



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office. (Crown Copyright). Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. No further copies may be made. Rother District Council Licence No 100018643 2013.

<b>BX1</b> Site Numbers (eg.BX1)	Broad Location
Green Site (see sites table for detail)*	Local Plan Allocations 2006
Amber Site (see sites table for detail)*	Large Site Commitments (as at base date 01/04/2013)
Red Site (Rejected – see sites table for detail)	Development Boundary

(\*Sites are subject to more detailed investigations)

Map Reference: TQ7323

## Robertsbridge

ID	Site Name	Compliance with Core Strategy Policy	Total Residential Units	SHLAA Conclusions
RB2, RB4, RB5, RB7a	East Robertsbridge - Land adjacent to Grove Farm and South East of Salehurst C E Primary School	<p>Yes suitable site, broadly compliant with policy and partly an existing Local Plan allocation (RB2). Sections RB4, RB5 and RB7a would represent an extension to the Local Plan allocation area. The site should be considered comprehensively to also include areas to the north (RB3) and south (RB7r), which although not suitable for residential development, nonetheless form essential green infrastructure components integral and essential to the development of the site.</p> <p>Large site, which benefits from close proximity to village core. Advantageous over other options in Robertsbridge in that it offers the opportunity to provide a mix of community facilities in a location within very close proximity to the village centre. If developed, it should incorporate 'sheltered/assisted housing scheme', medical centre (combining GP and dental services for the village), LEAP, MUGA and BMX track. All are needs identified either in evidence work or via Parish Council. Potential for extensive cycle/pedestrian linkages at boundary's and to increase site permeability.</p> <p>ASA survey required. Green space buffer to A21 with re-enforced planting would be necessary to mitigate landscape impact and comply with Policy EN1, this may have an additional function as a pedestrian/cycle route. Hedge and trees within site and at boundaries should be retained and incorporated in layout as far as practicable.</p> <p>Highways Authority initial advice that access to site could be achieved in principle via George Hill, subject to further investigations.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence of problems that should be considered alongside development of this site, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Surface water flooding and drainage from site onto George Hill. Essential that these are addressed by sustainable drainage solutions alongside any future development in order to comply with policies SRM2, IM2.</li> <li>* Need for traffic management on George Hill, particularly related to congestion problems alongside school drop-off times.</li> </ul> <p>Given that George Hill is likely to be the sole point of access for this site, these matters will need to be considered in parallel to any development in order to ensure compliance with TR3, IM2.</p>	Estimate 65 (including 30 from existing allocation area RB2)	Suitable and developable, subject to more detailed investigations (green site).
RB8	Land to the rear of Culverwells, Station Road	The site benefits from an existing allocation in the Adopted Local Plan 2006 (Policy VL8) as being suitable for mixed use development consisting of employment uses and some enabling residential uses. Employment provision would support policy RA1(ii), EC1, EC2, EC3. This is a highly accessible site, well related to services. Net developable area is actually smaller than site boundary suggests due to constraints related to EA defined flood zone and the presence of protected species (and need to safeguard their habitat). It will be necessary to secure a safe access via Culverwells. There are possible deliverability issues, intended level of employment may not be achievable in light of other constraints. In this light, a reduced quantum of employment may be considered subject to evidence. Employment should be provided via small 'start-up' units of a maximum of 200sq.m per unit, with overall quantity to be confirmed. Some doubt regarding this site's ability to deliver other plan objectives related to affordable housing (LHN2, LHN1) and CIL (Policy IM2). However there is a reasonable expectation that these could be overcome and the balance of sustainability assessment weighs strongly in favour of this site. Achieving viability can be further considered at detailed site allocations stage	Estimated 17 at 40 ph from net developable area (whilst still allowing some B1 employment)	Suitable and developable, subject to more detailed investigations (green site).
RB12	Land adjacent to George Close	Yes suitable site for residential, with previous lapsed permission for mixed use, which comprised 9 flats and B1/D1 premises.	estimated 10	Suitable and developable, subject to more detailed investigations (green site).
RB13west	Land west of Johns Cross Road	<p>Yes, site with development potential for residential expansion</p> <p>Possible gateway feature / traffic calming into village to be provided as a part of any development.</p> <p>Some access issues may need to be resolved. The Highways Authority have confirmed the suitability of the western access via Heathfield Gardens. However the Highways Authority are now doubtful of the suitability, viability or safety of either the central access option or access direct onto John's Cross Road, hence east side is considered amber.</p> <p>Southern boundary has been informed by assessment of landscape impact, and would require boundary planting. Open space potential for areas south of site boundary.</p> <p>ESCC Landscape Assessment sites this as within an area of moderate capacity. Site specific ESCC landscape advice suggests that high quality development in strong landscape setting would enhance AONB character of the area.</p>	Estimate 25 (across east and west of RB13)	Suitable and developable, subject to more detailed investigations (green site).
RB13east	Land west of Johns Cross Road	As above described in RB13west	As Above	Suitable and developable subject to more detailed investigations, including of some key factors (amber site).

ID	Site Name	Compliance with Core Strategy Policy	Total Residential Units	SHLAA Conclusions
RB9a	Robertsbridge Mill, SCATS, Northbridge Street	<p>Robertsbridge Mill is a key rural employment site. Business uses (with particular emphasis on small scale workshops and offices to support the local rural economy) would be the Council's preference for main use of the site (central and eastern area). Most respondents to the Local Action Plan also stated they would like to see the Mill site used first and foremost for employment and then for affordable housing. Seaspace support for employment and business development of this site. Development would currently be covered by Local Plan policy EM2.</p> <p>However, the area RB9a may be suitable for residential as an enabling development to ensure the viability of the employment components on the eastern section of RB9r. Residential may therefore be considered sustainable at this site in the context of enabling employment. The relative distance from village core is a further reason weighing against further residential use, in comparison to other sites in the village.</p> <p>The quantum of residential has previously been debated at appeal and most recent RDC position accepted principle of 13 units within Hodsons Mill and therefore did not oppose a mixed development in principle. Hodsons Mill remains in RB9a with the addition of further land to the west which is separated by a vegetation belt (and HW AONB historic routeway) from wider the employment area. This buffer is worthy of retention in its own right in accordance with Policy EN2. The additional 'residential' area created amounts to just over one third of a hectare developable area. May give an estimated 18 dwellings, whilst allowing a reinforced landscaped planting buffer to employment area.</p> <p>Issues remain for further investigation as part of the Local Plan Site Allocations process as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AONB location. Landscape issues particularly in relation to NW corner</li> <li>• Site twice rejected on appeal</li> <li>• Areas of site at risk from flooding. Areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3 along southern and western sections of site, including (crucially) the entrance. A Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) would be required alongside any future allocation. An FRA was provided as part of previous application. Although dismissing the appeal, the Inspector concluded that conditions could be put in place to satisfy flood concerns, including an emergency access. Requires further investigation in order to comply with policies EN6, EN7.</li> <li>• Possible contamination. Historic corn-mill, tank and saw-pit + electricity sub-station.</li> <li>• Trees on site, especially to boundaries</li> <li>• Conservation Area Heritage – parts of site are within or adjacent to Conservation Area. The areas to south and north-east are defined as 'Key Green Spaces' for the Conservation Area (as defined in the Robertsbridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal)</li> <li>• Key Historic Buildings. Western part of the former Oasthouse to Mill Farm is a listed building on-site. Also need to retain historic Mill building (an unlisted building of architectural interest, as defined in the Robertsbridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal) as part of any proposal. Eastern part of Mill Farm is also an unlisted building of architectural interest.</li> <li>• Public footpath on site.</li> </ul> <p>In the event of the site coming forward, future layout parameters should include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preserve key greenspaces as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Area adjacent to Northbridge Street Conservation Area, as set out in the Robertsbridge Conservation Area Character Appraisal.</li> <li>o Area south of the Mill to provide communal landscaped gardens, preservation of pond as conservation area feature and SUDs as necessary (see site RB16).</li> <li>o Retention and enhancement of interior and perimeter planting as illustrated</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Delivery of Environmental Enhancement and Mitigation Measures, to be supported by further report, but to include <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Clearance of invasive species (eg Japanese Knotweed)</li> <li>o Habitat enhancement measures for protected species (including water-vole).</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Above measures and mitigation needed to demonstrate compliance with policies EC1, EC2, EC3, CO3, , EN5, EN6, EN7, OSS4 and OSS5.</p>	Estimate 30	Suitable and developable subject to more detailed investigations, including of some key factors (amber site).

ID	Site Name	Compliance with Core Strategy Policy	Total Residential Units	SHLAA Conclusions
RB1	Land at Bishops Lane, Robertsbridge	<p>Not suitable and not a preferred site, with the balance of considerations weighing against it. The Valley of the Darwell Stream which runs through the centre of the village and the area separates the older part of the village from the more modern part developed near the railway. It is accessible meadows forming valued and locally important green infrastructure and is a key feature of the character of the village, being the backdrop to rural views from the village centre. Its erosion would diminish Robertsbridge's locally distinctive character of the village, and would not be an appropriate response to local context (contrary to Core Strategy Policies RA1(i), EN1, EN2, EN3).</p> <p>Net developable area is restricted by flood plain on northern side. There is a public footpath the length of the developable area.</p> <p>ESCC Highways advice suggest site could potentially be accessed from the south west corner adjacent to Bishops Lane, but only following extensive highways works, including an extension of the 30 mph zone to contain the vehicular access and appropriate road widening works to provide footway connection. Infrastructure works seem likely to impact upon viability and in turn upon the deliverability of the development bearing in mind other plan requirements related to affordable housing (LHN2, LHN1) and CIL (Policy IM2)</p> <p>Appropriateness of road widening and works at this point would impact on the area's rural character and tranquillity on a road defined by the High Weald AONB as a historic routeway. HW AONB objectives 'To maintain the historic pattern and features of routeways' and 'promote the reduction of the impact of intrusive highway engineering' may be compromised. The site itself is also sub-divided by a HighWeald AONB historic field boundary, which would be lost as part of any development. Further Policy issues would include OSS4, OSS5, RA2 and TR3 issues.</p>	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB3	Land adjacent to Salehurst C E Primary School	<p>Essentially a key component of the East Robertsbridge (RB2, RB4, RB5, RB7a) site discussed above, which although not suitable for residential development, nonetheless forms an essential green infrastructure component integral and essential to the development of the wider East Robertsbridge site, and should therefore be considered in parallel.</p> <p>Not considered suitable for residential development for following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Conservation Area frontage setting</li> <li>* Suitable for amenity open space, possible shared with school.</li> </ul> <p>Local evidence has suggested a need for a multi-use gaming area in the village, and the southern section of RB3 could potentially provide a site with the added benefit of sharing public use with school use.</p> <p>Fair Lane is congested and not suited to further vehicle access, however site should remain permeable for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB6	Land West of Salehurst C E Primary School, Robertsbridge	<p>Not suitable for residential development. Now occupied by existing community facilities and recent planning history of extending community facilities. Development would be contrary to Policies CO1, CO3 and CO4.</p>	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB7r	Land south of Grove Farm	<p>Essentially a key component of the East Robertsbridge (RB2, RB4, RB5, RB7a) site discussed above, which although not suitable for residential development, nonetheless forms an essential green infrastructure component integral and essential to the development of the East Robertsbridge site, and should therefore be considered in parallel. Not considered suitable for residential development primarily for reasons of landscape impact. Could be utilised instead for amenity open space. Parish Council aspiration for the village to have a BMX track and this site could offer a potential location.</p>	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB9r	Robertsbridge Mill, SCATS, Northbridge Street	<p>This write up should be read alongside the write up of site RB9a. RB9r essentially comprises the parts of the Mill site not considered suitable for development. There are two sections of relevance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Land to the east comprising the proposed employment area (supporting Policies RA1ii, EC2).</li> <li>*Land to the west that is outside of the development boundary and not suitable for built development. This area is well treed and traversed by a public footpath.</li> </ul>	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB11	Bracken Hill House	<p>Broadly compliant with Core Strategy policy. Site is within the development boundary (Policy OSS3) and makes effective use of land within the main built up confines (OSS4).</p> <p>Suitable for intensification of low density property. Owners unwilling to develop so not a reasonable prospect of coming forward.</p> <p>Otherwise offered an opportunity to make better use of a large plot, although small scale intensification refused 20 years ago.</p> <p>Trees on site likely to be worthy of retention and site access issues (particularly from south). On site constraints suggest 8 dwellings is best estimate at this point - following existing building lines. Possible future large site windfall.</p>	N/a	Suitable for residential but not currently developable (Red site)

ID	Site Name	Compliance with Core Strategy Policy	Total Residential Units	SHLAA Conclusions
RB14	Land at Brook House, Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	No. Ruled out of consideration as allocation given other factors such as access constraints, and distance from services. Does not comply with Core Strategy Policies OSS4, OSS5, RA1, EN1, EN2, EN6 and 7 (due to flood risk at access points) and TR3.	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB15	Land at Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	No. Not considered suitable by reason of its prominence in views, access issues and distance from services. Does not comply with Core Strategy Policies OSS4, OSS5, RA1, EN1, EN2, EN6 and 7 (due to flood risk at access points) and TR3.	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB16	Land at Northbridge Street, Robertsbridge	No. Not considered suitable for development by reason including flooding issues and dissection by river. However, section north of river should form part of the consideration of the wider Mill site (RB9) and be utilised predominantly as amenity open space to serve the development, with possibly a small section serving as car parking. Only retain car park as existing if required. Does not comply with Core Strategy Policies OSS4, OSS5, RA1, EN1, EN2, EN6, EN7 and TR3.	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
RB20	Land at Beech Farm, Robertsbridge	No. Exposed AONB landscape. Contrary to policies OSS3, OSS4, OSS5, RA1, EN1, EN3.	N/a	Not suitable (red site)
			<b>Estimate from current allocations (following re-assessment) = 47</b> <b>Estimated new sites (Green and Amber) =100</b>	