

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details		Part of Neighbourhood Plan		Comment Full	Participate in oral exam	Notify when NP made
Reference	Respondent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Item	Support/ Object/ Comment			
TIC/R16/2018/1	Mrs Teresa Killeen	n/a	n/a	n/a	Full Plan	Support	I wish to support the plan as a comprehensive document that represents the needs of the community.	No	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/2	Mr Tom Maynard	Maynards Fruit Growers	n/a	n/a	Paragraph 6.29 of Policy H2	Comment	<p>Para 6.29 states that the land offered at Vineyard Lane is considered too far from Ticehurst.</p> <p>Para 6.21 states that the criteria for walking distance should be up to 800m.</p> <p>The distance from the site to the centre of Ticehurst is less than 800m, on level ground.</p> <p>I submit that the site would therefore be suitable for affordable housing, should there be a need.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/3	Charlotte Mayall	Southern Water	n/a	n/a	Full Plan	Comment	I confirm we have reviewed the document and are pleased to note that our representations on the earlier version of the Plan have all been addressed. We therefore have no further comments to make.		
TIC/R16/2018/4	Spencer Jefferies	National Grid	Hannah Lorna Bevins	Wood E&I Solutions UK Ltd	Full Plan	Comment	<p>An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Grid's electricity and gas transmission apparatus which includes high voltage electricity assets and high-pressure gas pipelines, and also National Grid Gas Distribution's Intermediate and High-Pressure apparatus.</p> <p>National Grid has identified that it has no record of such apparatus within the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/5	Mr Adnan Yusaf	SGN	n/a	n/a	Full Plan	Comment	<p>Following an assessment of the Ticehurst area, I would not anticipate any particular barriers to the proposed developments in Ticehurst with regards to gas infrastructure. The low pressure mains in the village provide good coverage to the most populous areas of the village.</p> <p>The Banky Fields development would be able to be supplied by the nearby district governor in Steelands Rise whereas the Singlehurst, Orchard Farm and Hillbury Fields developments would be able to be supplied by the district governor in Lower Platts.</p> <p>However, please note that this is based only on a brief assessment of the information provided as pertaining to existing SGN assets, and no in-depth analysis has been carried out at this stage.</p> <p>If you have any further queries with regard to gas distribution in Ticehurst, please feel free to contact Strategic Planning at strategicplanning@sgn.co.uk, or else myself directly at the number/email below.</p>	No	No
TIC/R16/2018/6	Mr Christopher Harrison	n/a	n/a	n/a	Pages 15-18 of the SEA relating to the Wardsdown House allocation as part of Policy H2	Object	<p>RE: Wardsdown House Proposed Development</p> <p>I am challenging the interpretation of policy and also expressing reservations as to procedures adopted and the availability of important documents in the consultation process.</p> <p>Please see attached representation form: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31296</p> <p>Please see attached supporting evidence: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31284</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/7	Mrs Janet Harrison	n/a	n/a	n/a	SEA paragraphs 4.1 - 4.14 & Table 4.1, relating to the Wardsdown House allocation as part of Policy H2	Object	<p>Table 4.1 Site 1, Wardsdown House Flimwell.</p> <p>This site assessment was not included in the Consultation SEA, also the ownership of land information was not provided. No consideration has been given in accordance with NPPF for the importance of the ancient woodlands (Wardsdown Woods) which adjoins the proposed site.</p> <p>Please see representation form and supporting evidence here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31285</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/8	Mrs Linda Matten	n/a	n/a	n/a		Comment	<p>The land to the rear of my property is adjacent to the proposal building site and also owned by the peer group.</p> <p>Having unsuccessfully attempted to purchase part of this land, with my neighbours, to protect it; I can only infer that the peer group intends to develop this land also.</p> <p>I am aware my wish to protect this area (which I am given to understand, should already be protected) sounds nimbyish . However, regardless of the view, I have hedgehogs, smooth newts and pheasants entering my garden from this area. I also see birds of prey, including buzzards, hunting from above this area. It would be shameful to force these delightful, and perhaps protected, species from their habitat.</p> <p>I appeal to you to protect this area which is designated as one of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>400 properties are planned for an area only 2 miles away. Surely this is enough for the local infrastructure to contend with.</p>	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/9a		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Policy H1 (Housing need)	Comment	<p>This representation is submitted by Thakeham Client, a contracting arm of Thakeham working on behalf of Optivo, and is in relation to the Submission version of the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan (2018 – 2028). Thakeham Client are a house builder based in Sussex, with a proven track record of delivering high quality, sustainable schemes. Thakeham Client has submitted a Reserved Matters Application (RMA) (reference RR/2018/2209/P) on behalf of Optivo at Banky Field, Steellands Farm which is included within the draft Neighbourhood Plan. Consequently, there is acknowledged delivery for housing development on this site by the Parish Council.</p> <p>As with the pre-submission version, we again support the Parish Council in taking a positive stance in its Neighbourhood Plan preparation. It is encouraging the Ticehurst Parish has taken the time to produce a draft set of objectives, policies and a strong vision statement for its village. We wish for the following comments to be taken into account in the review of the draft Neighbourhood Plan which are laid out in the order presented within the document for ease of reference.</p> <p>We would reiterate our position stated at Regulation 14 stage in respect to Policy H1 (The Spatial Plan). Namely, that Policy H1 acknowledges that (1) the overall spatial strategy is to focus development in the existing villages (Ticehurst, Flimwell and Stonegate) and (2) Ticehurst is the main focus since it is the most sustainable settlement. Moreover, Ticehurst has been designated in the Rother District Core Strategy (2012) as a rural service centre and this means it one of the largest civic parishes within the District. It is therefore appropriate for Ticehurst to provide proportionate housing growth when set against the District's overall housing need. This need is set out in Policy OSS1 (Overall Spatial Development Strategy) which is to (i) Plan for at least 5,700 dwellings (net) in the district over the period 2011 – 2028 (or 335 dwellings per annum).</p> <p>This is especially given considerations relating to the Duty to Co-operate in meeting neighbouring Authorities' unmet housing needs and the 'Standardised methodology for calculating housing need' which is expected to be brought into force by the Government shortly and which shows a significant OAHN increase from 335dpa to 463dpa.</p> <p>It is considered that Ticehurst is a sustainable settlement with a good range of shops and services. We are pleased to see Banky Field receiving recognition as a suitable housing development site for 40 dwellings as part of Policy H1 (The spatial plan) (and at Paragraph 6.20). The acknowledgement of sites benefitting from outline planning permission such as Banky Field is welcome, particularly with the way that the development boundary has been adjusted to take account of this, as shown in Map 15. In the case of Banky Field, it is considered that the site relates well to the existing settlement boundary, particularly given it is enclosed on three sides.</p> <p>We also support the provision of development at Banky Field within Policy H2 (Housing Site Allocations) for 40no. dwellings. The Reserved Matters Application (RMA) currently under consideration is therefore critical to meeting this policy.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/9b		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Policy H4 (Affordable Housing)	Comment	<p>Policy H4 (Affordable Housing) states that (1) "new developments of more than 10 houses should provide at least the 40% affordable housing which is Rother District Council policy". We would again suggest that the wording 'at least' means there is no upper limit to this amount. It means that should an all affordable housing scheme come forward, it would equally comply with this draft policy.</p> <p>The second part of Policy H4 refers to affordable housing being allocated to people with a 'strong connection to Ticehurst' and this is generally secured through consultation with Rother District Council and a local lettings plan. Even so, (2) of Policy H4 should not stifle the ability for affordable housing to come forward in a scheme. This is considered to be met through the words 'as far as possible' which is supported.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/9c		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Design Guidance (p92 - 107, Chapter 7)	Comment	<p>Whilst we welcome the design guidance set out in the draft Neighbourhood Plan including building typologies, plot layouts, boundary treatments, this should be used as a baseline reference from which development can be proposed and should be flexibly applied. It is noted that it only forms guidance and not policy. Even so, there is concern 'Sustainability and Resource Efficiency' should not be so prescriptive in terms of the need for renewables in a development as this may not be appropriate to the character and appearance of the area. This is particularly the case if it results in external storage units which may appear incongruous and seek to undermine what is being achieved through the design guidance. It is therefore reiterated that the phrase 'where appropriate in design terms' should be applied in respect to the use of sustainable on-site energy sources. The need for sustainable energy can perhaps be more efficiently delivered through Policy INF2 (Community Energy Projects) in any case.</p> <p>The design guidance should be no more onerous than Policy EN3 Design Quality in the adopted Core Strategy (2014) which sets down a list of key design principles and itself requires flexibility in its application. It is important to note that one of these design principles includes (h) sustainable design and construction, but equally (f) for design in context.</p>		

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/9d		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Sites with Planning Permission'; 'Banky Field, Steellands Farm, Ticehurst' in Chapter 8 'Site Specific Design Guidance'	Comment	<p>It is emphasised that a Reserved Matters Application (RMA) is currently under consideration with the Local Planning Authority (reference RR/2018/2209/P). This should be supported wherever possible as it is a deliverable scheme for much needed affordable housing in the area.</p> <p>Whilst the principle of a design brief for Banky Field is to be encouraged, it should avoid being too prescriptive as this would be too onerous for applicants and could stifle development from coming forward. This would in turn threaten housing delivery and the unit numbers set down within Policy H1 in the Neighbourhood Plan. Fortunately, the RMA is considered to meet the design brief for the site as far as is reasonably practicable and thereby fully acknowledges the Parish Council's intentions.</p> <p>Addressing the main sections in turn:-</p> <p>Strong landscape design Whilst the original landscape proposals were indicative at Outline stage, the Reserved Matters Application delivers a strong landscape design including a public open space to the north with a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP).</p> <p>Good road and layout design The RMA still delivers a new 'link road' from the north as approved at the Outline stage and therefore meets the preferences of the Parish Council.</p> <p>The site layout is considered to create a sense of place and has an informal feel that responds to the semi-rural character of the surrounding area, whilst acknowledging the topographical challenges of the site.</p> <p>Strong physical connections A formal pedestrian connection is being proposed through Steellands Rise cul-de-sac. Other connections are informally laid out as per existing arrangements. It is considered that the detailed scheme provides adequate physical connections with the surrounding area.</p> <p>In terms of the remaining design comments, a greater flexibility must be borne in mind given the topographical constraints on site, particularly to the west, which impacts design at a logistical and financial level. The end user must also be acknowledged which is a housing association (Optivo) and who owns the land with long term interest, maintenance and investment in return. Optivo has a proven track record for good quality housing delivery within the Rother District.</p> <p>It is suggested that a clarifying paragraph is added to the design guidance for the site that whilst design comments are suggested, there may be circumstances where they cannot be met in full, providing there is specific justification in doing so. Design guidance and quality should be no more onerous than that set down in Policy EN3 (Design Quality) within the adopted Core Strategy.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/9e		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Policy INF3	Support	We welcome our suggested change at Regulation 14 stage now undertaken to Policy INF3 (Community areas in housing developments) (2) in acknowledging the role that Ticehurst Parish Council can have in the formal transfer of outdoor play space.		
TIC/R16/2018/9f		Optivo	Damian Sullivan	Thakeham Client	Full Plan	Comment	We are pleased to note the progress made with the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan including the incorporation of some of our comments raised at the pre-submission version (Regulation 14). Notwithstanding this, we would still recommend there is a thorough review of this Neighbourhood Plan in view of the above comments for conformity and consistency in decision-making between local and district levels. We politely request that these comments are taken into account in its future review ahead of formal examination. We do hope that the Parish Council supports the RMA currently under consideration, together with Rother District Council in order to meet the policy intentions relevant to the site.		
TIC/R16/2018/10	Mrs Haylie Rudgley	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House site allocation (as depicted in Map 16, p73)	Object	Please see representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31297	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/11a	Elizabeth Cleaver	Highways England	n/a	n/a	Full Plan	Comment	<p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>The SRN in Ticehurst Parish comprises the A21 trunk road which runs through the east of the parish area and borders the Flimwell development boundary.</p> <p>I note that there was a previous consultation on the Pre-Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan in January 2018 but I can't find a record of Highways England being consulted.</p> <p>In Rother District Council's Local Plan 2011 - 2028, the Core Strategy sets a housing allocation for Ticehurst Parish of 130 dwellings up to 2028. Most of this allocation, 125 dwellings, has been met through developments already built, under construction or with planning permission. An additional 25 dwellings is allocated in the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan resulting an over provision of 20 dwellings. Traffic associated with the proposed housing site allocations would be unlikely to have a significant impact upon the safe and efficient operation of the strategic road network.</p>		

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/11b	Elizabeth Cleaver	Highways England	n/a	n/a	Policy E4 - Protect & Enhance Existing & Encourage Additional Commercial Employment Sites Specific criteria 2	Comment	We ask that this is re-worded to require that the proposed developments should not have an unacceptable impact on the SRN, not just on the local highway network.		
TIC/R16/2018/11c	Elizabeth Cleaver	Highways England	n/a	n/a	Policy R5 – Support Biodiversity Part 2	Comment	Developers should be aware that Highways England does not allow water run off due to any change of use into the highway drainage systems, nor new connections into these systems from third party development and drainage systems. (Department for Transport Circular 02/2013 "The Strategic Road Network and the Delivery of Sustainable Development" paragraph 50 applies.)		
TIC/R16/2018/12	Mr Marcus Orr	n/a	n/a	n/a	Page 114 of the Neighbourhood Plan relating to the Wardsdown House allocation.	Object	<p>As a local resident, I'm disappointed at the inclusion of Site 01, Wardsdown House as a potential site for development. This particular site is close to Wardsdown Wood a site of exceptional beauty and home to much wildlife and established ancient trees. In short it's ancient woodland with a rich thriving ecosystem.</p> <p>The developer has already shown scant regard for the area by decimating an area of woodland closeby, cutting down a significant number of trees, some of them well established Oaks. This was an action that has caused much distress locally and I believe this action is currently under review/investigation.</p> <p>Development on the proposed site would negatively impact on the local wildlife. This would especially be felt by the local bird life with this looming threat to their nesting and hunting grounds.</p> <p>The track down to the woods would also be ruined with this urbanisation that is proposed. Both visually and in feel. Who wants a street lit suburban development next to some of the most beautiful woodlands I've personally had the pleasure to walk? It makes no sense to build here.</p> <p>Currently myself, my wife and my children enjoy walking in this area, enjoying the woodland and in the case of my children the area is of great educational value as they get to observe the many aspects of a natural unspoilt woodland. We have dogs and this area is fantastic for destressing after the many stresses of my typical day. It has many benefits for my mental health and I'm sure for many others too. More development here would downgrade my family's 'Flimwell Experience' significantly.</p> <p>It is highly likely that this development is the developers way of gaining a foothold into Flimwell with more substantial developments planned for the future. The negative impact here goes without saying.</p> <p>The developer is not local and can only be interested in future profit, that's effectively what the Peer Group are all about, they're not looking to preserve our woodland or our green space, or indeed enhance the natural beauty of the area, they wish to make money at any cost and unfortunately that cost in this case is threatening Wardsdown Woods & the track that leads down to it from the B2087.</p> <p>I hope you can see your way to either remove this site from the proposed plan or if not then limit the number of dwellings and keep some sort of buffer between the development site and Wardsdown Wood.</p> <p>We must protect our best resources in Flimwell and that is the green space, especially Ancient Woodland.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/13a	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	Housing Site Allocation no. 5 Singehurst of Policy H2	Object	<p>The allocation of this site as suitable for housing development is flawed. A summary of the recent development history of this site accompanies this representation. The allocation is flawed because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 In his appeal judgment, the Planning Inspector makes it clear that detailed design considerations cannot mitigate the harm the (any?) development would cause to the AONB. The reference is in the accompanying paper. 2 It ignores "RDC objects strongly to the allocation of Singehurst." Consultation Statement point 18 page 17. TPC's response claims, "draft plans take into account all points raised by the inspector." There is no suggestion about how that might avoid causing harm. 3 It ignores High Weald AONB objection. Consultation Statement point 81 page 36. The claim that "The site has received favourable reaction locally" is unsubstantiated. Other than those with a personal interest, early discussions in formulation of the TNP did not show support for this site. Representations by members of the general public to RDC regarding the planning application submitted in 2015 showed Support=nil and Opposed=nil. 4 It ignores Natural England objection. Consultation Statement point 83 page 36. 5 It ignores parishioner objection. Consultation Statement under Q18 on page 97 and 15 H2 on page 134. 6 It was considered by the SEA consultants who failed to examine a 'reasonable alternative', namely the Hebditch Site (40-41 High Street) which is geographically much closer to Ticehurst village centre and is without any report of the major historical associations of Singehurst (see report by Dr Bannister commissioned by RDC). <p>Please see supporting documentation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31298</p>	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/13b	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	H1 Spatial Strategy in view of R3 Green Spaces.	Object	<p>The green spaces which have been nominated for protection are very welcome.</p> <p>The proposed extension of the Development Boundary towards Upper Platts on the S of the B2099 is not welcome and shown to be incongruous on Map 10. Green Space No. 7 provides a natural barrier to development to the E which should be respected by the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/13c	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy R2 - Maintain Green Gaps Between Settlements	Comment	<p>I strongly support the maintenance of green gaps between settlements and the provisions of both paragraphs 1) and 2) are welcome and highly desirable.</p> <p>These provisions cover routes from Ticehurst village to the NE (towards Flimwell); to the N (towards Three Leg Cross); to the W (towards Wallcrouch); and to the S (towards Stonegate).</p> <p>There is a major omission. The avoidance of ribbon development needs a similar restriction to the East. A green gap along the B2099 between the Ticehurst Institute and Gibbs Reed is essential.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/13d	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy R1 (2)	Comment	<p>Paragraph 2) of Policy R1 Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty stresses 'visual impact'.</p> <p>The High Weald AONB management plan (paragraph 1.2 on page 14) makes it clear that Government guidance for 'Natural Beauty' includes 'the rich history of human settlement over the centuries', not simply the visual aspect.</p> <p>Policy R1 2) should be revised to include the words 'or other' as below:</p> <p>2) Development should demonstrate that it will not have an unacceptable adverse visual or other impact on the landscape setting of the villages or views of key landmarks.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/13e	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	SEA Paragraph 4.11 regarding site selection	Object	<p>4.11 (page26) claims that 12 sites were put forward following the call for sites in late 2016.</p> <p>In fact, 10 sites were nominated by owners or their representatives. The TNP/SG also considered the 2 further sites mentioned in the SEA (one nominated outside the CfS period and the other had been the subject of a recent planning application) and also all of the sites considered by RDC within its SHLAA process. Of the latter, one site in particular (40-41 High Street - the 'Hebditch' site) had also been the subject of planning.</p> <p>The CfS report was ratified by Ticehurst Parish Council on 7th March 2017. It included the assessment of Site 5 Singehurst as not acceptable for development, and the Hebditch site as 'amber' - suitable for development if access arrangements could be resolved. The Hebditch site does not appear to have the historic value of the Singehurst site and is much closer to Ticehurst village centre (about 300 m compared with 700 m). The Parish Council subsequently modified the CfS report and published on the TNP website without documenting the reasons for the change. A copy of the ratified report will accompany this representation.</p> <p>The SEA has failed to consider the Hebditch site as a 'reasonable alternative' and is therefore flawed.</p> <p>Please see supporting documentation (Call for Sites Report) http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31286</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/13f	Mr Steve Barrass	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy H2 - Housing Site Allocations in relation to Paragraph 6.12 of page 70 of Policy H1	Object	<p>The statement: "All these sites have been carefully and impartially assessed (see "Call for Sites Report", "Site Assessment" and Policy H2 — Housing Site Allocations)." is untrue.</p> <p>The Call for Sites Report was approved by Ticehurst Parish Council on 7th March 2017. It was subsequently changed, without explanation; a document showing these changes accompanies this representation.</p> <p>In addition to the ten submitted sites plus the two 'extra' sites, the CfS process reviewed others identified by RDC's SHLAA process. In particular, the site to the N of the B2099 within Ticehurst village centre, 40-41 High Street - 'The Hebditch Site' was considered an 'Amber' site. Two planning applications had been made, and refused, for this site during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. This confirms that the landowner was prepared to make the land available for development.</p> <p>Given that Site 11 Dale Hill Farm and Site 12 Rosemary Lane were considered despite being out of time, failure to even consider the Hebditch Site within the Strategic Environment Assessment undermines the claim of care and impartiality.</p> <p>Please see supporting documentation http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31287</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/14a	Mr Nicholas Fairrie	n/a	n/a	n/a	Neighbourhood Plan, page 114, Paragraph 8.32	Object	<p>The existing lane is unviable as a means of access to the proposed site. The lane is privately owned, although rumour has it that Millwood Homes has sold the top part of the lane to the owners of the Wardsdown House site. The bottom (from the entrance Arabesque), North to the entrance to Wardsdown Woods is owned by Mr. & Mrs. Chris Harrison. There are existing easement rights that have to be settled. An important public footpath (the Sussex Border Path) runs along the lane. Numerous dog owners in the village and beyond walk their dogs along the lane, many on a daily basis. Improving the road surface will simply facilitate increased traffic movements and lead to the mistaken notion that it is a public highway on which people can park with impunity, potentially blocking access to the new development to Arabesque and Copperfield Cottage and Wardsdown Coppice at the end of the lane. Traffic movements there would be a constant hazard for hikers and dog walkers using the public footpath. If this site is to be developed at all, it should have its own independent access from the B2087. Neither the District Council nor any developer would have any legal right to improve the surface to a lane which is in private ownership. This paragraph should therefore be struck from the Plan.</p>	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/14b	Mr Nicholas Fairrie	n/a	n/a	n/a	Neighbourhood Plan, page 114, Paragraph 8.33	Object	This is all nebulous, aspirational and fundamentally meaningless verbiage denoting a development concept that cannot possibly be delivered on such a small site. Any plan involving as many as 9 separate dwellings will inevitably have an extremely deleterious effect on the visual amenity of both the present quasi-rural feel to the lane and the existing neighbouring houses. The inclusion of "semi-basement levels to incorporate parking or garages" is plainly ludicrous, especially since this site was a dumping ground for a decade or more and only extensive preliminary excavation could reveal what currently lies beneath, at a sub soil level, in order to determine the relative stability/instability of the locations where foundations would have to be laid. Whichever way one sited such dwellings there would inevitably be overlooking issues, most especially at the North end of the proposed site. This paragraph should be struck from the plan as fanciful and as impractical as it is.	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/14c	Mr Nicholas Fairrie	n/a	n/a	n/a	Neighbourhood Plan Paragraph 8.39 on page 115 in respect of Core Strategy Policy EN1 'Landscape Stewardship'	Object	Street lighting in such a development would violate Policy EN1 (v), (vi) and (vii) and would probably have an adverse effect on both tawny owls and barn owls that frequent the fringes of Wardsdown Woods, the green space at Old Wardsdown and the fields North of Fruitfields where they habitually hunt for prey at night.	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/14d	Mr Nicholas Fairrie		n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocation	Object	Please see representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31299	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15a		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy R1 - Conserve the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Support	This policy is supported. National Policy requires that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs. The conservation and enhancement of wildlife and cultural heritage are also important considerations in these areas. However, the policy guidance is about the management rather than prevention of new development. In assessing questions of enhancement and conservation it is important to recognise that the AONB is mainly comprised of open countryside but also the built environment in terms of both settlements and more isolated groups of buildings which contribute to the overall experience. The AONB designation washes over the whole of the Parish of Ticehurst, including its settlements, and its history, character and identity all contribute to the quality of the AONB. This is recognised by the policy and the need to conserve and enhance is expressed in terms of requiring a sensitive, sympathetic and careful approach to new development proposals ensuring that they are supported by professional assessments of likely impact. The policy provides the appropriate framework for such assessments and helpfully points to other development policies and key guidelines in the High Weald AONB Management Plan. It therefore successfully provides the reader with an understanding of what is to be expected from any development proposals across the Parish. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15b		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy R3 - Protect and Enhance Green Spaces	Support	This policy is supported. It is one of the main roles of an NP to identify green spaces that are important to the local community either in terms of visual setting or for recreation or both. Area T8 at the eastern end of the village plays a visual and recreational role, protecting and enhancing the series of ponds on either side of the road. The pond to the south of Pashley Road contributes to the setting of the Listed Building Singehurst. The ponds, meadow and woodland are well frequented and maintained by members of the local community and support wildlife. It is agreed that this area represents a green oasis between built-up areas and this is properly recognised by the Green Space designation. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15c		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy H1 - The Spatial Plan	Support	This policy is supported. Ticehurst as the main settlement in the Parish is the most sustainable settlement and should be the main focus for new development, particularly housing. Much of the employment is provided on existing business sites that are located away from the settlements themselves and therefore provide a series of localised focus points to accommodate new development in terms of consolidation and limited expansion. However, retail and other businesses are mainly located in Ticehurst and require support to enable local businesses to thrive. Limiting new housing to small developments of 10 or less dwellings is consistent with Policy H2 - Housing Allocations - and should enable more individual development with a greater connection to the village in terms of design quality and character. The village has evolved with small developments over the years and it is appropriate for future growth to take the same form rather than larger scale estate development. There is a potential difficulty in providing a wide housing mix within smaller schemes and National Policy would preclude the delivery of affordable housing from residential developments that are not major developments. However, the Banky Field development, together with existing stock, means that the village will be well-provided with affordable housing and therefore there is less difficulty on this point. The use of brownfield land is supported, but opportunities are few and consideration has to be given to any potential loss of local rural employment as a result. However, the policy is worded flexibly, allowing each case to be considered on its individual merits. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/15d		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy H2 - Housing Site Allocations	Support	<p>This Policy is supported. Ticehurst is a sustainable settlement and is one of the largest villages in Rother District. It serves as a service centre for the surrounding rural area and it is appropriate that it should take a proportion of the strategic housing growth that is required across the District. This has largely already been provided, for the present, on sites that have planning permission at Banky Field and Hillbury Field, although these development:) due to their scale, present difficulties in fully reflecting the village typology and character that has evolved from more gradual growth in past years. Therefore, whilst significant new numbers of homes are not required, the allocations provide the opportunity to achieve a series of small-scale developments where quality and consistency with local character can be better expressed and which, once mature, will become imperceptible from the village form and will sustain its quality and character. This is the form of development that, from local consultation, is more accepted locally than the larger strategic developments advocated to meet District needs. It is therefore an appropriate form of development for the NP because there is no pressing need for strategic growth at present and the overall level of growth for the village remains generally consistent with the spatial strategy of the District Core Strategy.</p> <p>The Singehurst site was initially identified by the District Council as being suitable for a fairly intensive mixed use of employment and housing. A subsequent planning application identified the importance of the site in terms of the setting of the village and local heritage assets. The Parish Council have consistently supported the principle of some development on this site in recent times but have always insisted that the design, materials and form of development should be carefully controlled and should represent the highest quality and best village typology in order to preserve and enhance the quality of the local environment. The allocation of the site in the NP and the introduction of site-specific and general design guidance with which any development scheme must comply, provides the opportunity for these local objectives to be achieved, consistent with the overall theme of the NP - Development on our terms.</p> <p>Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15e		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	H3 - Mix of Housing Sizes and Tenures	Support	<p>This policy is supported. The analysis of the existing provision and future housing needs of the village is consistent with Rydon ' s assessment and they are confident that the required housing mix, with the emphasis on two and three-bedroom properties can be delivered. The Singehurst housing allocation (H2(2)) can provide a compliant mix and specifically provide character housing suitable for starter homes and those wishing to trade down, thereby releasing larger family homes elsewhere in the village.</p> <p>Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15f		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy H4 - Affordable Housing	Object	<p>This Policy raises some questions of consistency with National Policy. Paragraph 63 of NPPF 2018 states that normally, provision of affordable housing should not be sought for residential developments that are not major development (i.e. 10 or more homes or site areas of 0.5 hectares or more). A lower threshold of 5 units or fewer can be set in policies for designated rural areas, but this is to provide for local affordable housing need. With the Banky Field development there is no need for more affordable housing in Ticehurst and therefore no obvious local justification for departing from the national policy norm. The question also arises as to how and where any financial consideration in lieu of the provision of affordable housing will be spent. It would not be appropriate for it to be spent on anything other than local affordable housing within the Parish because that would be the only justification for such a financial contribution in the first place. The lowering of the threshold to below 10 is not currently justified by the evidence base of the Plan.</p> <p>There is also the difficulty that financial contributions made towards affordable housing, for which there is currently no local need, may limit the availability of financial contributions towards improving local infrastructure and services for which the need is more pressing.</p> <p>Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15g		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy H5 - The Design of New Buildings	Support & Comment	<p>This Policy is supported. In particular it is agreed that promoting good design will preserve and increase the quality of Ticehurst ' s built environment. This in turn will encourage pride in the area, attract tourism and reinforce Ticehurst ' s identity. The assessment of good, high quality design is a subjective exercise. The guidance set out in this policy and in the Design Guidance section of the NP is therefore welcomed as representing the expectations of the local community in terms of design. The text could perhaps refer to the need for prospective developers to engage with the local community at an early stage and to liaise with the Parish Council so that design considerations are made acceptable at the local level rather than leaving interpretation of the guidance to developers and/or the Local Planning Authority.</p> <p>Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307</p>	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/15h		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Policy H6 - Conservation & Heritage	Support & Comment	This Policy is supported. In particular the text identifies the heritage assets that are most appreciated by the local community and these are focussed on the Conservation Area and included examples, some undesignated, of important buildings and good and bad schemes from the past. Section 16 of the NPPF and Policy EN2 of the Rother Core Strategy provide more detailed advice on the approach to the preservation and enhancement of the historic built environment. There is therefore a question as to what this policy adds to these existing policies and whether it is needed. In some ways the text is more helpful than the policy in that it identifies the heritage interest that is of particular local importance. The policy wording at present is bland and would benefit from specific references to other parts of the Development Plan (Core Strategy Policy EN2) and National Guidance (NPPF Section 16). The proposal to prepare a Conservation Area appraisal and Management Plan is strongly supported. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15i		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Neighbourhood Plan Design Guidance, p92 - 107	Support	If the Design Guidance provided with the Plan is helpful and is supported. It is user-friendly in that it reduces the need to refer to separate documents for the reader to understand the expectations of the local community in respect of new development occurring within their Parish. It provides a check list and guidance for designers of new development schemes as to what elements need to be addressed in order to make new development acceptable. It is a companion to, but not a substitute for, discussion of individual proposals with the local community. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/15j		Rydon Homes Ltd	Christopher Hough	Sigma Planning Services	Site-specific Design Guidance - Singehurst, Pashley Road, Ticehurst	Support	This is supported. The main elements of any proposal for this site that must be considered are:- -effect on setting of Listed Buildings nearby; -views from and to existing buildings; -improvements to pedestrian routes into the village; -traffic calming on Pashley Road, including the extension of the existing 30mph restriction; -consistency with AONB Management Plan; -protection of area of Ancient Woodland and associated ecology; -general landscaping, street landscaping including road and verge treatment; -mix of dwelling types and sizes, including starter homes, 'downsizer' homes and family homes; -reference to local historic building forms and layout, avoiding suburban house types; -quality detailing; -holistic approach - cohesive design of landscape, road surfaces, wall materials and detailing of fences and garden walls. All these elements will feature in the Rydon design approach to the site and they are comfortable with the prospect of providing a suitable development scheme that meets the demands of this design guidance. Please see full representation document here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31307	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/16	Mr H Dawson	Peer Group Plc	Mr D Bedford	DHA Planning Ltd	Land to the North of Wardsdown House, H2(3), as allocation for 9 houses.	Support & Comment	Please see representation including supporting documentation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31288	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/17	Mr Philip Youdan	n/a	n/a	n/a	The proposed development of 9 houses in Flimwell at the Wardsdown House Site ("the Development") & The absence of any provision for housing at Stonegate ("the SG plan").	Object	Please see representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31300	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/18	Mr John Beecher	n/a	n/a	n/a	Neighbourhood Plan Chapter 6, Policy H1 Paragraph 6.33 & Map No 20	Object & Comment	Flimwell site 01 Wardsdown House should be limited to 6 houses in the southern half of the site. This avoids negative impact on the environment of the woods and wildlife and shows that this site will not be accepted as the first piece of a much larger development area on the same owner's adjacent land. It will be in keeping with existing development nearby.	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/19	Ms Claire Tester	High Weald AONB Partnership	n/a	n/a	Policy H2 (2) Paragraphs 8.19 - 8.25 Map 19	Object	<p>Planning application RR/2015/2151 for 16 dwellings on this site was refused planning permission and the subsequent appeal was dismissed. The Inspector's decision letter made it clear that development on this site would have an unacceptable impact on the setting of adjacent listed buildings. He was particularly concerned by the impact on Singehurst, Singehurst Barn and Breckles and stated in paragraph 40:</p> <p>"Introducing the appeal development to the site would, therefore, detrimentally affect the contribution that that part of each setting makes to the significance of each of these three heritage assets. Notably, this would be as a result of its fundamental effect on the open, agricultural feel of the site and the associated significantly diminished intervisibility between the appeal site and those heritage assets from beyond and within the site thereby eroding the legibility of each of those listed buildings".</p> <p>This 'open, agricultural feel of the site' and the contribution of the heritage assets themselves to the landscape are key aspects of the natural beauty of the the AONB. The High Weald AONB Management Plan defines this natural beauty in its 'Statement of Significance' and sets objectives for each of its components in order to conserve and enhance the AONB. These components include the fields themselves and the historic settlement pattern.</p> <p>These issues would not be overcome by reducing the number of units from 16 to 10. The requirement in paragraph 8.19 that "Any proposal would need to consider carefully its effect on the neighbouring listed buildings and their current context" and in paragraph 8.22 that "Any scheme would need to protect the woodland and provide landscape features which enhance the development" would not overcome the loss of the field itself to development, which result in serious harm to the AONB and the setting of the heritage assets.</p> <p>The High Weald AONB Unit therefore strongly objects to the allocation of the site at Pashley Road, Ticehurst.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/20	Sophie Page	Environment Agency	n/a	n/a	Full Plan	Comment	<p>We were pleased to be consulted on the above submission for the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan (regulation 16).</p> <p>Biodiversity We have reviewed the Plan and note that our previous comments have been taken into account, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That net gain in natural capital is included in Policy R5 Biodiversity. We would recommend that the wording is aligned with the 2018 NPPF paragraph 170 by removing the caveat of "seeking to" from the requirement for net gain. <p>Groundwater and Contaminated Land We have no detailed comments in relation to groundwater protection and contaminated land to make in reference to the Neighbourhood Plan. We would recommend that site allocations on land with previous use will need to address potential contamination issues by adequate investigation and risk assessment. Detailed comments on any specific site will be provided at the planning application stage, to ensure adequate investigation and if necessary remediation is carried out to address any identified contamination and risks to controlled waters. Any new proposals should ensure that sustainable drainage design will achieve appropriate protection of groundwater.</p> <p>In the case of limited mains sewer provision, we would also object to major development sites that do not tie into upgrade of sewer capacity in the area. This is for the LPA and utility company to manage in terms of timing for release of permissions for sites being developed.</p> <p>Flood Risk and Water Resources We commented on the draft Plan in December 2017 and I reiterate our comments from there – we are pleased to note that matters of interest to us have been adequately considered including that,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • your proposed site allocations are all located within flood zone one • water has been recognised as a valuable resources and consequently water efficiency measures expected in new developments <p>We have no comments to make on your SEA.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/21	Mr & Mrs Ian & Diana Dethridge	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House site allocation	Object	<p>I strongly oppose the additional 9 houses proposed for the Wardsdown House Site No 1</p> <p>The Peer Group seem to be planning a massive development around this site stretching all the way to the A21 and Flimwell already has a mass of new builds to cope with.</p>	No	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/22a	Amy Croombs	Natural England	n/a	n/a	Policy R1 - Conserve the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Support	<p>Natural England supports the inclusion of a policy which aims to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the High Weald AONB. All development should have regard for the High Weald AONB Management Plan with reference to the AONB's key characteristics.</p>		

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/22b	Amy Croombs	Natural England	n/a	n/a	Policy R5 – Support Biodiversity	Support	Natural England supports the inclusion of a policy seeking to deliver a net gain in natural capital. This policy will be integral to working towards the objectives of the 25 Year Environment Plan.		
TIC/R16/2018/22c	Amy Croombs	Natural England	n/a	n/a	Policy H2 - Housing Site Allocations	Comment	<p>Natural England advise that biodiversity net gain should be sought for all allocations. Net gain can be in the form of on site or off site enhancements</p> <p>Natural England advise that SuDS should be considered where possible,</p> <p>Priority habitat (deciduous woodland), is located adjacent to the three housing allocations. Impact on this habitat needs to be considered as the NPPF requires the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitat. To achieve this aim, appropriate mitigation measures may need to be specified,</p> <p>As Ticehurst is within the High Weald AONB, all development must protect and enhance the character of the AONB. Natural England have not provided advice on the presence or absence of key characteristics of the High Weald AONB. Ticehurst Parish Council should conserve and enhance these characteristics in line with the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/23	Mrs Wendy Beecher	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown Site Allocation Paragraph 6.33 Map 20	Object	Overdevelopment of Flimwell site01. Should be limited to six properties in the southern half of site in order to avoid negative impact on environment and wildlife in an AONB. This site should not be an entry into the development of the whole back land behind Union Street owned by the same London-based development company as site01. Six properties rather than nine or 40 would be in keeping with existing properties on the opposite side of the woodland track.	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/24	Mr Steve Knott	Quantum Homes	Mr Ian Coomber	Absolute Town Planning Ltd	Policy H2 - Housing Site Allocations With reference to Paragraph 6.24 and Map 11	Object	<p>The objection relates to the non inclusion within the Development Area Boundary of a Flimwell and the site proposed for inclusion comprises 2.37ha of land at the junction of London Road and A268 south of the Royal Oak PH.</p> <p>Please see full representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31289</p> <p>Please see supporting documents here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31310 http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31311</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/25a	Mr Chris Flavin	ESCC	n/a	n/a	Policy H2 -Housing Site allocations: Site H2 (1) 'Orchard Farm' (6 houses)	Comment	<p>In our last response we advised that the following transport requirements associated with this allocation <u>should be made explicit within the Planning Policy</u> or at the very least with the supporting text of the NP.</p> <p>The site is served via the Orchard Farm access track off the B2099 (High Street). As the access track meets the High Street in close proximity with the Lower St Marys junction there is potential for conflict between traffic movements as priority between the access point is unclear. This risk of conflict is likely to be exacerbated by further development. The junction would therefore require improving as part of development proposal -to clarify priority between the two access points or alternatively it may be possible to provide a shared access point serving Lower St Marys and Orchard Farm.</p>	No	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/25b	Mr Chris Flavin	ESCC	n/a	n/a	Site H2 (2) Singehurst, Pashley Road (10 Houses)	Comment	<p>Our previous comments on this site were as follows:</p> <p>Site H2 (2) Ticehurst Village, Singehurst, Pashley Road (10 houses) - Site falls just outside the 30mph zone, in a 40mph limit. The sightlines required would be 120m x 2.4m. Visibility is not currently achievable. <u>For the site to be considered acceptable in highway safety terms, the 30mph zone would need to be extended.</u> Footways would also need to be included as part of the development to improve the link to the village centre. Bus stops are also outside the acceptable walking distance.</p>	No	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/25c	Mr Chris Flavin	ESCC	n/a	n/a	Site H2 (3) Flimwell, Wardsdown House (9 houses)	Comment	<p>Our previous comments on this site were as follows:</p> <p>For a development of 9 houses the access would require a minimum width of 4.8 -5.0m. Ideally a footway into the site would also be proposed. Visibility splays measuring 2.4m x 43m would be required either side of the access. It is noted that there is a hedge along the boundary of property no.2 on the west side of the boundary and this may obstruct the visibility splay this side of the access. The hedge along the frontage of Wardsdown House on the east side could be cut back to improve the sight line in the opposite direction. It would appear that appropriate visibility could be achieved over land if the hedge is cut back.</p>	No	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/26	Alan Byrne	Historic England	n/a	n/a	Full Plan & SEA	Comment	<p>As the Government's adviser on the historic environment Historic England is keen to ensure that the protection of the historic environment is fully taken into account at all stages and levels of the local planning process, and welcomes the opportunity to comment upon this key planning document.</p> <p>Historic England is content that the neighbourhood plan will provide an adequate framework for the protection and enhancement of the historic environment of the parish through the application of its policies for protecting the character of the AONB and wider landscape, Policy R1, and the design and conservation Policies H5 and H6.</p> <p>The site allocations Policy H2 does not, in our view, raise any significant issues relating to heritage assets, with only that for Singehurst, Ticehurst having proximity to designated assets. We considered that any impacts on setting of the listed Grade II group of cottages (Breckles, Caperer's Cottage, Meadow Cottage, The Homestead) adjacent to the site boundary can be managed by the application of the above policies and those in the Rother Core Strategy.</p> <p>Historic England would strongly advise that Rother Council's conservation staff are consulted on the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan, as they are often best placed to advise on local historic environment issues and priorities, sources of data and, consideration of the options relating to the historic environment.</p> <p>These comments are based on the information provided by you at this time and for the avoidance of doubt does not reflect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to, any specific development proposal which may subsequently arise from this or later versions of the plan and which may, in our view, have adverse effects on the historic environment.</p> <p>We are content that the SEA Scoping report appropriately assesses the potential impacts of the policies in the plan on the historic environment of the parish and we have no further comments to offer on this document.</p>		
TIC/R16/2018/27a	Mr John Lomas-Bullivant	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy H2 -Housing Site allocations, page 76, para 6.32/6.33, Map 20	Object	<p>Please see representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31303</p> <p>Supporting Documents</p> <p>Full Conflict of Interest Email Dialogue October 4 2018: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31290 TNP Call For Sites July 18 2017 - Sites 01 and 02 - No Ownership Details http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31294 DHA David Bedford assessment of TNP sites: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31301 DHA Final LVIA for Wardsdown April 2016: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31302 Wardsdown correspondence with DHA Planning and Peer Group: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31291</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/27b	Mr John Lomas-Bullivant	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy R3, Map 11, page 37	Object	<p>I am writing to convey my concern about the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan and its complete lack of protection for the AONB in Flimwell and unacceptable lack of protection of Green Spaces that runs completely contrary to the stated objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan Policy R3 Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan submission monumentally fails to offer the Flimwell community any genuine and meaningful protection of its important Green Spaces, especially the land North of and adjacent to Flimwell's Ancient Woodland, designated aggregate asset.</p> <p>This lack of protection is directly correlated to the TNP's support of the proposal to develop the Wardsdown House site. The Neighbourhood Plan and the Parish Council are now in direct conflict with the community they claim to represent and protect. The plans ability to protect the AONB identity of Flimwell including its Ancient Woodland is fundamentally compromised by the Steering Groups close association with the Wardsdown House landowner and its agent DHA Planning and the promotion and support of the Wardsdown Site. The Parish Council knows the landowner is actively campaigning at local and district level to develop all its AONB land adjacent to the Ancient Woodland and consequently the submitted Neighbourhood Plan totally fails to deliver on Policy R3 Protect and Enhance Green Spaces.</p> <p>As far as Flimwell is concerned the R3 Policy, points 4.15, 4.17, 4.19 are simply meaningless, planning clichés that have NOT been applied in Flimwell whatsoever. The Ancient Woodland, a vital AONB feature in Flimwell, has been given ZERO Greens Space Protection and as matters stand it is threatened by the Neighbourhood Plan's proposal to develop the Wardsdown House site. The proposed plan is simply offers limited and arbitrary protection of non-contentious Green Spaces that aren't owned by property developers and already have a degree of protection in place. This is unacceptable and a betrayal of the current and future AONB identity of Flimwell village.</p> <p>On Page 26 – Rural Policies the Neighbourhood Plan states that Objective Number 1 is "Conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB" The Neighbourhood Plan utterly fails to deliver on this objective and on Policy R3 Protect and Enhance Green Spaces in Flimwell. There is virtually NO protection and ZERO enhancement of the Ancient Woodland area which is Flimwell's most important AONB asset. This is shameful and the plan should now be amended to protect the land North of the Ancient Woodland.</p>	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/28	Mrs Marjorie Barden	n/a	n/a	n/a	Policy R3, Map 11, page 37	Object	<p>The Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan fails to protect the AONB in Flimwell and this is completely contrary to the stated objectives of the Neighbourhood Plan Policy R3 Protection and Enhancement of Green Spaces.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan submission fails to offer the Flimwell community any protection of its important Green Spaces, especially the land North of and adjacent to Flimwell's Ancient Woodland.</p> <p>The TNP's plan to develop the Wardsdown House site will really effect the hydrology of the land and the Ancient Woodland that are next to it. This is wrong and not acceptable to Flimwell residents.</p> <p>The Parish Council knows the landowner wants to develop all its AONB land adjacent to the Ancient Woodland. The Neighbourhood Plan totally fails to deliver on Policy R3 Protect and Enhance Green Spaces in Flimwell.</p> <p>The R3 Policy, points 4.15, 4.17, 4.19 are hollow words that deliver no meaningful actions and they have NOT been properly applied in Flimwell whatsoever. The Ancient Woodland, a vital AONB feature in Flimwell, has been given ZERO Greens Space Protection and as matters stand it is threatened by the Neighbourhood Plan's proposal to develop the Wardsdown House site.</p> <p>On Page 26 – Rural Policies the Neighbourhood Plan states that Objective Number 1 is “Conserve and enhance the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB” The Neighbourhood Plan utterly fails to deliver on this objective and on Policy R3 Protect and Enhance Green Spaces in Flimwell. There is virtually NO protection and ZERO enhancement of the Ancient Woodland area which is Flimwell's most important AONB asset. This is not acceptable and the plan should now be amended to protect the land North of the Ancient Woodland.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/29	Mrs Kerry Fairrie	Swann Fairrie Assoc.	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocation	Object	Please see attached Representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31304	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/30	Mr Paul Gaston	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocation	Object	<p>In respect to the Wardsdown House site I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) It will ruin the visual amenity of the rural approach down the track to Wardsdown Wood.</p> <p>(2) Constitute over-intensive back land development outside the present limits to built development.</p> <p>(3) Threaten the fragile eco-system of the ancient woodland at its southern end.</p> <p>(4) Threaten the hydrology of one of the sources of the River Bewl adjacent to the site in the woodlands.</p> <p>(5) Threaten the nesting and hunting grounds of bird and wildlife.</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/31	Mrs Carole Youdan	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocation	Object	Please see representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31305	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/32	Stephen Baughen	Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	n/a	n/a	Full Plan & SEA	Comment	Please see representation here: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31306		
TIC/R16/2018/33	Mr Richard Stapylton-Smith		Mr Geoff Megarity	Bell Cornwell	Policy no: H1 and R2	Object	<p>We have put together representations in the following documents:</p> <p>1. Representations to The Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan: Land at Cherry Tree Field, Land at Steellands Rise and Former Agricultural Buildings at Steellands Farm, Ticehurst prepared by Bell Cornwell LLP dated December 2018 - http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31230</p> <p>2. Indicative Layout Drawing prepared by FIBONACCI-ARCHITECTS (drawing number 6104 P60)</p> <p>As set out above, the evidence base that has been used for the TNP is not considered to be based on up to date information, and does not address the issues of housing under delivery and under-provision in Rother District. We believe that an all-encompassing review of the Development Plan is required, rather than this staged approach and that the adoption of the TNP should be postponed until after the adoption of an updated Core Strategy and updated Development Plan - http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31229</p>	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/34	Mr Andy White	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocationp. 76 Chapter no: 7 Policy no: H2 para no: 6.33 fig/map no: 20	Object	I strongly object to Wardsdown being considered for a development site in Flimwell. It's clear what the peer group intentions are for extending this development into the field behind fruit fields. Their latest plans clearly show what will be a future access road into this second field. By letting this site be approved as part of the plan we are essentially opening up the opportunity to extensive development which will be negative for the existing people in Flimwell. Massively disappointed that we are even considering this development site given the people that own the land and the land that surrounds it.	Yes	Yes

Submission Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Representations

TIC/R16/2018/35	Mrs Sarah White	n/a	n/a	n/a	Wardsdown House Site Allocationp. 76 Chapter no: 7 Policy no: H2 para no: 6.33 fig/map no: 20	Object	I strongly object to Wardsdown being considered for a development site in Flimwell. It's clear what the peer group intentions are for extending this development into the field behind fruit fields. Their latest plans clearly show what will be a future access road into this second field. By letting this site be approved as part of the plan we are essentially opening up the opportunity to extensive development which will be negative for the existing people in Flimwell. Massively disappointed that we are even considering this development site given the people that own the land and the land that surrounds it. Also, the latest plans show that Wardsdown house will remain, clear that in phase 2 that will be removed to make way for addition access. As the current late is entirely unsuitable, and we were promised that would not be impacted.	Yes	Yes
TIC/R16/2018/36a	David Marlow	Rother District Council	n/a	n/a	Policy H2(2) – Singehurst, Pashley Road Ticehurst (10 houses) – Map 19	Object	Please see below links relating to this representation: Representation is on pages 6-9 of the RDC Cabinet Report: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31228 Appeal Decision letter APP/U1430/W/16/3150796 dated 24 May 2017 relating to Land at Pashley Road, Upper Platts, Ticehurst, East Sussex: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31292		
TIC/R16/2018/36b	David Marlow	Rother District Council	n/a	n/a	2. Policy R2 – Green Gaps – Maps 5-9	Support & Comment	Please see below link relating to this representation: Representation is on pages 9-10 of the RDC Cabinet Report http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31228		
TIC/R16/2018/36c	David Marlow	Rother District Council	n/a	n/a	3. Policy R5 – Support Biodiversity	Comment	Please see below link relating to this representation: Representation is on page 10 of the RDC Cabinet Report http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31228		
TIC/R16/2018/36d	David Marlow	Rother District Council	n/a	n/a	4. Policy H4 – Affordable Housing	Comment	Please see below link relating to this representation: Representation is on page 11 of the RDC Cabinet Report http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31228		
TIC/R16/2018/37	John Barnes		n/a	n/a	Policy H2 - Wardsdown House allocation and Land to the east of Wardsdown	Comment	As the County Councillor for North West Rother and the District Councillor for another part of the AONB, I am concerned that the late mediaeval landscape of the High Weald is vulnerable to large scale development. Equally to the point the character of the ridge villages needs to be preserved. Flimwell is a case in point. It is about to see a brownfield site developed which should largely accommodate any foreseeable needs over the next few years. While not opposed to the limited development suggested at Wardsdown House, I would have preferred to see it limited to half a dozen houses given the need to adjust access. There is at least one further brownfield site that could accommodate another half dozen, preferably bungalows, if required. My major concern is with the land between the proposed site and the ribbon development along the west side of the A21. This is very open to view from the north west and should be safeguarded from development as a vulnerable part of the AONB located outside the proposed new development boundary. Effectively the area is the source of of the feeder stream to Bell Water, and is clearly part of the historic landscape. There will be some protection for what is ancient woodland, but the whole area needs to be regarded as green space. This will also help to maintain the ridge nature of the settlement. Please see supporting documentation: http://www.rother.gov.uk/CHttpHandler.ashx?id=31293		