

## Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst
Respondent Details	Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.			
ROB/R16/2017/1	Mrs Anne Wells	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	n/a			Support plan in entirety.		
ROB/R16/2017/2	Mr Jonathan Vine-Hall	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	H03 & EN2			I support the whole of the neighbourhood plan I specifically support the mill site in policy H03 I specifically support the local green spaces identified in policy EN2		
ROB/R16/2017/3	Devine Homes	n/a	Mr Howard Courtley	Courtley Planning Consultants Ltd	Object	H03 & EN2 SEA			Refers to representations to the earlier Pre-Submission Plan. These objected to the non-allocation of land at Bishops Lane for housing, as well as to its designation as a Local Green Space (GS16) under Policy EN2. A supporting Transport Statement and indicative layout are submitted, as is a separate submission objecting to the SEA, stating that it lacks the necessary evidence base and, specifically, does not justify the housing allocation of the Mill site, which also fails the sequential tests for flood risk. The housing requirement is regarded as a minimum. The Plan should identify suitable employment sites.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/4	Mrs Carol Hodgson	Sedlescombe Parish Council	N/a	N/a	Support	H03 & EN2			1. Sedlescombe Parish Council supports the whole of the Salehurst and Robertsbridge Neighbourhood plan 2. Sedlescombe Parish Council specifically support the local green spaces identified in poly EN2 3. Sedlescombe Parish Council specifically support the mill site in policy H03		
ROB/R16/2017/5	Kirsten Williamson	Southern Water	n/a	n/a	Comment	H03 & EN2			Southern Water notes the amendments made to policies H03 and IN3 in respect of our previous representations, and the inclusion of a reference to Utility Infrastructure in policy EN2. We have no further comments to make in respect of the Plan at this time. We would wish to be kept informed of the progress of the Plan towards being 'made' and are happy to provide further information in respect of our previous representations if requested by the Examiner.		
ROB/R16/2017/6	Dionne Herelle	BT	N/a	N/a	Comment	n/a			I confirm that I have buildings owned or occupied by BT or Telereal Trillium within the area you have indicated, in particular Robertsbridge Automatic Telephone Exchange (ATE), George Hill, Robertsbridge TN32 5AX and Staplecross UAX. I would therefore appreciate communications/copy information regarding progress in and around these sites as they may be affected. Please be aware that this advice does not extend to BT's telecommunications apparatus located in the public highway or under private land, nor does it include BT's deep level tunnels.		
ROB/R16/2017/7	Mr Richard Hedger	n/a	n/a	N/a	Support	H03			I support all of the chosen sites. The Mill Site should be used as it is a brown field site which has stood empty for 12 years. The Heathfield Garden site, whilst being a greenfield site has not supported any agricultural activity since the bypass was built. The Mill Site - a brown field site should be used to develop necessary housing. I support the Policy requiring developers to replace parkingspaces - Robertsbridge has a parking issue already.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/8	Mrs Sheila Rogers	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			The Mill Site - a brown field site should be used to develop necessary housing. I support the Policy requiring developers to replace parkingspaces - Robertsbridge has a parking issue already.		
ROB/R16/2017/9	Miss Muriel Ambler	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	behind Culver Well, Station Road			Station Road is already very busy with traffic throughout the day. Any more traffic will make it even more dangerous for children than it already is. It is also surrounded by a serious flooding problem. The road is also very badly damaged and getting worse!		
ROB/R16/2017/10	Ms Muriel Webster	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	EC4		p/26	It is very important that the premises of the Youth Club are retained - a great asset to the village.		
ROB/R16/2017/11	Miss Karen Rees	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support and Comment	H03			I agree with policy H03 the allocations namely Mill site, Heathfield Gardens and Vicarage*. With regard to the latter* this would directly affect my business and needs very careful access arrangements as Fair Lane is very narrow and already congested.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/12	Mrs Gillian Stokoe	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			Approve the Neighbourhood Plan		
ROB/R16/2017/13	Mr R S Clymo	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			A welcome and well-prepared plan		yes
ROB/R16/2017/13a	Mr R S Clymo	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	IN7		p48	The word 'tandem' is Latin and means 'one after the other'. It is wrongly used here: the context suggests that the NP means 'at the same time' or 'in parallel'. The least you can say is that 'tandem' is ambiguous. This is not a trivial mistake: it will delight developers. Refer to the OED.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/13b	Mr R S Clymo	n/a	N/a	N/a	Object	EN2		p31	Cites cases where development allowed on local green spaces and states that 'Will be resisted' is too feeble. Should rather say something like "No proposal to building land not designated is this NP will be permitted".		yes
ROB/R16/2017/13c	Mr R S Clymo	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	H02		p37	Housing requirement' 'Additional allocations will only be made if the identified housing sites do not proceed. Unclear as to meaning - suggest it looks like another developer's back door, points out if planning permission has been given then it is up to the grantee to build.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/14	Mr Michael Hennessey	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			Agrees with the whole development, especially the conversion and redevelopment of the Mill Site. One major aspect for all the sites is the provision of ample car parking space for each unit	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/15	Miss Karen Rees	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	Tourism Strategy			Comments on Tourism Strategy. Would definitely support an application to be a 'Walkers are Welcome' village, but public transport would need to be improved as would signage. All year round events such as the programme developed by Robertsbridge Arts Partnership and a vibrant programme of events at the Village Hall and markets are better than one-off larger events such as the such as the idea of developing something unique and specific.		
ROB/R16/2017/16	Miss Susan Stokoe	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			Supports the plan.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/17	Ms Kathryn Bell	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Site Assessment Document.			This appears to be a fair, systematic review of the pros and cos of each site. But disagrees with one point: Mill Site is rated 'could cause minor increase in congestion on one of the main thoroughfares. I think this should be 'could significantly increase ....'		
ROB/R16/2017/17a	Ms Kathryn Bell	n/a	N/a	N/a	Object	EN5			Critical of ambiguous and vague wording which is hard to enforce. This needs to refer to some suitable benchmark for environmental and sustainability standards		
ROB/R16/2017/17b	Ms Kathryn Bell	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	3.3.9 (Environment character appraisal)			Re Salehurst - 'The only negative characteristic ..., area for enhancement. The consultants seem to have applied standard town planning standard to a hamlet centre - completely inappropriate. Would knocking down some listed houses to make parking space be an enhancement? Clearly not.		
ROB/R16/2017/17c	Ms Kathryn Bell	n/a	N/a	N/a	Comment	H04 + Character Assessment			This does nothing to protect existing homeowners from backyard development which affects them by noise and visual impact. The character assessments would only prevent extremes, such as blocks of flats. The character assessment for Upper Langham Road is inaccurate, partly because 3 such disparate areas have been combined. The phrase 'the area is not very pedestrian friendly due to speeding cars and lack of pavements' applies to Brightling Road but not Upper Langhorn Road, which is well used by walkers, dog walkers, school children and kids playing on bikes, all of whom would be affected by increased traffic.		
ROB/R16/2017/17d	Ms Kathryn Bell	n/a	N/a	N/a	Support	Full Plan			Overall support, just some minor reservations.		

## Representations

Respondent Details		Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst	
Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.				
ROB/R16/2017/18	Mr John Maltman	n/a	N/a	N/a	Object	SRNDP EN8		p35 and as expanded in Schedule 3, p67 -8 and as evaluated on p70 (with specific reference to Butts Cottage)	I wish my property, (Butts Cottage, Beech House Lane) to be deleted from the list Schedule 3, p66 'Local Lists of buildings and other structures'. The cottage is set well above the lane, and cannot be seen from it, or indeed anywhere else, since it is surrounded by farm land and separated from the Old Vicarage by a thick high hedge. Certainly the cottage cannot "contribute to the parish's distinctiveness" or embrace its "sense of community" because no one can see it. The present building bears no relationship to any "historic building". Photographs were supplied.		
ROB/R16/2017/19	Mr Neil Barden	Robertsbridge Community Association	N/a	N/a	Support	Robertsbridge Hall			We support the concept of the village and lands remaining as it now is. The Hall is a very important asset to the village people. All surrounding grounds are used ie allotment, football field, and the immediate grounds are necessary for hirers of the Hall for garden shows, boot sales and parking and its grounds and Hall are in constant use by village people. Large parts of the grounds are subject to flooding.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/20	Mrs Amanda Fellowes	Robertsbridge Children's Services	N/a	N/a	Support	ED1			The Plan supports provision for school places for every child in Salehurst & Robertsbridge in whichever of Robertsbridge Community College (RCC), Salehurst C of E Primary School (SPS) or Robertsbridge Children's Services (RCS). Housing development only permitted where demonstrated that either the expected child yield would not result in the Schools exceeding the maximum number of children permitted on its roll or that appropriate modifications and/or extension to the School can be delivered at developer's expense. Policy supported as Robertsbridge Children's Services will not have the capacity to provide sufficient places without developer funding of additional premises.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/20a	Mrs Amanda Fellowes	Robertsbridge Children's Services	N/a	N/a	Comment	ED1	3.2.1	30	Robertsbridge Children's Services provides pre-school childcare. We have a waiting list of 15 children and have had to turn many families away. Being the only childcare provider in the village, we are concerned that further housing development will add to the problems of families being unable to access local pre-school. The site that we occupy has little room to expand and any further loss of green space in this location would be resisted. We are keen to ensure that the need for childcare places is met and obtain developer contributions for a new build on the sites allocated for development.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/21	Mr George Chichester	The Mountfield Estate	Mr Paul Carnell	Struttandparker.com	Support HO3; Object to Schedule 4 (re trees at Heathfield Gardens)	HO3, Schedule 4 (Local list of trees)			As landowners, the Mountfield Estate reiterates its continued support for the allocation of Heathfield gardens under Policy HO3 for 40 residential dwellings, and will continue to work with the neighbouring landowner to bring the site forward for development following adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan. Refers to earlier comments on the criteria in policy HO3 (letter of November 2016). We do not consider that robust evidence has been provided to demonstrate the value of the group of trees on the Heathfield Garden Site (group G7) in Schedule 4 or that they merit protection. Refers to comments of December 2016.		
ROB/R16/2017/22	Mr Chris Flavin	East Sussex County Council	N/a	N/a	Object	IN1			It is not clear how the evidence has been used to arrive at Policy IN1, particularly as it differs to that as set out in the ESCC parking standards. It is recommended that, instead of adopting an arbitrary localised standard, that Policy IN1 is removed and that the Plan makes reference to the need for development to comply with the ESCC parking calculator and the ESCC 'Guidance for parking at new residential development', which uses local car ownership data and dwelling size.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/22a	Mr Chris Flavin	East Sussex County Council	N/a	N/a	Object	ED1			Policy ED1 remains unclear and contradicts the revised supporting text. We suggest that the Policy is amended, which reiterates our previous suggestion, clarifies how it should be applied and makes it consistent with the supporting text. Recommended wording provided. It is also recommended that additional changes to clarify and make the supporting text (paragraph 3.2.1) clearer are made. Recommended text provides which removes references to the current capacity in education facilities, as pupil numbers change and the text would quickly become out-of-date. Amendments also take into account future potential changes to development contributions.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/22b	Mr Chris Flavin	East Sussex County Council	N/a	N/a	Object	IN8			We are firmly of the view that inclusion of this policy would be in conflict with the relevant basic conditions regarding consistency and conformity with national planning policy and the strategic policies in the Rother Development Plan. We would recommend that Policy IN8 is deleted. If the Parish Council want to include a section on Flood Risk Management, we would recommend the use of a statement or guidance note, making accurate reference to ESCC's role as a Statutory Consultee and to the East Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2016 – 2026 and relevant guidance.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/22c	Mr Chris Flavin	East Sussex County Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	EN3			Whilst this policy does make reference to the conservation and enhancement of some natural features, it is primarily concerned with landscape and does not take into account the need to have a general policy for the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity more generally. None of the other ecology comments that were raised in the previous response seem to have been addressed. Therefore, we would like to reiterate these points.		
ROB/R16/2017/23	Elizabeth Cleaver	Highways England	N/a	N/a	Comment	Full plan			Highways England will be concerned with developments that result in intensification of use of an existing access on to the A21. Any such proposals would need careful consideration in relation to the type of access already provided and whether or not it would still be suitable for use following re-development of the site. The creation of a new access to the A21 is likely to be resisted by Highways England unless there is significant economic benefit in doing so and that the new access would not be detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of our network. The cumulative traffic effects of development will need careful consideration in relation to the efficient operation of the A21 specifically the roundabout junction with Northbridge Street and Church Lane as well as the priority junction with George Hill.		
ROB/R16/2017/24	Messrs Higgins	n/a	Mr Paul Atherton	Savills	Support	Housing Section 3.4			Agree that both parcels of land (named as Heathfield Gardens west and east for this exercise) are suitable for the type of development proposed, both sites were available and both sites were achievable and economically viable. We would strongly recommend and support for the sites to be allocated and included in the new Local Plan. We confirm that the sites are immediately available and deliverable for the residential development.	yes	yes

## Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst
Respondent Details	Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.			
ROB/R16/2017/25	Gardner Crawley	Rother Valley Railway	N/a	N/a	Comment	Presubmission Plan	1.4.7		The Rother Valley Railway project to re-connect the railway from Robertsbridge to Bodiam should be included in the Neighbourhood Plan as Rother District Council Planning Committee unanimously approved the planning application for the Northbridge Street to Junction Road "missing link" at its meeting on 16 March 2017. The plan will at least encourage strategies to minimise the impact of the arrival of the railway on the village and maximise its economic benefit.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/26	Ms Claire Tester	High Weald AONB Unit	N/a	N/a	Support	EN3			I support the proposed policy as being in general conformity with the NPPF in that it gives great weight to conserving and enhancing the AONB, and adding local distinctiveness to the national policy by referring to the High Weald AONB Management Plan and the specific landscape components in the parish that need conserving and enhancing.		yes
ROB/R16/2017/27	Mrs Sophie Page	Environment Agency	N/a	N/a	Comment	IN8	1.4.3		We do not think there should be a policy included in the Neighbourhood Plan that suggests any deviation from NPPF, the requirements of the Sequential and Exception Tests and the need for all planning proposals in flood risk areas to be supported by a site specific flood risk assessment. We support the final comment in respect to the presumption against culverting and the loss of open watercourses. However, the final part of this policy is not really necessary and is again confusing. This matter should be addressed independently of policy IN8 as this policy is for the purpose reducing flood risk.		
ROB/R16/2017/28	Ian Lings	Woodland Trust	N/a	N/a	Object	EN3			Pleased that Neighbourhood Plan supports conserving and enhancing woodland and seeks to reduce the loss of Ancient Woodland, but it is also important to expand the amount of trees and woodland, to provide enhanced green infrastructure and to mitigate against future loss of trees to disease and deliver a major contribution to resolving a range of water management issues. Would therefore like to see Policy EN3 wording amended to read (upper case amendments) – "All development will be considered with regard to the need to protect AND ENHANCE the landscape character of the countryside as the whole of the Parish...."		
ROB/R16/2017/28a	Ian Lings	Woodland Trust	N/a	N/a	Object	EN4			Until the NPPF is amended, there is a clear role for Local and Neighbourhood Plans, and associated documents, to provide this improved level of protection and to ensure that irreplaceable habitats get the same level of protection as heritage assets enjoy under the NPPF. We would therefore like to see Policy EN4 amended to include – "Development proposals directly or indirectly affecting ancient woodland or ancient trees will not be accepted".		
ROB/R16/2017/28b	Ian Lings	Woodland Trust	N/a	N/a	Comment	EN9			Whilst the Woodland Trust is pleased to see that Policy EN9 seeks to protect and manage locally listed trees, our Space for People publication can also be taken into account given that this and the Woodland Access Standard (WAST) provide an important policy tool complementing other access standards which can be used in delivering green infrastructure standards. If the WAST is acknowledged accordingly together with Space for People', which is the first UK-wide assessment of any form of greenspace, this would provide an important contributor to the design of green infrastructure and placemaking in the Neighbourhood Plan.		
ROB/R16/2017/29	Robert Lloyd Sweet	Historic England	N/a	N/a	Object	EC1 & EC6			Policy EC1 is broadly supported but could be improved to provide more clarity. An amended wording is suggested. Support Policy EC6 where the Steering Group have incorporated our suggested amendment to provide a suitable approach to the conversion or extension of historic buildings including heritage assets. As such we feel that provision 1. in the policy is no longer necessary and should be removed to avoid confusion.		
ROB/R16/2017/29a	Robert Lloyd Sweet	Historic England	N/a	N/a	Support EN8; Comment EN6	EN6 & EN8			Policy EN6 - We support the intention of the policy but would suggest the wording is simplified to make it easier to understand. An amended wording is suggested.  We are pleased to support Policy EN8 and see this as the implementation of National and Local Planning Policy at the neighbourhood level.		
ROB/R16/2017/29b	Robert Lloyd Sweet	Historic England	N/a	N/a	Comment	EN9			We support the identification of other elements of the historic landscape as worthy of protection but would suggest that trees and hedgerows do not meet the definition of a heritage asset set out in the NPPF. We recommend using an alternative term to local listing to make it clear that these are 'local character features' rather than confusing them with the buildings or structures on the local list.		
ROB/R16/2017/29c	Robert Lloyd Sweet	Historic England	N/a	N/a	Object	HO3			We recommend identifying the need to protect the listed oast house and its setting in the supporting information to Policy HO3, as well as possibly identifying the opportunity that development provides to secure the long term viable use of the building and of providing greater public access to it. The insertion of a stated bullet point is suggested. Also, we would be pleased if the examiner could remove the words ", which is better understood as a programme of work to understand the area's archaeological potential and interest". An appropriate wording for bullet point 7 is put forward.		
ROB/R16/2017/30	Mr Max Meyer	Hodson's Mill Limited	N/a	N/a	Support	Housing provision Employment Delivery Appropriate mix of housing / employment			Our site, which extends up to 4.05ha in size, is located to the north east of Robertsbridge. The extent of the site is delineated by the enclosed red line plan. It is identified as the "Mill Site". A full planning application has been submitted. We support the identification of the site as one of the three preferred locations to enable the local housing requirement (155 dwellings) to be delivered during Rother District Council's (DC) Local Plan Period to 2028.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/30a	Mr Max Meyer	Hodson's Mill Limited	N/a	N/a	Support	HO3 & Map 11			The Mill site comprises previously developed land, in an accessible location, unfettered by multiple land ownerships, close to existing amenities and within the settlement boundary. Its current derelict and under-utilised form creates a significant eyesore within the surrounding landscape. Its allocation fully accords with the principles of sustainable development. The site's allocation is supported, as is the extension of the Robertsbridge development boundary on Map 11 (at Annex 1) to incorporate the whole of our client's ownership.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/30b	Mr Max Meyer	Hodson's Mill Limited	N/a	N/a	Support	General employment strategy including Polices EC2 and EC3			The Neighbourhood Plan's approach to promoting facilities to enable a growth in working from home (at Policy EC2) is supportable. Furthermore, Policy EC3 offers clear guidance in regard to the protection of existing employment areas. This is supported. The approach of the Neighbourhood Plan to protect existing employment sites, whilst encouraging new floorspace where appropriate (ie as part of mixed use developments) is considered to represent an appropriate strategy. Reference is made to the job creation from 1,200sqm of new commercial floorspace proposed in a current planning application on the site.	yes	yes

## Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst
Respondent Details	Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Obje ct/ Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.			
ROB/R16/2017/30c	Mr Max Meyer	Hodson's Mill Limited	N/a	N/a	Support	Housing/Employment - HO3 (re Mill Site)			It would not be appropriate to insist upon delivery of an overly excessive amount of employment floorspace at the expense of maximising the residential yield. The Mill Site represents the most sustainable option for development in planning terms, is an underutilised vacant brownfield landholding which falls under single ownership and is readily available for redevelopment. It is the only site capable of accommodating a significant scale of residential development. We fully support its allocation.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/31	Ms Helen Flanagan		N/a	N/a	Object	HO3 - Vicarage land			Objection to the proposed development of the 'Vicarage Land'. Development of any additional dwellings on the 'Vicarage Land' will result in increased road traffic and worsen an already problematic highways safety issue. In addition, it would not preserve the special character of Fair Lane as a quiet residential lane, including via the significant excavation required to facilitate the access. Development of the 'Vicarage Land' will also cause an increase in the risk of flooding to high street houses that back on to the 'Vicarage Land' and a complete loss of privacy and overshadowing to properties which back onto it.	yes	yes
ROB/R16/2017/32	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	EC1			Note for information: The requirement for additional provision to "enhance" the village centre retail offer needs to be mindful that planning applications are not specific to a use, and that changes of occupier within the A1 shops use class are permitted development.		
ROB/R16/2017/32a	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Support	EC2			The policy is supported.		
ROB/R16/2017/32b	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EC3			It is unclear whether parts 1 and 2 of the policy both need to be met to be compliant. In part 2, the additional phrase "or as identified by the market" is regarded as undermining the effective retention of business sites while Part 3 of the S&RNP policy is not consistent with Core Strategy policy EC3. Recommended amendments to the policy are set out.		
ROB/R16/2017/32c	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EC4			It is considered helpful for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify potential Assets of Community Value as a supporting "Nominations List". However, the sites listed in policy are not currently registered as Assets of Community Value. This would be subject to a judgement by the local authority as to whether the criteria set out in the Localism Act and supporting regulations had been complied with. The policy is considered unnecessary as the nominated sites are largely protected by RDC planning policies Recommend to delete the policy.		
ROB/R16/2017/32d	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EC6			This proposed policy relates to Core Strategy policies RA2, RA3 and RA4. Support the policy subject to the following amendments: a) add a further proviso to add to the second list of four provisos which states: ' it has an acceptable impact upon the rural High Weald AONB landscape; b) delete proviso 1, and c) amend the first line of the policy to include 'extension' as well as re-use or conversion Also, consider amending the title to 'Re-use, conversion and extension of rural buildings'.		
ROB/R16/2017/32e	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EC7			Notwithstanding that the Plan elsewhere supports the loss of business sites, this policy is supported subject to the amendments to improve clarity by highlighting due regard to local amenities and by recognising that the High Weald is a generally enclosed landscape, but its character may still be harmed by inappropriate development: Recommended amendments are set out,.		
ROB/R16/2017/32f	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	ED1			Support the policy subject to the recommended amendments. Also, amend the supporting text (paragraph 3.2.1) as set out..		
ROB/R16/2017/32g	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN2			The S&RNP designates large areas as Local Green Space (LGS) which raises questions of consistency with the NPPF (paragraph 77). Cumulatively, the LGSs, many of which are co-joined, form an extensive tract of land. It is recommended that the merits of the areas put forward be reviewed to avoid coverage of extensive tracts of land. Consideration should be given to incorporating those areas that form part of the open valleys of the River Rother Valley and its tributaries, in a separate policy to protect the valley setting.		
ROB/R16/2017/32h	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN3			The capitalised reference to "Gap Between Settlements" implies a formal designation and defined area, which is not put forward in the landscape assessment, nor in the S&RNP. Therefore, the policy is supported, subject to the amendment/clarification set out. Also, Core Strategy policies EN2, EN5, EN6, EN7, SRM2 should be referred to in the Conformity List of References		
ROB/R16/2017/32i	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	EN4			This policy is supported subject to the following amendment to the supporting text: At the end of paragraph 3.3.4 add 'The above policy should be read in conjunction with Local Plan Core Strategy policies EN5 and EN1.'		
ROB/R16/2017/32j	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN5			Part 1 may be taken as not applying the higher water efficiency standard which would reflect the whole District being identified as under 'serious water stress'. The implications of parts 2 and 3 are not clear, while parts 4 and 5 are covered by the Building Regulations; hence, the policy does not add value in those respects. It is recommended that either: a) Policy EN5 is amended by replacing part 1 with the following: '1. effective use of resources and materials by minimising CO2 emissions and minimising water use through application of the higher water efficiency standard;' Or b) Policy EN5 is deleted		
ROB/R16/2017/32k	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN6			The sentiment of the policy is supported, although essentially repeats national guidance regarding heritage assets Also the wording only refers to 'any monuments that may be scheduled or conservation areas that may be designated' which implies the policy does not cover those that already exist. It is recommended that either: a) Policy EN6 be amended as follows: Replace 'any monuments that may be scheduled or conservation areas that may be created' With 'scheduled ancient monuments or conservation areas' OR b) Policy EN6 be deleted, since it replicates national guidance.		

## Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst
Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/ Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.				
ROB/R16/2017/32l	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN7			The policy only refers to Schedule 2 which contains a list of all the Listed Buildings. In this event, the words 'or buildings or structures of character' seem inappropriate. If it is meant to have a wider application, the term 'non-designated heritage assets' should be used, although these are not afforded the same weight. It is recommended that either: a) Policy EN7 be amended by deleting ' or the buildings or structures of character' and replacing with 'and Scheduled Ancient Monument' OR b) Policy EN7 be deleted, but Policy EN8 be expanded to embrace nondesignated heritage assets, using terminology to be consistent with the NPPF.		
ROB/R16/2017/32m	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN8			Historic England's (HE) Advice Note 7: 'Local Heritage Listing' sets out the process for local listing. This guidance states that work in preparing a neighbourhood plan may indicate sites that merit inclusion on the 'local list', which needs to be ratified by the LPA. The HE guidance also sets out that there needs to be clear nominations process, including consultation with owners of proposed listings. It is considered that the identification of buildings in Schedule 3 can be supported if the terminology is amended. Proposed amendments to policy EN8 are put forward.		
ROB/R16/2017/32n	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	EN9			The concept of locally listed trees is not a recognised planning term and should not be used. Schedule 4 is however a useful appraisal of trees and hedgerows and can inform the basis for any further TPOs that may be warranted. An amended Policy EN9 is put forward to reconcile the issues.		
ROB/R16/2017/32o	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	H01			The development boundary does not just relate to housing. Support the policy subject to the addition of the sentence currently in Policy HO2 regarding infill development (see comments on that policy). Amend the supporting text by the addition of a sentence at the end of 3.4.1 to read: 'The definition of the development boundary has particular significance in relation to the location of housing, but is also relevant to the location of other new development.'		
ROB/R16/2017/32p	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	HO2			This policy is regarded as largely contextual explanation, with the exception of the final sentence. The first three sentences are already covered by the supporting overleaf table. It is recommended to amend Policy HO2 as follows: a) Delete the first three sentences. b) Insert the fourth sentence in policy HO1 c) Amend the fourth sentence as follows: (Proposed deletions struckthrough, proposed new text in red italics) Additional allocations will only be made if the identified housing sites do not proceed and the The SRNDP will be reviewed at least every 5 years to ensure deliverability of the allocations.		
ROB/R16/2017/32q	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	H03			The estimated capacities for individual sites are not considered achievable in light of environmental and heritage constraints. This could be compounded by the requirements of other policies within the Plan, notably parking standards. In the light of assessments of realistic capacities, unless the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority favourably comment on residential development being accommodated within Flood Zone 3 on the Mill Site, having regard to the sequential and exception tests, it is reluctantly concluded that the proposed allocations fall materially short of the housing target for Robertsbridge, contrary to the strategic policies of the Council.		
ROB/R16/2017/32r	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	H05			Without a specific proportion requirement, given the market tendency to favour larger dwellings, it may prove difficult to achieve the significant increase in two bedroom dwellings that the S&RNP appears to suggest is needed. In respect of sheltered accommodation, it is accepted that there is some evidence of a need for such accommodation in rural centres. However, it may not be a practicable requirement on every scheme, as the policy requires. Support Policy HO5 subject to amendments, as set out.		
ROB/R16/2017/32s	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	H06			There may be a local case for departure from the PPG. Indeed, house prices in this part of Rother are the highest in the District. Even so, it is likely that a more substantial case is needed. Moreover, there is no evident viability evidence to support this more onerous policy. Also, given that the large majority of the new dwellings will be on larger sites, the additional contribution of affordable dwellings from sites of 6-10 dwellings does not appear significant. Policy HO6 should be deleted, but textual cross-reference be made to the District Council policies, notably LHN2, and guidance.		
ROB/R16/2017/32t	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	H08			This policy might better sit in the Infrastructure section rather than in Housing chapter.		
ROB/R16/2017/32u	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	IN1			There seems to be insufficient evidence to justify a local departure from the County Highways Authority's approach to parking which already calculates requirements taking into account local circumstances. It is proposed that Policy IN1 be deleted and, instead, reference be made in supporting text to the need for development to comply with the ESCC parking calculator and the ESCC 'Guidance for parking at new residential development'.		
ROB/R16/2017/32v	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	IN2			This policy is rather broad or inflexible as an approach. Applied rigorously, it may limit scope for home-zones and shared surfacing. Therefore, the policy is supported subject to the following amendment: (Proposed deletions struck-through, proposed new text in red italics) 'Development proposals that would result in the overall net loss of existing on-street and/or off-street car parking will not <b>generally</b> be supported.'		
ROB/R16/2017/32w	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Support	IN4			This policy is supported.		
ROB/R16/2017/32x	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Support	IN5			This policy is supported.		

## Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan				Comment Summary	Indicated a specific reference to participate in oral examination	Requests to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Robertsbridge and Salehurst
Respondent Details	Respondent Name 3982	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/ Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.			
ROB/R16/2017/32y	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	IN6			Policy IN6 appears to essentially cover the same subject matter as policy EC2, so it may be advantageous to combine into a single policy. The final sentence of IN6 is problematic as the provision of superfast broadband is dependent on the private sector. Policy cannot compel developers to install high speed broadband infrastructure on new developments, although there is scope to require ducting. It is recommended that the policy be amended accordingly and applied to all sites, subject to viability and feasibility.		
ROB/R16/2017/32z	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	IN7			This policy substantially overlaps with Core Strategy IM2. It is therefore questioned whether IN7 is necessary. The wording of the policy leaves some ambiguity as to whether it meets these tests. However, as the policy cannot usurp legal tests, it is not regarded as a key issue.		
ROB/R16/2017/32aa	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	IN8			A number of issues in respect of consistency with NPPF paragraphs 100-102 are raised. Given that the wording leads is ambiguous and does not sit comfortably with national policy nor emerging Local Plan policy on the matter, it is recommended that Policy IN8 is deleted. Replacement text could usefully refer the East Sussex Local Flood Risk Management Strategy 2016 – 2026 and relevant guidance.		
ROB/R16/2017/32bb	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	LE2			This policy substantially repeats Core Strategy policies CO1 and CO3. It is not considered to add value to those. It is not clear if an applicant would need to fulfil all 3 criteria or just one (i.e; use of the terms and/or). If retained, it may help to define the use classes to which the policy applies. Suggested amendment is to either: a) Delete the policy OR b) Put 'and' at end of bullet 1. Replace 'and' with 'or' at the end of bullet 2.		
ROB/R16/2017/32cc	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	LE3			The policy reference to run-off sits out of place here, could this not be better dealt with under a policy relating to flooding etc?  The title could clarify - New 'Leisure or Community' facilities.		
ROB/R16/2017/32dd	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Object	Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA)			Overall, the SEA has been produced so as to be consistent with the RDC screening assessment and consistent with the RDC framework, which is welcome. It is considered to be a proportionate assessment. However there are some issues with scores as highlighted in the representation. Proposed Amendments: Amend SEA accordingly.		
ROB/R16/2017/32ee	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	Environment 1.4.11-1.4.12			Sections 1.4.11 to 1.4.12 describe the District as a whole and not Robertsbridge specifically. Rother DC has previously provided extensive material relating to the local environmental situation and context. Suggested non-material amendment: Include locally specific, rather than District wide environmental information.		
ROB/R16/2017/32ff	Dr Anthony Leonard	Rother District Council	N/a	N/a	Comment	Mapping			Sections 1.4.11 to 1.4.12 describe the District as a whole and not Robertsbridge specifically. Rother DC has previously provided extensive material relating to the local environmental situation and context. Suggested non-material amendment: Include locally specific, rather than District wide environmental information.		
ROB/R16/2017/33	Rector & Scholars of Exeter College		Mr Wai-kit Cheung	Turnberry Planning Limited	Object	H03			The emerging SRNP is considered inflexible/over optimistic and appears, with too much emphasis on the three sites to deliver the required housing target. A more flexible approach to housing delivery is required and other sites such as Grove Farm reconsidered for allocation.. The site selection process has not been undertaken positively and is not in general conformity with the strategic development policies and the adopted Local Plan. Object to how the above three sites as well as the Grove Farm site were assessed in the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) that accompanied the emerging SRNP. Further justifications are set out.		
ROB/R16/2017/33a	Rector & Scholars of Exeter College		Mr Wai-kit Cheung	Turnberry Planning Limited	Object	SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment)			We have undertaken a comprehensive review of the assessment of the four sites in the SEA (the three proposed allocations and Grove Farm) and this is contained in Appendix 2. In summary, we have major concerns as to how the four sites have been assessed. The draft Neighbourhood Plan therefore fails the additional test of not complying with EU Regulations. This is a serious legal flaw in the process and needs remedied before the Neighbourhood Plan can progress.		

### Late Representations

Respondent Details			Agent Details (if applicable)		Part of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge				Comment Summary	Willing to participate in oral examination if required?	Wishes to be notified when the council resolves to 'make' the Sedlescombe Neighbourhood Plan?
Respondent ID	Respondent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Agent Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Document (Support/Object/Comment)	Policy No.	Paragraph No.	Page No.			
ROB/R16/2017/L1	David Evison	Chichester Diocese	n/a	n/a	Comment	Former Vicarage & Glebe Site Fair Lane			<p>The diocese supports the proposed allocation of the site (Vicarage Land) for housing in the draft plan.</p> <p>The site is now redundant (except for limited use of the hall which is in very poor condition). A replacement parsonage has been provided elsewhere.</p> <p>The diocese has now entered into advanced negotiations with a preferred purchaser.</p> <p>Current proposals are for redevelopment of a hall on part of the site of the existing hall building.</p>		Yes
ROB/R16/2017/L2	Rebecca Bishop	Natural England	n/a	n/a	Comment	SEA			<p>Thank you for consulting Natural England on your Neighbourhood Plan and SEA and I apologise for the late submission of this response, which is due to sickness leave.</p> <p>I note that we provided general advice in relation to a previous consultation (Natural England ref. 197218) on 28th October 2016. We have nothing further to add to that advice.</p>		
ROB/R16/2017/L3	Mrs Patricia Hanson		n/a	n/a	Support	Full Plan			<p>The Mill Site is OK. It is time the site was used. I am broadly in accordance with the plan though I regret the extension to the village as I am not sure houses here will affect those who have to travel. "Affordable" housing is good but I doubt many jobs can be found locally.</p>		Yes