surgery (which would be self-financing) would allow for a degree of non-frontage road access.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site is productive farmland, much needed for food production.</p>	<p>Together with the majority of agricultural land within the District, the site is classified as grade 3 (good to moderate quality).</p> <p>Given the modest size of the site, its development would have no significant impact on food production capacity in the District. Having regard to the need for housing and the lack of alternative sites within the village, any potential minor impact is considered acceptable.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Council has failed to consult people appropriately and has not followed its Statement of Community Involvement.</p>	<p>Fairlight Cove was not included in the consultation at Regulation 18 stage (Options and Preferred Options) because at that time, a Neighbourhood Plan was in preparation which was to identify housing allocation(s) to meet the Core Strategy target.</p> <p>However, following the abandonment of the Neighbourhood Plan in January 2019, it was necessary for the District Council to include the village within the DaSA.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Planning Group had undertaken a level of informal public consultation in</p>

	<p>support of their Plan, including a residents' questionnaire, the results of which have been passed to and considered by the District Council in developing the DaSA. Direct consultation was also carried out with the Parish Council prior to publication of the submission DaSA.</p> <p>It is not considered that anyone wishing to make comments has been unfairly disadvantaged, especially since the Plan has now been subject to a formal representation period (Regulation 19) and will be subject to public examination.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site should be enlarged to include sites FC2 and FC2a as referenced in the DaSA Sustainability Appraisal (Sept 2018), with the developable area in the western and central/ northern parts of the site. Open space, a GP surgery and shop should also be included in the allocation.</p>	<p>Site FC2a is not considered appropriate for development. The extent and position of the site means its development would have a significant and adverse landscape impact, detrimental to the character and appearance of the High Weald AONB, which could not be mitigated.</p> <p>The allocation already includes public open space and a doctor's surgery. There is an existing village shop and post office within Fairlight Cove.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site density is too low: the site could accommodate 45 dwellings rather than 30.</p>	<p>The density is considered appropriate, having regard to the edge of village location, the size of the site and the inclusion of open space and a doctor's surgery within the allocation.</p> <p>The number of dwellings (30) slightly exceeds the village's residual housing target (21) identified in the Core Strategy but this is considered acceptable having regard to the size of the site and the negligible additional impact on services. However, to increase it by a further 15 dwellings (45 dwellings in total) would represent a significant increase compared to the village's residual housing target and would represent overdevelopment of the site, having regard to its location and its ability to also satisfactorily accommodate the other aspects of the allocation.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The policy should not require age-restricted housing but instead, a proportion of housing suitable for older people.</p>	<p>The village has one of the largest proportions of older people in the District, relative to its population, and a particular demand for older people's housing has been identified, consequently, the policy requirement is considered appropriate.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

Iden: Policy IDE1	
<i>Development provisions and development boundary</i>	
<p>Site ID6 (Land at Orchard Farm) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated instead of the site subject to policy IDE1, or should be used as an exception site. It is a brownfield site and the employment use, which employs only a small number of people, could easily be relocated to Rye Harbour. It is near the centre of the village and has an existing safe access onto a straight road. The development could be screened by planting. Its development is supported by local residents.</p>	<p>Site ID6 is not considered suitable for allocation. It is in the countryside, 300 metres north of the main body of the village. It is prominent in the open countryside, especially to the west, and residential development here would represent an inappropriate intrusion into a rural area, harming the landscape character of the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>Also, Policy EC3 of the Core Strategy and Policy DEC3 of the DaSA would apply to the site's redevelopment, which seek to retain land and premises currently or last in employment use in such use unless it is demonstrated there is no reasonable prospect of its continued use for employment purposes or it would cause serious harm to local amenities. The site is occupied for employment purposes and the loss of employment land would be resisted. An application for planning permission for the site's redevelopment with 18 dwellings (reference RR/2011/154/P) was refused in 2011.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). There have been no changes to the proposal and consequently, no changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>We question whether a full evaluation has been undertaken of site ID6 (Land at Orchard Farm) to justify its rejection. It may be a more appropriate alternative (Iden Parish Council).</p>	<p>Site ID6 was considered through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) Review in 2013 and again through the Options and Preferred Options stage of the DaSA, including the Sustainability Appraisal. It has also been subject to a planning application as detailed above. The site has been robustly evaluated and rejected for clear reasons.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Local services will need to be improved including access to work and further education.</p>	<p>Noted. The modest level of growth identified for Iden in the Core Strategy has had regard to its level of services and accessibility. The site subject of Policy IDE1, which meets the housing target accepted through the Core Strategy, is in close proximity to village services and bus stops.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Policy RA1 of the Core Strategy considers the needs of the rural villages and Policy TR2 gives general support to improvements in the provision and use of sustainable transport.</p>

	No change proposed.
The DaSA states that no new sites have come forward recently, but to our knowledge no such request has been made (Iden Parish Council).	This reference, contained within paragraph 11.132, refers to the fact there have been no new large housing sites granted planning permission in the village recently, meaning the Core Strategy target of 12 dwellings remains. No change proposed.
Rural exception sites should be considered as an alternative way of achieving the affordable housing needed (Iden Parish Council).	Rural exception sites are sites that come forward in addition to the housing that is identified by the Core Strategy as being required. By its nature, a rural exception site would not be identified as an allocation in the Local Plan. The allocation that has been identified through Policy IDE1 meets the Core Strategy target and is policy compliant in terms of the proportion of affordable housing required (40%, as detailed in DaSA Policy DHG1). No change proposed.
<i>Policy IDE1 – Land south of Elmsmead</i>	
The Parish Council was not properly consulted (Iden Parish Council).	Noted but not agreed. Direct communications with the Parish Council have taken place. The DaSA has been subject to statutory consultation and publication and all comments received have been summarised and addressed through the respective Consultation Statements. No change proposed.
Local residents do not support the allocation.	Noted. It is appreciated there is a level of public objection to development on this site. However, the village has a housing requirement which has been accepted through the Core Strategy, the site is considered appropriate and a suitable alternative site has not been identified. No change proposed.
The site has been rejected in the past.	It is noted the site has been subject to a number of planning applications for residential development which were refused primarily for reasons relating to the access. However, these were in the 1960s and 1970s when Elmsmead was a private road with no footways. Elmsmead is now an adopted road with a standard surface and footways on both sides and, as noted by the Highway Authority, now provides an acceptable access to the site in principle. No change proposed.

<p>The site access via Elmsmead is inappropriate and will cause considerable disruption for existing residents (Iden Parish Council).</p>	<p>The Highway Authority has considered the site and considers an access via Elmsmead would be acceptable in principle. The Highway Authority's advice has taken account of the conditions of existing roads and junctions. The allocation is for a limited number of dwellings (12), and while additional traffic may be noticeable to existing residents it is not considered this would be to a level that would unacceptably harm their amenity.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would be formally consulted on the detail of the access at planning application stage.</p> <p>The effect on the amenity of a particular scheme on local residents would also be considered at planning application stage, with any proposal required to be compliant with Policy OSS4 (ii) of the Core Strategy, which ensures development does not unreasonably harm the amenities of adjoining properties.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The junction of Elmsmead with Main Street is already dangerous.</p>	<p>The Highway Authority has considered the site and considers an access via Elmsmead would be acceptable in principle. The Highway Authority's advice has taken account of the conditions of existing roads and junctions.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would be formally consulted on the detail of the access at planning application stage.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Rose Cottage, a listed building, would be adversely affected.</p>	<p>The site is considered to have a negligible effect on the setting of Rose Cottage. The cottage is bordered to the north and south by existing development. Mature trees/ scrub on the site boundary separate the cottage from the open field to the west. Its principal elevation facing Main Street would be unaffected by the development and, subject to the retention of a suitable landscape buffer in the north-eastern corner of the site, the development of the site would protect the setting of Rose Cottage. The need to protect its setting is identified at paragraph 11.138 and the indicative Detail Map shows a tree belt at this boundary.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The development will cause harm to wildlife.</p>	<p>The site is not within a designated wildlife site, although it has some potential for biodiversity and consequently, part (iv) of the Policy requires a biodiversity strategy to make provision for</p>

	<p>protected species and also the retention and management of the pond within the site. This will ensure the allocation conserves and enhances biodiversity in an appropriate manner in accordance with Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy and Policy DEN4 of the DaSA.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Northiam: Policies NOR1 & 2</p>	
<p><i>Development provisions and development boundary</i></p>	
<p>The development boundary should be revised to include land at the former Blue Cross Animal Hospital (part of site NO19 as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016).</p>	<p>Not agreed. The site is not considered suitable for allocation for the reasons detailed in the following response and it would not be appropriate to include it in the development boundary.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The former Blue Cross Animal Hospital should be allocated for 45 units and community hub with associated infrastructure and open spaces. Alternatively a smaller (brownfield) portion of the site should be allocated for up to 17 units. It is a sustainable, well-contained, partly brownfield site, well related to village services with no ecological constraints. The site rejected in the 2013 SHLAA Review (site NO19) was much larger. Concerns related to the impact on heritage assets and access but supporting evidence demonstrates these can be overcome. The site is suitable, deliverable and achievable and should be allocated ahead of the sites subject to Policies NOR1 and</p>	<p>This is a smaller version of site reference NO26 (as referenced in the Submission DaSA Sustainability Appraisal (Sept 2018)).</p> <p>While restricting development to the brownfield portion of the site would reduce some of the negative impacts previously identified, it is unlikely that 17 units could be accommodated within the area currently occupied by buildings, particularly given the need to retain the historic oast and associated buildings, a non-designated heritage asset. In any event, a major constraint continues to be the vehicular access.</p> <p>The existing access to the site from Main Street is restricted in width and could not be widened within the site's ownership; furthermore, it is adjacent to a listed building on its southern side. Two-way traffic could not be accommodated and this would result in an increased risk of vehicles baulking onto the A28, causing congestion and harm to highway safety. A pedestrian footway could not be accommodated. While the previous use of the site (an animal rehoming centre) would have generated a level of traffic, this is likely to have been low, with many of the trips generated by members of the public visiting the centre outside of the general AM and PM peak periods.</p> <p>An alternative access from Beales Lane would not be appropriate. Beales Lane narrows a short</p>

NOR2, or alternatively, in addition to NOR1 and NOR2 to ensure flexibility to meet the village's housing needs.

distance beyond the junction with the A28 and two-way traffic cannot be accommodated on some of this stretch of road. Therefore, any intensification in use of this road would require the carriageway width to be widened (extending from the junction with the A28 up to the site access, a distance of some 80 metres) to accommodate two-way traffic in a safe and convenient manner. It is unclear whether this could be achieved within the highway boundary but in any event, Beales Lane is a historic routeway within the High Weald AONB. Historic routeways are one of the five defining components of character of the High Weald AONB, and The High Weald AONB Management Plan (2019-2024) includes a specific objective to maintain their historic pattern and features, including the need for creative highway engineering solutions which are sensitive to AONB character, avoiding insensitive highway engineering and altering the historic alignment.

Furthermore, there is little scope to provide a footway on Beales Lane and therefore, neither the existing access from the A28 nor a new access point from Beales Lane would provide an acceptable pedestrian link between the site and local services.

In addition to the significant access constraints, the larger development suggested (45 units) in particular would still represent a significant departure from the overriding character of this part of Main Street, where development is largely linear in nature (with the exception of the 2 small developments at Highfields Place and Hylands Close). The development of the open fields would fundamentally change the open and rural character of the land, diminishing the intrinsic landscape quality and scenic beauty of the AONB and constitute an intensification and extension of urban form into the AONB. The encroachment into open fields, which currently create a strong distinction between the tight linear development of the conservation area and the surrounding rural landscape, would also harm the setting of the conservation area, diminishing the significance of the heritage asset.

It is accepted that should option (b) of Policy NOR2 be taken forward, there will be a minor shortfall (of 16 dwellings) against the housing target for Northiam identified in the Core Strategy (as detailed further below). However, given the uncertainties that the smaller option (17 units) at the Blue Cross Animal Hospital is achievable due to the access constraints, and the harm that would be caused by the larger option (45 units), this is not a reason to allocate the site in either of the suggested forms.

	<p>In sustainability terms, the proposals have been assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal. While the smaller of the 2 schemes (17 units) may not warrant the significant adverse score against Objective 15 (protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment) that was given to site NO19, in other respects the scoring does not significantly alter.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Land at Friars Cote Farm, Dexter Lane (part of site NO8 as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated for 12 units. It is well placed near existing facilities and visually, it forms a natural extension to existing development in Dexter Lane.</p>	<p>This site is not suitable for allocation. It is outside the settlement boundary and would represent a significant and inappropriate encroachment into an open field, harming the rural setting of the village and the landscape of the High Weald AONB. Its development would result in unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the area.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018) under site reference NO28. There have been no significant changes to the proposal and consequently, no changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Even if NOR1 and NOR2 are developed, if option (b) is taken forward on NOR2 this would leave a shortfall of 16 dwellings compared to the residual Core Strategy requirement for the village.</p>	<p>Noted. Options are given for Policy NOR2 in order to provide flexibility and improve opportunities for the site to come forward for development, having regard to its planning history. The larger number of dwellings would only be achievable on the site if option (a) is taken forward due to the nature of the development, as detailed in paragraph 11.163.</p> <p>It is accepted there would be a minor shortfall against the Core Strategy target for Northiam should option (b) be implemented, however, no other appropriate sites have been identified in the village and the allocations remain in line with the overall settlement strategy. Furthermore, as noted in chapter 8 (Overview), the total number of dwellings on allocated sites across the settlements in combination is somewhat higher than the minimum requirement identified by the Core Strategy and this would remain the case even with a minor shortfall at Northiam.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>A 20% increase should be applied to the Core Strategy housing requirement to overcome the Council's record of persistent under-delivery, and</p>	<p>The requirement for a 20% buffer, as identified in the NPPF, applies to the 5 year housing land supply rather than the housing requirement set out in the adopted Core Strategy. The housing target is taken from the Core Strategy and is up to date.</p>

consequently, the village requirement is 148 dwellings with a residual requirement of 83.	No change proposed.
<i>Policy NOR1 – Land south of Northiam Church of England Primary School</i>	
Support the policy/ parts of the policy (Northiam Parish Council, Historic England).	Noted.
The site is on the very edge of the village. Other sites are better related to village services.	While the site is on the southern edge of the village, it is in close proximity to village services, including the school, and bus stops and is in a sustainable location. No change proposed.
It is unclear whether a safe access could be achieved.	The Highway Authority has been consulted on the allocation and considers an appropriate access can be achieved in principle. Requirements are detailed in paragraph 11.156. The Highway Authority will be consulted on any forthcoming planning application. No change proposed.
The site is small and heavily constrained by TPO trees on its eastern boundary which limit the developable area, and it is within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area.	The site is allocated for a modest sized development of six dwellings which has taken account of site constraints, as detailed in paragraph 11.155 of the supporting text and part (iii) of the policy, No change proposed.
<i>Policy NOR2 – Land south of The Paddock/ Goddens Gill</i>	
Support part (ii) of the policy including the required 15 metres buffer to the ancient woodland.	Noted.
Concerns with the proposed density (Northiam Parish Council).	Noted. The site area is approximately 1.1 hectares (although the developable area is slightly less due to the necessary buffer to ancient woodland). The policy includes 2 options: (a) 52 age-restricted dwellings, or (b) 36 non-restricted dwellings. While option (a) would involve a relatively high density, by its nature, this type of residential accommodation has a reduced requirement for vehicle parking and external space and it is likely that the development would, at least in part, comprise apartments. The proposed density is comparable to, or slightly less than, similar schemes which have been permitted in the District in

	<p>recent years⁵, (including at this site) and is considered appropriate.</p> <p>Option (b) would involve a density of nearly 33 dwellings per hectare, which is considered appropriate, having regard to the site's central location and the density of adjoining development.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site may not be deliverable. It has been allocated since 2006 but has not been developed. The smaller development is unlikely to be viable.</p>	<p>Development at the site is considered to be achievable within the Plan Period.</p> <p>The extant planning permission for 58 units is for a specialist housing scheme which the developer decided not to pursue, however, the policy provides flexibility for an older person's scheme or a more general scheme of market housing. There is no evidence that a smaller scheme is unlikely to be viable.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>It is a greenfield site and should not be allocated when a brownfield site (the former Blue Cross Animal Hospital) is available.</p>	<p>Only a small part of the former Blue Cross Animal Hospital is brownfield and the brownfield portion could not accommodate the number of dwellings at NOR2. Furthermore, for the reasons detailed above, the allocation of the site is not considered appropriate.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Peasmarsh: Policy PEA1</p>	
<p><i>Development provisions and development boundary</i></p>	
<p>Sites PS5 (Land north-east of Tanhouse), PS6 (Land adjacent to superstore) and PS7s (Land south of Oaklands, Main Street) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated instead of the site subject to</p>	<p>The sites are not considered acceptable for allocation, either individually or in combination.</p> <p>Site PS5 is exposed in the landscape and there are clear views across attractive countryside to the west. Development would be harmful to the landscape of the High Weald AONB and the rural character and setting of the edge of the village, and this is considered an over-riding reason not to allocate it. Although the site is close to the supermarket and bus stops it is further from other village services.</p>

⁵ E.g. Planning permission RR/2013/1490/P (58 age-restricted dwellings at land off Goddens Gill, Northiam) had an approximate density of 51 dwellings per hectare; planning permission RR/2014/687/P (27 retirement living apartments at Hillborough House, Bexhill) had a density of approximately 56 dwellings per hectare.

<p>Policy PEA1. Access could be achieved via the existing roundabout via site PS5 or via the A268 via site PS7n. It would avoid the serious access and drainage issues on PEA1 and there would be no loss of dwellings. The sites have been rejected by the Council because of the alleged impact on the rural character of the area but this ignores the fact the sites lie adjacent to nearby commercial facilities with 24 hour lighting including the supermarket and petrol station.</p>	<p>Site PS6 is of a rural nature as the adjacent supermarket is on a lower ground level and not readily visible from the site. The site is on higher ground relative to the wider landscape, and consequently it is also exposed to wider views across AONB countryside, particularly from southern sections. Overall, there are negative impacts in terms of both landscape and rural character. Furthermore, the site is only accessible via other sites that have been rejected.</p> <p>Site PS7s is not adjacent to any existing development and there is a relative lack of integration with the existing village form at this location. The site reads more as wider countryside. It is also only accessible across other sites that have been rejected.</p> <p>Developing a combination of these sites together would represent a harmful encroachment into an area of rural character. It would cause harm to the landscape of this part of the High Weald AONB and the rural setting of the village. Sites PS6 and PS7s in particular are poorly related to the village form.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the sites were assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018) under site references PS5, 6, 7, 26 and 27. There have been no significant changes to the proposals and consequently, no changes to the scoring against the objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Sites PS7s and PS7n (Land at Oaklands, Main Street) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated instead of the site subject to Policy PEA1. It is better integrated with and closer to village amenities than PEA1. Access is no worse than for PEA1. It is visually contained from the wider AONB and there is the opportunity to also provide green space.</p>	<p>The sites are not considered acceptable for allocation, primarily due to vehicular access constraints. While PS7s could be accessed via PS7n, access to PS7n from Main Street is problematic for a combination of reasons. There is a highway safety issue in the general vicinity as sight lines are unlikely to be achievable due to topography.</p> <p>In addition, a pond is located adjacent to Main Street which is an obstacle directly and in terms of adverse impact via run-off, as well as being directly adjacent to another access.</p> <p>Alternative access options are limited and would require the use of third party land which would impact upon neighbouring uses (to the front) or have a likely landscape impact (to the rear).</p> <p>Furthermore, as noted above, site PS7s is not adjacent to any existing development and there is a relative lack of integration with the existing village form, the site reading more as wider countryside.</p>

	<p>The sites are not better integrated with the village than PEA1 and while they are marginally closer to the supermarket, they are further from other services including the school and recreation ground. The site subject to PEA1 reads as a natural extension to the village, bordered to the north-east and south-east by existing development, whereas PS7 would encroach into the wider countryside, causing harm to the character of the village and AONB.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the sites were assessed separately against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018). Combining the sites would still result in negative impacts against environmental criteria.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The actual number of houses proposed in the allocation, and required in the village, is unclear (Peasmarsh Parish Council).</p>	<p>The policy is clear at part (i) that the allocation is for some 45 dwellings (net). It is acknowledged at paragraph 11.178 that one existing dwelling (“Pippins”) would be demolished to facilitate a site access, hence the reference to 45 “net” dwellings.</p> <p>The residual requirement for the village is noted in the table at Figure 17 on page 108 of the Submission DaSA. This confirms the Core Strategy target is for 50 dwellings, and a large site permission for 11 dwellings was granted prior to April 2018, meaning the residual requirement is 39.</p> <p>Therefore, the allocation exceeds the residual requirement for the village by a marginal amount (6 dwellings). This is considered appropriate, given the scale, location and nature of the site and the relationship with and character of nearby residential development. The marginal increase will have a negligible additional effect on local services, and indeed, the policy provides for public open space, footpath linkages and a play area.</p> <p>An error has, however, been identified at paragraph 11.172 which refers to the recently permitted scheme at The Maltings as comprising 10 additional dwellings, when it actually comprised 11. The correct figure is reflected at Figure 17 as detailed above. [This error was identified independently, prior to the submission of the DaSA to the Secretary of State and its correction was consequently included within the list of minor amendments submitted with the DaSA on January 18th].</p>

	No change proposed.
<i>Policy PEA1 – Land south of Main Street</i>	
The words “as far as reasonably practicable” should be deleted from part (vi) of the policy (Natural England).	<p>The wording is considered appropriate, as it may not be practicable to retain and/ or enhance all features, for example all existing trees.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the policy wording is clear in its intent to retain and enhance ecological and AONB features. Furthermore, any proposal would be considered against the Local Plan as a whole, which includes policies to conserve the High Weald AONB having particular regard to its character components (DaSA Policy DEN2), and require the retention and enhancement of biodiversity in a manner appropriate to the local context (Policy DEN4).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The allocation should be reduced to 40 dwellings (Peasmarsh Parish Council).	<p>As noted above, the allocation for 45 dwellings marginally exceeds (by 6 dwellings) the residual requirement for Peasmarsh as identified against the Core Strategy target. However, the site is considered able to accommodate 45 which would make most efficient use of land.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The requirement for open space should be removed (Peasmarsh Parish Council).	<p>It is understood the Parish Council’s concerns relate mainly to the potential adverse effect on other areas of open space (specifically play areas) within the village, and the potential for a maintenance burden to fall on the Parish Council.</p> <p>The nature of the site allows for the inclusion of an area of open space, to incorporate a retained traditional orchard, an area of natural green space and open space with children’s play area.</p> <p>As well as providing for existing and future residents these will also secure the retention and enhancement of features of ecological and landscape importance, in accordance with DaSA Policies DEN1, DEN2 and DEN4.</p> <p>As noted at paragraph 11.180, the inclusion of a play area also addresses a deficit identified in the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (2007), since which time there have been no additional play areas developed in the village (although the one existing play area has been refurbished). The effect on the play area is considered further below.</p> <p>It should be noted that parts (iv) and (v) of the Policy require funding and management</p>

	<p>arrangements to be secured for the ongoing maintenance of the open space as part of the future development of the site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site access is unsuitable and hazardous and no evidence has been provided that an acceptable access can be achieved (Peasmarsh Parish Council).</p>	<p>The Highway Authority has been consulted and has indicated that an acceptable access can be achieved in principle, as detailed at paragraph 11.178.</p> <p>The Highway Authority would be formally consulted on the details of the proposed access at planning application stage.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site suffers from surface water flooding which affects neighbouring residents. SuDS is a short term solution only (Peasmarsh Parish Council).</p>	<p>The site is in flood zone 1.</p> <p>However, it is noted that surface water flow paths cross the southern part of the site. The Detail Map (Figure 54) indicates this area to largely comprise open space.</p> <p>The need for SuDS is acknowledged at paragraph 11.18 and policy requirement (ix). The aim of SuDS is to provide a permanent drainage solution. There is no evidence that SuDS would not be effective at this location.</p> <p>The detail of the proposed drainage scheme will be subject to further advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority at planning application stage, which would take account of existing drainage infrastructure and issues in the local area. Development of the site, including an appropriate SuDS, offers the opportunity to address existing drainage issues.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The development would harm the amenity of many residents and this has not been considered.</p>	<p>While development would be noticeable to adjoining residents it is not considered that impacts would unacceptably harm amenity.</p> <p>The particular effects of a specific scheme would be for consideration at planning application stage. Any planning application would be assessed against the Local Plan as a whole, including Policy OSS4 of the Core Strategy which requires all proposals to not unacceptably harm the amenities of adjoining properties.</p>

	No change proposed.
Local people/ the Parish Council have not been properly consulted (Peasmarsh Parish Council).	Not agreed. The DaSA has been subject to statutory consultation and publication at respective stages of plan-making and all comments received have been summarised and addressed through the respective Consultation Statements. No change proposed.
Data within the DaSA is inaccurate: the statement on public transport is out of date as the bus service has got worse, there is poor availability of/ access to medical and dental services, and there is no shortage of accessible open space.	It is unclear which data the comment is referring to. The DaSA notes at paragraph 11.171 that the village has a good range of services. This is considered to be the case. While the comment on the bus service being reduced is noted, the village still has a regular bus service. The Clinical Commissioning Group has advised the Council that there are no particular capacity problems for GP surgeries in Rother at the moment although the situation is fluid and can be impacted by the practices' ability to recruit new doctors. The housing target for the village, as identified in the adopted Core Strategy, has taken account of the level of services available. While the allocation exceeds this by a marginal amount (6 dwellings), this will have a negligible additional effect on local services. No change proposed.
Local services are more limited than the DaSA suggests (Peasmarsh Parish Council).	The DaSA notes at paragraph 11.171 that the village has a good range of services. This is considered to be the case. The level of local services is considered appropriate to serve the scale of development being planned for. No change proposed.
The current infrastructure and amenities in the village are insufficient and will not support 45 additional homes.	The village is considered to have a good range of services. The housing target for the village, as identified in the adopted Core Strategy, has taken account of the level of services available. While the allocation exceeds this by a marginal amount (6 dwellings), this will have a negligible additional effect on local services. No change proposed.
The Council has given too much weight to the proposed re-instatement of an old orchard, which in any event	The policy takes the opportunity to retain and enhance a traditional orchard, which is a Priority Habitat and a character feature of the High Weald AONB, in accordance with the NPPF and Policies DEN2 and DEN4 of the DaSA. It would be contrary to these policies to not secure the

<p>has a limited lifespan. This would not be a genuine public open space in view of the nature of the land and public benefits would be limited.</p>	<p>retention and enhancement of this feature. In addition to the orchard, additional public open space is required by the policy, including a children’s play area.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The orchard trees may already be unsafe and the burden of maintenance is likely to fall to the Parish Council (Peasmarsh Parish Council).</p>	<p>This is addressed through part (v) of the policy, which requires funding and management arrangements for the public open space (including the orchard) to be secured for its ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>There is no need for a new play area. The play area at the recreation ground was replaced in 2018 and a key aim of this was to improve community cohesion. An additional play area only a short walk away directly contradicts these efforts and could lead to the children in that area becoming isolated (Peasmarsh Parish Council).</p>	<p>Noted, although the existing play area in the village is over 400m (walking distance) from the site, on the opposite side of the main road through the village (the A268). A new play area within the allocation site, in addition to serving the new residents, would also better serve those residents in the western part of the village who are further from the recreation ground. Given the distance separation, it is unlikely that the provision of a new play area would significantly reduce the use of the existing, particularly because the existing play area is adjacent to other facilities including the recreation ground.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The proposal would result in the loss of an attractive dwelling.</p>	<p>It is acknowledged at paragraph 11.178 that an existing dwelling (“Pippins”) would be demolished to facilitate a site access. “Pippins” is not a listed building, in a conservation area or of any local historic or other significance. Given the lack of an alternative access point, its loss is accepted to facilitate development of the wider site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site is likely to be expensive to develop and 40% affordable housing is unlikely to be achieved.</p>	<p>There is no evidence that the site is unviable or unlikely to achieve the required affordable housing proportion.</p> <p>A Plan-wide Viability Assessment (October 2018) tested a number of site typologies in terms of their viability when required to comply with Core Strategy and DaSA policies (including affordable housing requirements). It found development in the vast majority of cases, including a 40 unit scheme on greenfield or brownfield land in the Rural East of the district, to be viable with financial headroom. While this is an indication only and did not consider particular sites, it supports the assumption that the site is likely to be able to fully meet the policy requirements of the DaSA.</p>

	No change proposed.
There are a number of records of refusals for small-scale residential development on adjacent land.	Noted. These are small scale schemes of 1-3 dwellings, largely of a historic nature dating from the 1950s to 1980s and relate to small sites, mostly to the east/ south-east of the current allocation site, which have subsequently been developed with small numbers of dwellings. These decisions are not directly relevant to the current allocation. No change proposed.
Rye Harbour: Policy RHA1 & 2	
<i>Policy RHA1 – Land at Stoneworks Cottages</i>	
Given the site's proximity to the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), reference to the Dungeness Complex Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) should be included. An additional policy criterion requiring a contribution to the SARMS should be added, to be consistent with the policies for Camber (CAM1 and CAM2).	<p>It is accepted that the site is in close proximity to the Natura 2000 Sites and may have a direct impact in terms of run-off and infiltration, access and other activity; (it has found not to be functionally-linked land) Hence, they can legitimately be expected to be compatible with, and potentially contribute to, ensuring that the integrity of the designations are maintained.</p> <p>Relevant measures are set out in the SARMS and may be considered in terms of their applicability to particular schemes on an individual basis.</p> <p>More generic implications of increased population within the overall catchment will be addressed through a programme of measures (with strategic oversight involving the District Councils and Natural England) funded via CIL/other sources.</p> <p><u>Proposed Changes:</u> Add a new criterion (vii) to Policy RHA1 to read: <i><u>(vii) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</u></i></p> <p>Add a new sentence after the second sentence of paragraph 11.197 to read: <i>In view of the proximity of the site to the international wildlife designations and the potential for additional impacts, the development should ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/ Ramsar site, with mitigation if necessary, in line with the provisions of the SARMS,</i></p>

	<i>referred to in Policy DEN4.</i>
An additional policy criterion should be added to ensure proposals are only permitted where there is no adverse impact on the adjacent SSSI, SPA or Ramsar site, to be consistent with the policies for Camber (CAM1 and CAM2).	Agreed. See response above.
An additional policy criterion should be added to require the protection and potential enhancement of the settings of the Grade II listed Holy Spirits Church and the Schoolhouse, in view of the proximity of these heritage assets to the allocation site (Historic England).	<p>The proximity of and need for development to respect the setting of these buildings is recognised in the supporting text at paragraph 11.198. Furthermore, part (iii) of the policy requires screen hedgerow planting on the boundary between the listed buildings and the site, as illustrated on the Detail Map.</p> <p>Any planning application would be considered against the Local Plan as a whole, including Core Strategy Policy EN2 which relates to development affecting the historic built environment, and also the NPPF, which seeks to protect heritage assets, including their setting, at paragraph 190.</p> <p>Therefore, it is considered the additional policy criterion is unnecessary. This is consistent with the approach taken with other site allocations adjacent to listed buildings (e.g. IDE1, CAT1), where the listed building(s) are mentioned in the supporting text but not the policy itself.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
The site is adjacent to the Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSSI/ SPA/ Ramsar site, which is sensitive to water quality impacts. In order to protect these designated sites, proposals must consider all potential pathways for hydrological impacts (not just groundwater). The policy does not identify the need to include adequate surface water protection measures and this must be included. A comprehensive approach must be	<p>Noted. It is considered that criterion (vi) largely addresses pollution risks from a wide range of sources, but it is accepted that surface water protection should be considered. However, as the site has a high water table and a risk of contamination from previous uses, any SuDS scheme will need to be particularly carefully designed to manage risks to the adjacent designated sites.</p> <p>For consistency with other site allocation policies in the vicinity of the Dungeness Complex, a separate policy criterion will be added to cover all impacts on the integrity of the Natura 2000 Sites (and have regard to the SARMS identified in Policy DEN4), together with additional text relating to potential SuDS.</p> <p><u>Proposed Changes:</u> Add a new criterion to Policy RHA1 to read:</p>

<p>undertaken in order to mitigate any potential adverse impacts, which is likely to require the inclusion of SuDS (Natural England).</p>	<p><u><i>(vii) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</i></u></p> <p>Add a new sentence to the end of paragraph 11.200 to read:</p> <p><i>An appropriate foul and surface water drainage scheme should include surface water protection measures and, where practicable, elements of SuDS in accordance with Policy DEN5 and taking due account of the high water table and risk of contamination.</i></p>
<p><i>Policy RHA2 – Harbour Road Employment Area</i></p>	
<p>An additional policy criterion should be added to ensure proposals are only permitted where there is no adverse impact on the adjacent SSSI, SPA or Ramsar site, to be consistent with the policies for Camber (CAM1 and CAM2).</p>	<p>This is already included at criterion (iv) of the policy, but this may also refer to the Strategic Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as referred to in other policies close to the Dungeness Complex.</p> <p><u>Proposed Changes:</u></p> <p>Amend criterion (iv) to read:</p> <p><u><i>(iv) the development has no adverse effect on the integrity of the adjacent Natura 2000 Sites and supports the implementation of the Sustainable Access and Recreation Management Strategy (SARMS) as appropriate.</i></u></p> <p><u>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 11.205 to read:</u></p> <p><u><i>11.205a In view of the proximity of the Employment Area to the international wildlife designations and the potential for additional impacts, the development should ensure that there is no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/ Ramsar site, with mitigation if necessary, in line with the provisions of the SARMS, referred to in Policy DEN4.</i></u></p>
<p>An additional policy criterion should be added to require surface water drainage and foul provision</p>	<p>The potential contamination risk is already highlighted by the inclusion of criterion (ii). However, it is agreed that an additional criterion should be added to require an appropriate drainage scheme, in order to address the comments of the Environment Agency.</p>

<p>agreements. This is because drainage at this location is an issue due to contamination (Environment Agency).</p>	<p><u>Change proposed</u></p> <p>Add an additional policy criterion as follows:</p> <p><i>(viii) An appropriate foul and surface water drainage scheme is provided, in accordance with Policy DEN5.</i></p> <p>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 11.205a (see above) to read:</p> <p><i>11.205b Development will also need to include provision for appropriate foul and surface water drainage, having regard to sewer provision and existing levels of contamination. The scheme should include elements of SuDS where practicable, although these will need to be carefully designed having regard to the high water table and risk of underlying contamination.</i></p>
<p>Recognition of the need to safeguard minerals and waste infrastructure is supported (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>There needs to be an element of flexibility in the definition of the Employment Area boundary to accommodate future development proposals.</p>	<p>This comment relates specifically to part of site RH6 (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016), which is the subject of the next comment.</p> <p>The Employment Area boundary has been carefully drawn to encompass largely brownfield land that does not encroach into the adjacent Dungeness Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA/Ramsar site.</p> <p>Having regard to the fact the area is almost entirely surrounded by the SPA/ Ramsar, the Dungeness Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SSI, and the Rye Harbour SSSI, it would be inappropriate for its boundary to include an element of flexibility that could result in encroachment and harm to these designated sites.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The Employment Area boundary should be enlarged to include part of</p>	<p>The proposed enlargement would result in direct encroachment into greenfield land within the internationally protected Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA/Ramsar site and would</p>

<p>site RH6 (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016), to allow the expansion of an existing employment site. Environmental impacts could be mitigated through an ecological management plan.</p>	<p>harm the integrity of those sites. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate how impacts of the proposed enlargement could be mitigated. It would be inappropriate to include this land within the Employment Area boundary as it would directly conflict with the NPPF (paragraph 174a), Core Strategy Policy EN5 and DaSA Policy DEN4.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the enlargement has been assessed against the objectives within the Sustainability Appraisal, as detailed below in the section on “Sustainability Appraisal”.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Westfield: Policies WES1, 2, 3 & 4</p>	
<p><i>Development provisions and development boundary</i></p>	
<p>Land adjoining Mill Lane/ Cottage Lane (a variation of site WF10 as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016) should be allocated for 80 dwellings and should be included in the development boundary. It is within reasonable walking distance of amenities and a suitable access can be obtained. A high quality development could deliver a mix of houses with open space and pedestrian linkages with only a negligible impact on the landscape and townscape character and no significant impact on the High Weald AONB.</p>	<p>The site is not suitable for allocation. It is located on elevated land on the northern fringe of the village, outside the settlement boundary. Its character and that of the immediate surroundings are markedly different to the southern part of Cottage Lane which is more intensively developed. Although there is housing on the western side of Cottage Lane (opposite the site), the overall character of the area is rural, and the site makes an important contribution to this. Land north of the site is open countryside, typical of this part of the High Weald AONB, and the site forms a buffer between this and the village. The agricultural buildings in the north-western corner are typical of the rural landscape and in keeping with the character of the area but the site’s development for housing would change its character considerably to the extent that harm would be caused to the landscape setting of the village and the character of the High Weald AONB.</p> <p>The site is accessed via narrow country lanes of rural character. It was subject to a number of planning refusals for residential development between the 1960s and 1980s and was most recently subject to two appeals in the late 1980s which were dismissed for reasons including harm to rural character. While some time has passed since these decisions, there have been no significant changes in circumstances that would justify supporting the development of this site.</p> <p>The Highway Authority commented in 1989 that Cottage Lane is unsuitable to serve a development by reason of its narrow width, poor alignment and lack of footways. The Highway Authority has confirmed that Cottage Lane has not changed in its character since that date and the point of access from the highway is in the position that has been deemed unsuitable. The applicant has put forward a Transport Appraisal and potential access arrangements but does not</p>

	<p>appear to have agreed these with the Highway Authority and has not fully addressed the shortcomings of Cottage Lane. While an access through the “Moorhurst” site could potentially be explored, the site allocation is considered unacceptable for other reasons, as detailed above.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, it has been considered whether the additional information now submitted by the respondent warrants changes to the scoring given to the site against the Objectives identified in the Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The SA (2018) assessed this site under reference WF28. It is concluded that there are no significant changes to the proposal or to the scoring against the sustainability objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>For the housing strategy at Westfield to be found sound, additional land is needed. There can be no reasonable certainty that Land at Westfield Down (Policy WES1) will be developed as it has been an allocation since 2006, or that 40 dwellings will be delivered at the Moorhurst site (Policy WES2) within the Plan period, and in any event, residential development at the Moorhurst site will only replace the previous residential accommodation (care home) lost to demolition.</p>	<p>Development at land at Westfield Down and the former Moorhurst Care Home is considered to be achievable within the Plan Period.</p> <p>At Westfield Down, planning permission has recently been granted for the approval of reserved matters pursuant to an outline permission for 39 dwellings (Oct 2018) and related recreational facilities (May 2018). There is also a planning application currently under consideration for related drainage works. This illustrates the landowners’ active intention for the site to be developed. The County Council, as part-owner, is supportive of the allocation.</p> <p>With regard to the former Moorhurst Care Home, the County Council, as landowner, is supportive of the allocation and has recently taken the decision to place the property on the open market for sale. The care home, which it is understood had 19 bedrooms, was demolished in 2008 and the site has been vacant ever since. Consequently, the previous use has been abandoned and the allocation is correctly considered to represent additional (rather than replacement) housing for the village. In any event, the previous use was an institutional use rather than individual dwellings.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>There would appear to be a more suitable site to meet the housing needs of the village whilst also providing possible employment and</p>	<p>The site is not considered suitable for allocation. It reads as part of the wider rural setting and several High Weald AONB features are present. The area of Tanyard Farmhouse (in the southern part of the site) is a historic farmstead and the remainder of the site forms part of an associated medieval field pattern.</p>

<p>community facilities. That is land at Tanyard Farm House, Fishponds Lane (site WF13 as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016).</p>	<p>The Farmhouse itself and a traditional barn are considered to be non-designated heritage assets and their settings in turn influence the prevailing rural character of the area. The whole curtilage setting is worthy of retention as its loss would be harmful in heritage terms and to the historic rural setting and this would affect the site's development capacity in the event that development on the medieval fields was accepted.</p> <p>In sustainability terms, the site was assessed against the Objectives in the Sustainability Appraisal (2018) but that was for a solely residential use. While the inclusion of additional uses including employment and community facilities could improve the scoring against those objectives relating to economic growth and engagement in leisure activities, the site continues to score poorly against several environmental objectives.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy WES1 – Land at Westfield Down</i></p>	
<p>Development could have an adverse effect on the landscape character of the High Weald AONB, contrary to national policy, particularly due to floodlighting which may be associated with the sports pitches. An assessment of potential impacts has not been completed. The allocation is not justified as it does not provide sufficient evidence to support its inclusion with regard to impacts on the AONB, considered against reasonable alternatives. Pending further information the policy may be found to be inconsistent with national policy in this regard. It is for the decision maker to decide if a proposal constitutes major development. If it does, the allocation should be assessed against</p>	<p>The allocation takes forward an extant allocation in the 2006 Local Plan, for which planning permission has been granted but not yet implemented.</p> <p>The policy does not provide for floodlighting of the recreation land/ sports pitches. Planning permission was first granted for the change of use of the northern part of the site for sports uses in 2007, and due to the permission not being implemented, has been successively granted since then, most recently in 2018 (reference RR/2018/761/P). The planning permission does not provide for floodlighting. Any proposal for floodlighting would need a separate planning permission and would be assessed in accordance with Local Plan policies including DaSA Policies DEN1 (Maintaining Landscape Character) and DEN7 (Environmental Pollution).</p> <p>The allocation does not constitute major development in the AONB. The proposed addition of 39 dwellings represents a 6% increase on the existing number of dwellings within the development boundary which is not significant within the meaning of the NPPF. Furthermore, the site is well related to the main confines of the village.</p> <p>The suggested additional wording is not considered necessary because the policy does not provide for floodlighting and already includes criteria to provide screening of the site from the wider AONB (paragraph 11.129, part (iii) of the policy). The village's location within the AONB is</p>

<p>NPPF paragraph 172 and if the criteria cannot be met, the allocation should not be pursued. If it is not considered major development the policy should include wording requiring early consideration of impacts (such as, but not limited to, floodlighting) to avoid impacts on the AONB and conflicting with other local plan policies (Natural England).</p>	<p>discussed at paragraphs 11.208 and 11.210. Furthermore, any further planning application at the site would be assessed against the Local Plan as a whole, which includes policies to protect the landscape character of the High Weald AONB (DaSA Policy DEN2, Core Strategy Policy EN1).</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p><i>Policy WES2 – Land at the former Moorhurst Care Home</i></p>	
<p>The site is not well connected to existing services and pedestrian access to the village is poor.</p>	<p>The supporting text notes at paragraph 11.225 that a number of measures will be necessary to make a development at the site acceptable in planning terms to prioritise safe pedestrian access and sustainable forms of transport to the village core, and these are reflected in part (v) of the Policy. Notwithstanding this, while the site is north of the village, it is a brownfield site and is not isolated, being within walking distance of the village centre and services including the doctor's surgery (250 metres away). It will also become more integrated within the village in the event of the Westfield Down site opposite being developed.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The site is too small to satisfactorily accommodate 40 dwellings.</p>	<p>The proposed allocation is for retirement living/ sheltered housing rather than general-needs housing. By its nature, this type of residential accommodation has a reduced requirement for vehicle parking and external space. Furthermore, it is likely that the development would, at least in part, comprise apartments. The proposed density of 50 dwellings per hectare is comparable to, or slightly less than, similar schemes which have been permitted in the District in recent years and is considered achievable at this site.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>The proposed housing tenure would not provide a balanced housing mix for the village.</p>	<p>The proposed allocation seeks to meet an identified demand for a particular type of residential accommodation. Together with the other allocated sites in the village, an overall balanced housing mix will be achieved.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

<i>Policy WES4 – Land between Moor Lane and the A28</i>	
Support the policy as the village currently has no allotments (Westfield Parish Council).	Noted. However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former’s recent proposal for the disposal of the land.
The land is totally unsuitable for allotments due to its sloping nature and boundary trees.	<p>The land is considered suitable for allotments. It is not steeply sloping, and boundary trees are not to such an extent that would cause unacceptable over-shadowing.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former’s recent proposal for the disposal of the land.</p>
The proposed use will adversely affect the amenity of adjoining residents due to direct overlooking.	<p>Due to the nature of the proposed use it is not considered there will be any unacceptable effect on adjoining residents.</p> <p>However, it is considered important that existing boundary planting is retained, in order to provide screening between the proposed use and existing residents. Furthermore, there may be opportunities to enhance it with additional planting in some limited locations. This will also benefit biodiversity. Therefore, it is appropriate to insert additional wording and an additional policy criterion to reflect this.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Insert wording at the beginning of paragraph 11.238:</p> <p><i>Existing boundary trees and hedges should be retained, and enhanced with additional native species planting where necessary, in order to provide screening between the allotment use and adjoining residents and for the benefit of biodiversity.</i></p> <p>Insert an additional policy criterion:</p> <p><i>(iv) Existing boundary trees and hedges are retained, and additional native species planting is provided to fill in any gaps.</i></p>

	<p>However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former's recent proposal for the disposal of the land.</p>
<p>The proposed use will adversely affect wildlife including badgers.</p>	<p>The land currently comprises a largely grassed area with boundary trees and some areas of scrub. Bringing it into use as allotments is likely to retain any ecological value and could enhance it, particularly with the additional requirement of retaining boundary planting detailed above. Badgers are protected under separate legislation with which any development would be required to comply.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former's recent proposal for the disposal of the land.</p>
<p>An additional policy criterion should be included to require ecological improvements to be implemented in accordance with the Hastings Fringes Biodiversity Opportunity Area and Rother Green Infrastructure Study.</p>	<p>Bringing the land into use as allotments is likely to retain any ecological value and could enhance it, particularly with the additional requirement of retaining boundary planting detailed above. Any planning application would be considered in accordance with the Local Plan as a whole which includes policies to require the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity, including in defined Biodiversity Enhancement Areas (policy DEN4 of the DaSA, Policy EN5 of the Core Strategy).</p> <p>However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former's recent proposal for the disposal of the land.</p>
<p>The parking area would need to be designed in a way that removes the need for vehicles to reverse out, as this would be hazardous in this location opposite a 4 way junction. Reference to this requirement should be added to the supporting text (para 11.237) (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>It is agreed this should be added in the interests of clarity and highway safety.</p> <p><u>Change proposed:</u></p> <p>Insert wording at the end of paragraph 11.237:</p> <p><i>The parking area will need to be designed in a way that removes the need for vehicles to reverse out, in the interests of highway safety.</i></p>

	However, the Policy is subject to further discussions with East Sussex County Council (as landowner) and the Parish Council in the light of the former's recent proposal for the disposal of the land.
--	--

Other potential changes to Policy WES4 (unrelated to representations received)

It has come to the Council's attention that the landowner is considering proposals to sell the site in whole or in part on the open market, which could affect its availability for allotment use. The situation is on-going and will be kept under review by the Council in advance of the public examination.

Chapter 13: Other Policies

Gypsies and Travellers: Policy GYP1	
<p>The data that Core Strategy Policy LHN5 (sites for the needs of Gypsies and Travellers) is based on is out of date.</p>	<p>The strategic policies within the adopted Core Strategy are considered up to date as they are less than five years old (as set out in the NPPF). Taking into account what has been granted planning permission in the interim, the Gypsy and Traveller sites identified within the DaSA are proposed to meet the outstanding identified need for pitches across the district.</p>
<p>The temporary gypsy site at Bramble Farm, Staplecross Road, Ewhurst should be allocated to provide for the needs of the resident gypsy family who have lived there for a number of years. The proposed allocations made by policies GYP1 and BEX3c will not meet their needs.</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>The site at Bramble Farm is located to rear of an existing barn, against a backcloth of established, native trees. The site forms part of a larger area of land being used as a smallholding. The surrounding area is rolling open countryside and is located within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). There are a small number of residential properties to the east and south of the site. The site is accessed via a single track off Staplecross Road which is also used to access the wider smallholding. This area is relatively well contained at present and not visually prominent from the main road. Some areas of flood risk along the access track to the site (outwith the site). The site is not particularly well located in terms of access to services, but a small scale site in this location would not place undue pressure on local infrastructure and services. However the predominant means of transport would be by car.</p> <p>Previous appeal Inspectors have indicated that they are satisfied that taking into account the nature of the vehicular movements associated with the residential use; the separation distances between properties; the nature of the intervening planting; the remote location of the access point; and the small scale nature of the caravan site accommodating a single family group, the residential use does not unacceptably harm the living conditions of the neighbouring residents in respect of noise and disturbance.</p> <p>Some planting (conifers and laurels) has been carried out in front of (west) and beyond (going north) the area where the mobile home/s are currently located. This planting does help to screen the residential element of the site, although it would benefit from a native mix of tree planting to sit more comfortably within the wider landscape. Additional native screening would better reflect the character and appearance of the surrounding AONB countryside.</p>

	<p>Notwithstanding the additional screening effects, having regard to previous planning appeal Inspectors' consideration, it is still regarded as an inappropriate site for permanent Gypsy pitches within the High Weald AONB and is in an unsustainable rural location which is not well related to services.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<i>Policy GYP1 - Land adjacent to High Views, Loose Farm Lane, Battle</i>	
<p>As the planning permission was not implemented the site cannot be assumed to be deliverable and therefore it is unlikely to contribute to the future supply of traveller sites.</p>	<p>The planning permission for 1 pitch on this site was granted in April 2016. That planning permission was granted with a personal planning condition given the requirements set out in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites (PPTS).</p> <p>The site has now changed ownership and therefore that planning permission cannot be implemented. However the site is still in ownership of a traveller household.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<i>Site allocation – Land at North Bexhill (Policy BEX3)</i>	
Comments made under this section have been moved to Policy BEX3c: Land east of Watermill Lane	
Marley Lane: Policy MAR1	
No comments made	

Sustainability Appraisal/Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)

Sustainability Appraisal/ Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA)	
<p>Disagree with scoring on site NO19 (Blue Cross Animal Hospital, Northiam) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016). Site should be taken forward as an allocation.</p>	<p>The comment refers to the 4 negative scores and contends that the 3 attributed to flooding/ water related objectives and economic growth can be mitigated, which leaves only the negative scoring against Objective 15 (Protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment). It contends that while there is likely to be an impact on the setting of the adjacent Conservation Area, this would be less than substantial. Therefore, on balance, the positive or neutral scores against all other objectives would mean the site scores more highly than any other site in the village and should be taken forward as an allocation.</p> <p>It is arguable that the scoring on those negative attributes could be improved by the inclusion of a community building as suggested, and while flooding could potentially be mitigated through SuDS, the negative scoring on Objective 15 relates to more than the impact on the Conservation Area, as noted in the commentary. Development would change the character of the wider AONB landscape with visual encroachment to the east of the village. This, together with the impact on the Conservation Area, justifies the strong negative score against Objective 15.</p> <p>On this basis, the two sites taken forward as Policies NOR1 and NOR2 score more highly.</p> <p>It is noted the respondent has submitted two alternative, smaller proposals as variations on site NO19. These proposals have been assessed in sustainability terms under the Northiam section above.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
<p>Disagree with scoring on site FO10 (Land at Kings Bank Lane, Beckley) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016). Site should be taken forward as an allocation.</p>	<p>The comment refers in particular to the scoring against Objective 15 (Protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment) and queries why site FO12 scored positively against objective 15 but site FO10 did not. It argues the scoring for objective 15 should be reassessed which would likely result in FO10 scoring as one of the two most sustainable sites in the village; and FO10 should therefore be taken forward as an allocation.</p> <p>As explained in the commentary, site FO10 scores poorly against objective 15 because it is an open field, forming part of a historic field pattern and clearly visible from adjacent roads. Its development would harm the rural setting of the village and AONB landscape. The commentary</p>

	<p>for site FO12 makes clear that the scoring is based on the development of land to the rear of the Buddens Green estate only. This area is relatively well screened from views from the south and east, and while its development would be visible from Main Street to the north it would be viewed as a logical and small continuation of existing development, against a backdrop of mature trees.</p> <p>The scoring is considered correct and no changes are proposed.</p>
<p>Disagree with scoring on North Bexhill site. Land north of the North Bexhill Access Road (NBAR) should be taken forward as an allocation.</p>	<p>This comment relates to site BX133 (North Bexhill) and the Options for that land, depicted on page 70 and detailed on page 78 of the SA Appendix 4.</p> <p>The comment refers in particular to the scoring against Objective 15 (Protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment) and queries why Option 5 (Areas A and D) has a significant negative score whereas Option 2 (Areas A, B, C and D) has only a minor negative score. It contends the scoring against Objective 15 for Option 5 is erroneous, and that had the inclusion of Area D been scored correctly, its inclusion for development with Area A would be shown to not have a materially harming impact and accordingly, Area D should be taken forward as an allocation.</p> <p>The SA of options for North Bexhill (BX133) shows the different component parts which make up those Options 1-5. Options 2, 3 and 5 all show development north of NBAR. It is not agreed that the SA scorings of Option 3 and 5 are incorrect but that Option 2 should have resulted in a major negative score at SA Objective 15 (protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment) by virtue of NBAR providing a clear edge between the urban area and the countryside to the north.</p> <p>It is concluded there should be changes to the scoring for Objective 15 for BX133 option 2. This results in a minor amendment to the conclusion of that option which endorses the overall finding that it should not be allocated for development, particularly due to the significant adverse effects that have been identified against Objective 15.</p> <p><u>Proposed changes to Sustainability Appraisal</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change the scoring against Objective 15 for option 2 (site BX133) from minor negative to major negative.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the final sentence of the commentary for option 2 site BX133 as follows: <i>Some positive (Obj 1 & 2) and minor negative (Obj 9-11 & 14-16, 14 & 16) sustainability criteria identified. <u>One major negative criteria identified in respect of Obj 15.</u></i>
<p>Disagree with scoring on Sidley Sports Ground and Social Club. SA of this site is not legally compliant.</p>	<p>The comment refers to site BX123 and the two options appraised on page 78 of the SA Appendix 4.</p> <p>It contends that the scoring for the Housing option is not accurate or objective; and the negative scores against Objectives 2 and 9 (Improve health and well-being; and Improve efficiency in land use) are unsubstantiated when compared to other sites for housing which score more positively against these objectives.</p> <p>It also contends that the SA is flawed because no mixed use is appraised for the site, which would have been a “reasonable alternative”, given the owner’s aspirations for the site and the planning application history. Therefore, the SA is not legally compliant.</p> <p>The commentary which accompanies the SA for site BX123 explains that the options are based upon an initial assessment of what the site could realistically be potentially re-used for. This is in the light of policy position suggesting retention of the site for playing pitches, compared to the owner’s aspirations for residential. Generally, a neutral to negative scoring against the SA criteria for housing, particularly in terms of Objectives 2, 8 and 9 (Improve health and well-being; engagement in cultural and leisure activities and improve efficiency in land use). Generally a more positive SA scoring against playing pitches on the site in terms of the health and leisure benefits (Objs 8, 9 - (Engagement in cultural and leisure activities and improve efficiency in land use). The approach set out in the SA, which considered both uses separately, is consistent with how other sites in Bexhill have been assessed. If a mixed use is considered appropriate this is then assessed through the SA of the specific policy.</p> <p>The scoring is considered correct and no amendments are proposed.</p>
<p>Disagree with scoring on sites RH3 (Land adjacent to Rye Wastewater Treatment Works, Rye Harbour) and RH6 (Land south of the former spun</p>	<p><i>The comment notes that the SA of site RH6 assumes the whole site is greenfield, whereas this is not the case, and the poor scores do not accurately reflect the position.</i></p> <p><i>It also requests that a reassessment is made of Site RH6 based on a newly submitted plan,</i></p>

<p>concrete site, Rye Harbour) (as referenced in Appendix 3 of the DaSA Local Plan Options and Preferred Options document, Dec 2016). Scoring should be reassessed.</p> <p>Postscript: Since the representations were sent to the Inspector, the respondent has confirmed that the reference to site RH3 is erroneous, as the result of a typographical error, and the representation should only refer to site RH6. The Council’s response therefore only relates to site RH6.</p>	<p><i>which has changed the site area so that it now encompasses the existing employment site and some expansion land. It notes that the expansion land is needed for the relocation and consolidation of an established business from Rye town centre.</i></p> <p><i>The SA correctly assesses site RH6 as a greenfield site, as the original boundaries of RH6, shown on page 131 of the SA Appendix 4 (and also in Figure 110 of the DaSA Options and Preferred Options (Dec 2016), wholly encompass greenfield land. The new plan, which the respondent has submitted as an alternative to site RH6, includes some brownfield land as well as greenfield land and this is assessed below.</i></p> <p><i>The newly submitted proposal, which includes a smaller part of site RH6 together with existing (partly brownfield) employment land to the north has been assessed for employment use in sustainability terms against the Sustainability Objectives.</i></p> <p><i>The land in the northern part of the site (including the existing employment land) is already within the Harbour Road Employment Area, where business development is supported in principle in accordance with DaSA Policy RHA2. While the redevelopment of this part of the site only would score positively in sustainability terms, the extension to the south, while smaller than that proposed through site RH6, still scores poorly against Objective 9 (Improve efficiency in land use and encourage the prudent use of natural resources) as greenfield land would be affected. Also, significantly, the proposed extension to the south would still directly encroach into greenfield land within the internationally protected Dungeness, Romney Marsh and Rye Bay SPA/Ramsar site and would harm the integrity of those sites. Consequently, in common with site RH6, the new site warrants a significant adverse score against Objective 14 (conserve and enhance biodiversity). In other respects there are no significant changes in the scoring of this new proposal, compared to site RH6.</i></p> <p><i>The effects of extending the employment site to encompass this area of land have been assessed in the section on Rye Harbour (Policy RHA2) above.</i></p> <p><i>No change proposed.</i></p>
<p>Disagree with scoring on site FC2 (Land east of Waites Lane, Fairlight</p>	<p>The comment further explains that the significant adverse scoring for site FC2a against Objective 15 (Protect and enhance the high quality natural and built environment) is considered</p>

Cove) and site FC2a (Land south of Pett Level Road, Fairlight Cove) (as referenced in Appendix 4 of the DaSA Local Plan Proposed Submission Sustainability Appraisal, Sep 2018). The assessment of FC2a should be more positive than FC2.

incorrect because mitigation should be taken into account and the score should be positive or neutral.

Furthermore, the comment considers that the neutral/ negative scores against Objectives 6 (Economic growth), 7 (Accessibility to services) and 12 (Flooding) for site FC2a should be positive. The comment contends that, overall, the assessment of site FC2a should be more positive than FC2 due to the shop and large area of open space and that the harm to the AONB that has been identified is not justified by the evidence (the Council's Landscape Assessment is considered to be flawed).

The significant adverse score against Objective 15 is justified. As explained in the commentary, the extent and position of the site means its development would have a significant and adverse landscape impact, detrimental to the character and appearance of the AONB, which could not be mitigated. This is supported by the findings of the Council's Landscape Assessment which has been undertaken in accordance with up-to-date guidance.

Objective 6 has been given a neutral score. While the proposed use includes a doctor's surgery and a retail unit which would provide some on-site employment, these would have a relatively limited impact on economic growth. However, it is accepted that on balance, the employment opportunities warrant the score being changed to a minor positive. [At the same time, the scoring for Objective 6 for site FC2 (the mixed use option) also warrants being changed from a neutral to a minor positive effect due to the on-site employment that would be provided by the doctor's surgery. While FC2 (mixed use option) does not also include a shop, in sustainability terms the difference is not significant and does not warrant a different score for Objective 6.]

Objective 7 has also been given a neutral score. The proposed use includes a doctors surgery, open space and new retail unit on-site. Taking services as a whole and having regard to the level of services in the village, the additions are not significant in sustainability terms but on balance, it is considered the provision of these services would result in a minor positive effect on Objective 7. [At the same time, the scoring for Objective 7 for site FC2 (the mixed use option) also warrants being changed from a neutral effect to a minor positive effect. While, unlike FC2a, this option would not provide a shop, there is an existing shop nearby, and consequently, the scoring against Objective 7 does not warrant being less than for FC2a. The overall level of services in the village would remain relatively low.]

Objective 12 has been scored negatively for sites FC2 and FC2a, which is considered correct as there is a risk of surface water flooding on the site's southern boundary and surface water drainage capacity is limited in the village, meaning flows and volumes will have to be attenuated prior to discharge to a watercourse. However, the commentary for both sites notes that adverse effects on flooding could be mitigated.

It is concluded that the changes to the scoring for Objectives 6 and 7 for site FC2a do not affect the overall conclusion that the site is not suitable for allocation, particularly due to the significant adverse effects that have been identified against Objective 15.

Proposed changes to Sustainability Appraisal

- Change the scoring against Objectives 6 and 7 for site FC2a from neutral to minor positive.
- Change the scoring against Objectives 6 and 7 for site FC2 (Mixed use option – residential, doctor's surgery and open space) from neutral to minor positive.
- Change the scoring against Objective 6 for Policy FAC2 from neutral to minor positive.
- Add the following wording to the end of the commentary for site FC2a:

While it would provide a shop in addition to the uses provided through FC2 (mixed use option) the SA scoring for objectives 6 and 7 are the same as there is an existing shop nearby and its inclusion would not have any significant additional effects in sustainability terms.

- Amend the second sentence of the commentary for site FC2 (mixed use option) as follows:

~~Neutral~~ Minor positive effects in economic growth and accessibility terms (obj. 6 & 7) as the development would provide some on-site employment and facilities but it is not directly linked to the core of the village (although this could be mitigated if a pedestrian link provided to Waites Lane).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add the following sentence to the end of the commentary for Policy FAC2 under the heading “Commentary on Economic Objectives (Primarily 1, 4, 5, 6, 9)”: <i>The doctor's surgery will provide some on-site employment (obj. 6).</i>
<p>Agree with references to Commercial & Industrial Waste and Construction, Demolition & Excavation Waste (East Sussex County Council).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>We are content that the Strategic Environmental Assessment (Sustainability Appraisal Environment Report) appropriately assesses the potential impacts on the historic environment of the policies and programmes set out in the draft DaSA Local Plan (Historic England).</p>	<p>Noted.</p>