

# Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan 2018 — 2028

Consultation Statement  
October 2018












This consultation statement sets out the comments received during the pre-submission consultation period and the actions taken as a result





This Consultation Statement been prepared by Ticehurst Parish Council, the qualifying body responsible for plan preparation. Contacts for further information:

Chair of Ticehurst Parish Council

- Stephen Burley | [stephenburley1@gmail.com](mailto:stephenburley1@gmail.com)

Chair of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group

- John Pilcher | [pilch@3leg.co.uk](mailto:pilch@3leg.co.uk)

Core Steering Group

- Sheena Carmichael | [sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com](mailto:sheena.carmichael1@gmail.com)
- Teresa Killeen | [teresa.killeen@icloud.com](mailto:teresa.killeen@icloud.com)
- Liz Young | [lizayoung100@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:lizayoung100@yahoo.co.uk)

Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan, c/o Francesca Nowne, Ticehurst Village Hall, Lower High Street, Ticehurst, TN5 7BB



The qualifying body has received technical support during the preparation of this plan from Feria Urbanism, a planning and design studio that specialises in urban design, urban planning, neighbourhood strategies and community engagement. Contact for further information:

- Richard Eastham
- [richard@feria-urbanism.eu](mailto:richard@feria-urbanism.eu)
- [www.feria-urbanism.eu](http://www.feria-urbanism.eu)
- 07816 299 909 | 01202 548 676

Document reference 131\_Q\_181009\_FINAL-Consultation-Statement

All maps within this document are reproduced from the Ordnance Survey mapping with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright and database rights. Unauthorised reproduction infringes crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings.

# Contents

Page 6	<b>01 Consultation Process &amp; Preparation Timetable</b>
Page 11	<b>02 Responses Received from Statutory Consultees</b>
Page 36	<b>03 Survey Responses to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan</b>
Page 131	<b>04 Written Responses to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan</b>
Page 144	<b>05 Evidence Based Review Comments (AECOM)</b>

## 01 Consultation Process & Preparation Timetable

Work on the Ticehurst Parish Neighbourhood Plan began in October 2015, when Rother District Council approved the designated boundary for the neighbourhood plan area (Ticehurst Parish boundary).

### Visioning Events & PLACE Assessments, January 2016

Since late 2015, the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) Steering Group has been supported in its work by Feria Urbanism, a professional design and planning practice based in Bournemouth. The process began with site visits made by the consultant team, allowing them to understand the local context. Several key events to engage the community then followed.

A series of three Visioning Events were held on the evenings of 12th, 13th and 14th January 2016. These explored some of the main challenges and issues facing the parish. A specific event was held for each of the settlements of Ticehurst, Stonegate and Flimwell, hence the three dates. Over 200 people signed into these Visioning Events.

Each of the Visioning Events was preceded by a “PLACE” assessment earlier that afternoon. These events were used to establish the main factors affecting the parish under the different categories of Planning, Landscape, Architecture, Conservation, and Engineering (PLACE).

### Design Forum, March 2016

The results of the PLACE assessments and the three Visioning Events were used to prepare the ground for a two-day Design Forum held on 9th and 10th March 2016. Over 100 people took part in the design forum when presentations from 13 different community groups were also made. This was a design-led exercise that examined how change can be accommodated, designed, and planned. A series of task groups worked over 48 hours to develop new ideas across the parish.

A final slideshow presented the results of the two-day Design forum. This comprised 260 slides capturing the main ideas and concepts. This was published on the neighbourhood plan website and was accompanied by a video of the final presentation.

### Continuous Consultation

The TNP website was set up early in 2016. Two videos on the site explained what was happening: Richard Eastham of Feria Urbanism made an 11-minute video explaining what a neighbourhood plan was; and four members of the steering group made a 7-minute video on why they were working on the plan.

The TNP steering group took part in the annual Village Assembly each April, beginning in 2016.

From the beginning of the neighbourhood plan process, the local parish magazine, News and Views, has been used to inform the parish of the progress being made on the plan. The September 2018 issue

contained the twenty-fifth neighbourhood plan news bulletin. An email list of over 500 is also regularly sent updates. The steering group meets approximately once a month and its minutes are also published on the website. There have also been regular meetings with Rother District Council to discuss the plan.

## Interim Report, July 2016

The publication of an Interim Report in July 2016 was a key milestone. This captured the consultation work to date, including the full results of the Visioning Event and the Two-Day Design Forum. The report also set out twenty emerging policy themes and how these could be used as a framework for the final neighbourhood plan.

## Draft Policy Headings, November 2016

The ideas generated in the first part of the year were used to inform a series of draft policy headings that were subject to public consultation in November 2016. More than 180 people attended a poster exhibition event on 3rd and 4th November 2016 and submitted 36 booklets of comments on a range of policy proposals.

## Business Survey, Autumn 2016

During the autumn of 2016, the Business Survey was undertaken, helping the TNP team to understand the requirements of the many businesses in the parish. The results of this survey were put on the website in early 2017.

## Call for Sites, late 2016

In the autumn of 2016, the TNP steering group ran a “call for sites” process. The purpose of this was to gauge the potential land supply for new development across the parish, with the results used to inform the emerging neighbourhood plan for the whole parish area. The TNP steering group asked land owners to nominate any land they would be willing to see developed.

A key consideration in this process is the suitability of sites for development within the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The call for sites period ran from 3rd November to 24th December 2016 and resulted in twelve sites being nominated for consideration.

Three more sites had already gained outline planning permission. A further two sites had tried and failed to gain planning permission, even on appeal. More sites are likely to be submitted in the future.

## Public Exhibition, December 2016

A further poster exhibition and a series of slideshow presentations were held on 1st and 2nd December 2016. The focal point of the December event was a set of visualisations showing changes to the streets and public spaces. Photomontage images were used to show a combination of measures aimed at reducing speeds, discouraging through-traffic, and increasing driver awareness of the built environment. The concepts also aimed to reduce highway signage and clutter, including painted lines, and to draw out the existing qualities of the parish, some of which is within a Conservation Area. Comments on these ideas were collected, many of them very supportive.

## Review of Sites being considered, 2017

In January 2017, a tent was set up in Ticehurst village square, to bring the consultations to a wider audience. The Village Assembly on 25th April 2017 was used to show all 17 sites being considered (12 from the Call for Sites, 3 with outline planning permission and 2 currently in the planning process). The 200 attendees were asked to comment on the sites, as well as on the green spaces and green gaps being proposed in the plan. Following this, the steering group took a stall at the Village Fete on 17th June 2017, using similar exhibits and reaching a different set of parishioners.

## Strategic Environmental Assessment, July 2017

Draft neighbourhood plans must be assessed to determine whether they will have significant environmental effects, and a screening opinion request was sent to RDC in April 2017. In July 2017, RDC advised that a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was required. This was undertaken by AECOM and is presented as a separate document with its findings integrated into the plan, thus allowing the plan to include any necessary mitigation measures. The seventeen sites mentioned above were considered in the initial SEA.

## Household Survey, September 2017

In September 2017, a short (one page) survey was distributed to all dwellings in the parish. This was designed to answer some very specific questions on affordable housing and employment which could not be answered by other available data. The results of this survey were put on the website in October 2017.



## Regulation 14 Consultation, January & February 2018

The draft plan was published for consultation (Regulation 14) on 2nd January 2018. All dwellings in the parish were posted a two-page leaflet giving information on the consultation, which ran from January 2nd to February 14th, 2018. Posters were used to advertise the consultation throughout the parish, with a final-reminder over sticker in the last week.

700 copies of the plan were printed and made freely available to parishioners: in Ticehurst Village Store, the Annex (used by the Parish Clerk), local pubs and the three parish churches. A response document was given out with the printed plan. The plan was also available on the TNP website, as was the response document which could be filled in online. To get the widest possible response, a team of “Street Champions” offered help in completing the survey by calling at homes and attending schools, churches and local events.

The plan was notified to 30 statutory consulting bodies, with emails sent to 68 individuals. Ten of these bodies responded.

On February 1st and 2nd Ferial Urbanism hosted a drop-in event and exhibition in Ticehurst Village Hall (advertised in the leaflet sent at the beginning of the consultation). During these two days, there were six presentations on the draft plan. These were always well-attended (over 120 people came in total) with lively discussion of the plan. A video of this presentation was put on the website the day afterwards

and circulated to the email list, enabling those who could not attend to see the presentation before the end of the consultation.

During the consultation, there were two pop-up events, in Ticehurst Village Square and in Springfields, to try to reach as many people as possible.

At the request of some Flimwell residents, two members of the steering group attended a meeting with them to hear their concerns.

## Pre-Submission Responses

As a result of the consultation, over 300 surveys were completed by parishioners (with about 6,000 written comments). In addition, the statutory consultees provided over 80 responses (particularly Rother District Council and East Sussex County Council). There were also 50 written or email responses. The number of comments was very high, but the overall satisfaction with the plan was also high, with over 96% giving general support to the plan. Details of the consultation comments and the responses from the TNP are given in the Consultation Report.


In April 2018, the TNP was again represented at the Ticehurst Village Assembly and responded to many questions and concerns on the draft plan.

## Evidence-based Review of draft TNP

An evidence-based review was commissioned via Locality from AECOM. This examined the draft plan to make sure its policies had evidence to back them up and were written so that they were clear and could therefore be implemented. For each policy, AECOM made recommendations on what needed to be changed to strengthen it.

## Revisions to the Plan Spring & Summer 2018

Following the consultation, the draft plan was revised, with 9 of the 19 policies largely rewritten, one policy on Biodiversity added and two of the employment policies amalgamated. The Call for Sites document was rewritten as the Site Assessment document. Several documents were added to the Evidence Base. The SEA was revised, taking into account the revisions to the draft plan and site assessments and focusing on the 11 sites put forward in the Call for Sites (one was omitted as being too small). The Consultation Statement and the Basic Conditions Statement were also written. Responses to all these community events and the Regulation 14 consultation on the draft plan have been used to revise the plan and formulate the submission version of the plan, now subject to a formal six-week consultation managed by Rother District Council.





## 02 Comments Received from Statutory Consultees

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
1	RDC written comments 1	Planning policies should be highlighted and distinguished from Community Actions. Number paragraphs.	Planning policies are highlighted, numbered and in a larger print face.	Bolder colour to be used.
2	RDC written comments 2 p.30 R1	Policy should not include process. Reference to D&A and LVIA's in text to demonstrate that policy is being complied with	Process is sometimes relevant to outlining the policy	R1 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
3	RDC written comments 3 p.32 R2	Only one green gap required to be defined (between Ticehurst and Flimwell) – rest covered by open countryside and development boundaries. Map needed.	Green gap policy is being defined and revised by the Steering Group. Public consultation has however exhibited a keen sense of separating the different community places.  Maps with a better definition will be included in the Regulation 16 document.	R2 has been modified. New map of the green gaps.
4	RDC written comments 4 p.34 R3	Maps need revision. Policy needs to reference maps. Review revised NPPF for each green space. Reasoning should be within policy. Define "very special circumstances"	Definition of special circumstances is defined as "such as essential utility services" which neither the Parish nor the planning authority would be able to influence. However, it is accepted that ambiguity should be avoided in case of misinterpretation.	R3 has been modified.
5	RDC written comments 5 p.37 R3	Add F4 to map	The Parish Council agree. F4 is land to the SW of the crossroads of the A21.	R3 map has been modified.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
6	RDC written comments 6 p.40 R4	How realistic is footpath between Flimwell and Ticehurst? What support from ESH?	The Parish Council agrees that this is possibly an unrealistic aspiration led by consultation pressure. A rural path between Steelands Farmhouse and Tinkers Lane might be more realistic.	RCA2 has been modified to reference rural path.
7	RDC written comments 7 p.41 R4	Add ref to Ticehurst website	<a href="http://www.ticehurstonline.org">www.ticehurstonline.org</a> to be added as suggested	RCA2 has been modified to add Ticehurst Parish website.
8	RDC written comments 8 p.46 E1	Duplicates in part E5. Should E1 and E5 be amalgamated?	The Parish Council agrees. E1 and E5 are to be amalgamated within the Regulation 16 document.	E1 and E5 being amalgamated. E1 now retail centres, E4 commercial sites.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
9	RDC written comments 9 p.47 E1	Expand range of services in text	<p>The Parish Council agrees. We will include, amongst others, a chemist, dry cleaners, interior decorators, greengrocers, collectable model shop, general grocery store, hairdressers, haberdashery shop, gift shop, fish shop, bakery, art gallery, florist shop, estate agents, 2 cafes, Indian restaurant, car showroom, in the centre of the village as well as other retail outlets on some of the farm industrial units.</p> <p>Flimwell retail core – Flimwell will shortly have a shop.</p> <p>Stonegate has a church, school, nursery, dramatic and choral clubs as well as a main line station.</p>	<p>E1 is being rewritten and will include the range of services in the retail centres.</p> <p>Map of Flimwell retail core to be deleted.</p>



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
10	RDC written comments 10 p.49 E2	Define concept of sustainable rural tourism re AONB and Ticehurst.	Sustainable rural tourism: the more visitors are attracted to the area, for holidays or for special occasions such as weddings, the more income is brought into the Parish, outweighing the additional costs of tourism. Host venues in the Parish strive to source produce and labour locally, to ensure that as much economic value as possible goes back into the community.	E2 has been modified.
11	RDC written comments 11 p.50 E3	Make E3 more specific in line with RA3 and RA4. Are both modern and traditional buildings included?	“The conversion of existing agricultural buildings” could mean both modern and traditional. Policy E3 should be used to supplement RDC Local Plan policies RA311 and RA4. Remove ambiguity of the use of “imaginative”.	E3 has been modified.
12	RDC written comments 12 p.51 E4	Use “employment” rather than “business employment”. Look at wording on minor lanes. What does “significant loss of amenity” mean? Wording should be “Rother Local Plan Core Strategy”, not “Core Plan”.	Would prefer to substitute “commercial” for “business”. “Significant loss of amenity” might mean increased traffic, noise, smell etc.	E4 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
13	RDC written comments 13 p.52 E5	Amalgamate with E1?	The Parish Council agrees. E1 and E5 are to be amalgamated within the Regulation 16 document.	E1 and E5 being amalgamated. E1 now retail centres, E4 commercial sites.
14	RDC written comments 14 p.53 E5	Wording should be "Rother Local Plan Core Strategy", not "Core Plan".	The Parish Council agrees.	Modified wording in new E1 as suggested.
15	RDC written comments 15 p.58 H1	Reword No. 3 to be clearer. Reference maps by name. Reword part 4 re priority on 10 or fewer. Stronger wording on using Design Guide.	The Parish Council agrees. We will change the wording to remove 'essential' or 'exceptional circumstances' in order to avoid ambiguity.	H1 has been modified. Maps now numbered and referenced in text.
16	RDC written comments 16 p.59 H1	Conflict possible on max 30 houses/ha. Affordable housing missed.	Since the publication of the draft plan, it appears that Banky Field will provide 100% affordable housing – remove 30 dwellings per hectare and leave 'density appropriate to location' that will match policy H1 (5).	H1 has been modified.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
17	RDC written comments 17 p. 60 H1	Reword first para. Refer to flood maps	The Parish Council agrees to delete “in exceptional circumstances” and replace with “within development boundaries”.  Flood information to be referenced.	H1 has been modified.
18	RDC written comments 18 p.64 H2	RDC objects strongly to the allocation of Singehurst.	Singehurst is still being considered and has received favourable local opinion. It is understood that RDC and the potential developer have had talks about meeting the objections raised by the planning inspector. NP group remain in favour of its inclusion – latest draft plans take into account all points raised by the inspector.	H1 has been modified.
19	RDC written comments 19 p.65 H2	Amend text to reference Rother Local Plan Core Strategy housing allocations. Example attached.	The Parish Council agrees to provide a tabulated – TNP Housing Figures – page 65	H2 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
20	RDC written comments 20 p.66 H2	Reference sites 5 and 13 as dismissed at appeal.	The status of the planning applications and any appeals for each site is covered in the Site Assessment document.	H2 has been modified. Also, Site Assessment document has been produced (to replace Call for Sites document).
21	RDC written comments 21 p.66 H2	Dale Hill Farm – revise wording "contravenes Policy R2" (not R3).	The Parish Council agrees to change the policy reference to R2.	H2 has been modified.
22	RDC written comments 22 p.67 SEA summary table	Singehurst comments are wrong. Minor amendment "site" to "sites".	We have discussed this with RDC and are still going to include Singehurst as an allocated site. However, we will take note of their comments in our text.	H2 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
23	RDC written comments 23 p.72 H <sub>3</sub>	Imprecise wording on mix of housing does not add to RDC Core Strategy. Can put in proportions for Ticehurst Parish. Will smaller houses be "market" or "affordable" or both?	Public consultation has provided evidence of a need for single storey properties, one and two bedroomed properties and suggest a proportion of 40% are in this category. This may require policy changes.	H <sub>3</sub> has been modified and takes account of the Rother Strategic Housing Research Project, published since Reg 14.
24	RDC written comments 24 p.73 H <sub>3</sub>	Does "current housing stock is in good shape" refer to mix or variety?	The Parish Council agrees – "current housing stock is in good shape" will be omitted.	H <sub>3</sub> has been modified.
25	RDC written comments 25 p.74	Refer to LHN <sub>2</sub> and DaSA. There is a national requirement to house homeless people.	We will make reference to these policies. But Parishioners have expressed strong opinions that new housing should be allocated to locals, with the older housing stock for the wider need.	H <sub>4</sub> has been modified.
26	RDC written comments 26 p.76 H <sub>5</sub>	Refer to Design Guidance in part 1. Combine parts 1 and 2 using suggested text?	Adopt the paragraph suggested by RDC	H <sub>5</sub> has been modified.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
27	RDC written comments 27 p.77 H5	Design & Access statements are governed by statute, so cannot be enforced.	The Parish Council agrees. We will add the alternative of a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA).	H5 has been modified.
28	RDC written comments 28 p.77 H5	Pavements – are they suburban? When and where?	The Parish Council agrees. Alter last paragraph – remove “pavements” and suggest “suitable for pedestrians”	H5 has been modified.
29	RDC written comments 29 p.78 H6	Reword part 2 of policy (see suggested text).	The Parish Council agrees to adopt the suggested text.	H6 has been modified.
30	RDC written comments 30 p.78 H6	Supporting text would benefit from reordering and adding more facts.	The Parish Council agrees to adopt RDC suggestions.	H6 has been modified.
31	RDC written comments 31 p.81 Design Guidance	Change D&A to LVIA?	The Parish Council agrees.	Design Guidance has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
32	RDC written comments 32 p.82 Design Guidance	Conservation Area – Paragraph 2 cannot legally be required – reword.	The Parish Council would prefer detailed planning applications. We would want to remain a consultee when outline permissions were granted. When subsequent detailed permissions are applied, they should not be dealt with under reserved matters but should be referred to the Planning Committee.	Design Guidance has been modified.
33	RDC written comments 33 p.83 Design Guidance	Reword re roofscapes.	The Parish Council agrees.	Design Guidance has been modified.
34	RDC written comments 34 p.87 Design Guidance	1st paragraph is confusing – reword.	The Parish Council agrees. The first two sentences will be omitted.	Design Guidance has been modified.
35	RDC written comments 35 p.90 Design Guidance	Add “clay” to last line (“clay tiles”).	The Parish Council agrees.	Design Guidance has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
36	RDC written comments 36 p.94 Design Guidance	Working log burners have been rejected in previous NPs.	The Parish Council will research other neighbourhood plans to see if “made” plans have included this and gone through referendum.	Design Guidance has been modified.
37	RDC written comments 37 p.103 INF2	Need to reword so as not to encourage solar farms and wind turbines. What is “land of highest quality” – is there a map? Re-word policy to tighten definitions	Agricultural land is graded into categories. 1 being the highest. Land in the High Weald is almost all category 3. The Parish Council agrees that this land should be protected generally not just from energy projects.	We believe there is no land of highest quality in Ticehurst Parish (or the High Weald).  INF2 has been modified.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
38	RDC written comments 38 p.104 INF <sub>3</sub>	Reword policy to tighten and clarify.	<p>Policy INF 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Less than 10 homes = informal open spaces to be provided.</li> </ul> <p>Policy INF 2) and 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>LEAP re maintenance of play.</li> </ul> <p>Ticehurst Parish Council or Residents Association would need to be responsible for maintenance. If the Parish Council is responsible, the areas are available for all local children.</p>	INF <sub>2</sub> has been modified.
39	ESCC written comments 1.3 and 2.1 R <sub>4</sub>	Plans for a footpath to link Flimwell and Ticehurst will require significant third-party funding (not ESCC). Further investigation is needed to see if this footpath is feasible.	The Parish Council has been informed by East Sussex Highways that a path would not be realistic – the more likely route is over the top of the water holding point between Tinkers Lane and Banky Field. This could be with the goodwill of the owner of the land and using 106 monies for the area.	R <sub>4</sub> and RCA <sub>2</sub> are being modified to cover this.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
40	ESCC written comments 1.4 R4	Suggest prioritising infrastructure where it supports key services (e.g. education, shopping).	The Parish Council planning committee always seeks ways of increasing pedestrian connectivity within the village when larger scale plans come forward to link services with dwellings.	No change.
41	ESCC written comments 1.5 R4	ESCC Cycling & Walking Strategy will be published later in 2018.	With most of the bank of Bewl Reservoir in the Parish, the Parish Council is keen to see increased expenditure on safe cycle and pedestrian links. Would Bewl owners (Marker Study) be interested in sponsorship?	ESCC strategy may be too late for Reg 18.
42	ESCC written comments 1.7 Rural community actions	Specify Ticehurst website address for footpath maps.	<a href="http://www.ticehurstonline.org">www.ticehurstonline.org</a>	RCA2 modified to add Ticehurst Parish website.
43	ESCC written comments 1.8 Rural community actions	Specify how to "actively discourage" parking on the pavement by vehicles.	The use of attractive bollards to prevent pavement intrusion in the square has been discussed. A policy of installing oak bollards was implemented by the Parish Council to prevent parking on green verges that assisted in reducing the problem. This could be introduced in pavements especially at junction splays.	No change.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
44	ESCC written comments 1.9 Rural community actions	ESCC support fingerposts being maintained jointly by Parish and ESCC.	The Parish Council has received match funding from ESCC in the past to assist in maintaining the posts – currently we apply for two posts a year for match funding for refurbishment.	No change.
45	ESCC written comments 1.10 H2	Allocated sites should have good access to sustainable transport – does Site 05?	Safe pedestrian access can be delivered to site 5 – there is a pavement to the northern side of the road and an established footpath through to Meadowside Lower Platts.	No change.
46	ESCC written comments 1.11 E6	RDC needs to assess parking areas on a case-by-case basis.	There is government guidance on car parking spaces per dwelling.  There are plans to extend the Pickforde Lane car park again. Recreation Ground car park is under used and needs better signage.	No change.
47	ESCC written comments 1.12 E6	East Sussex Highways is responsible for the condition of roads (reported to them).	Highways issues should be directed to ESCC	No change.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
48	ESCC written comments 1.13 INF1	Feasibility work being undertaken on Public Realm work.	It is still hoped that Ticehurst will be the rural pilot scheme for RDC to invest in. The Parish Council has invested over £140,000.00 to date on measures that make the village centre more flexible and fluid.	No change.
49	ESCC written comments 1.14, 1.15 and 1.16 INF1	ESCC supports the NP approach to designing a pedestrian-friendly environment for the centre of Ticehurst. Funding by third-parties may be necessary.	The Parish Council agrees and will try to locate funding.	No change.
50	ESCC written comments 1.17 and 1.18 INF1	Any scheme for Flimwell crossroads needs to be properly drawn up.	The green space at the junction is to be protected as the gateway to the new community area, with hall and shop which will be visible from the road and hopefully attract custom.	INF1 has been modified.
51	ESCC written comments 1.19 INF1	Electric charging points should be included for new developments and for the village centre.	The Parish Council agrees – this has been discussed with the local car show room.	INF2 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
52	ESCC written comments 2.2, 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5 E4	Any new vehicular access for business employment sites should meet ESCC standards.	<p>2.2 agreed</p> <p>2.3 agreed</p> <p>2.4 agreed (such as Browsers Barn site)</p> <p>2.5 agreed but could it be made conditional that the agreed traffic volumes should not increase (i.e. in size and number of vehicles accessing the sites)</p>	E4 has been modified.
53	ESCC written comments 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 H2	Any new residential development should meet ESCC standards for vehicular access and parking.	This is covered by Rother District CS Policies TR3 (Access and New Development) and TR4 (Car Parking).	No change.
54	ESCC written comments 2.9 H2	Orchard Farm access would require access junction improvement.	There is an option in place for accessing the site from the lane going into Lower St Mary's. Also, there is the chance of the cottage on the point being purchased by a would-be developer.	No change. This is covered in the Site Assessment document.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
55	ESCC written comments 2.10 H2	Singehurst ESCC require extension of 30mph and of footpaths.	The previous speed restrictions included this area in the 30 mph zone – local pressure brought to bear resulted in the change to 40 mph. The inclusion of Upper Platts in the 30 mph once more would be welcomed.	No change. This is covered in the Site Assessment document.
56	ESCC written comments 2.11 H2	Wardsdown House access needs consideration but should be possible.	DHA Planning suggest that this will meet standard requirements.	No change. This is covered in the Site Assessment document.
57	ESCC written comments 3.1 AONB	ESCC supports protection and enhancement of the AONB.	The Parish Council agrees.	No change.
58	ESCC written comments 3.2, 3.3 and 3.4 R1, R2 and R3	These policies are all supported by ESCC.	The Parish Council welcomes this support.	No change.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
59	ESCC written comments 3.5 R4	ESCC support policy R4 but need more specific references to how to access open spaces (maps etc).	This has already been pointed out by RDC. The footpath maps on the East Sussex website ( <a href="https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtours/countryside/rightsofway/map/map.aspx">https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtours/countryside/rightsofway/map/map.aspx</a> ) are extremely difficult to print for a small area.	Footpath maps have been requested from ESCC but not yet obtained.
60	ESCC written comments 3.6 H1, H2 and H5	These policies are all supported by ESCC. Could refer to High Weald AONB Design Guide which is due to be published in Summer 2018. Also refer to East Sussex County landscape assessment.	It is understood that this High Weald AONB publication has been postponed until Autumn 2018 but can be included at that stage. We will add a sentence to acknowledge this.	Design Guidance is being modified.
61	ESCC written comments 3.7 E6 and INF1	ESCC supports the proposed public realm scheme for Ticehurst.	The Parish Council welcomes this support. We can include it in the supporting text for INF1	INF1 has been modified.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
62	ESCC written comments 3.8 SEA and Design Guidance	SEA should include potential impacts on the character of the assessed sites. Design Guidance should ensure landscape character is addressed at the planning stage.	The SEA is being rewritten.	Design Guidance has been modified.  SEA has been revised.
63	ESCC written comments 4.1 Ecology	NP is weak on biodiversity and natural capital – no objectives, no policies.	Sussex Biodiversity Report for the Parish has subsequently been obtained and is in the Evidence Base.	New policy R5 Support Biodiversity has been added to the plan.
64	ESCC written comments 4.2 Ecology	Recommend request to Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre for report.	The Parish Council has obtained a biodiversity report on the Parish.	No change.
65	ESCC written comments 4.3 Ecology	Green infrastructure alignment to Rother DC, ESCC and Natural England is not apparent. ESCC and Natural England GI reports are not in evidence base.	The Parish Council agrees that more evidence is required.	We will add these reports to the evidence base.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
66	ESCC written comments 4.4 Ecology	Green spaces designated are focused to recreation and amenity, none specifically for biodiversity.	The Sussex biodiversity report should enhance this – also Luke Wallace’s report on Meadowside field between Upper and Lower Platts.	R3 has been modified.
67	ESCC written comments 4.5 Rural Community Action	ESCC maintains a schedule of Designated Wildlife Verges, no need to do locally.	The Parish Council agrees.	RCA1 has been modified.
68	ESCC written comments 4.6–4.8 H2	All proposed developments should have Ecological Impact Assessment and minimum 15m buffer to ancient woodland.	DHA have recognised this with the Wardsdown site.	R5 Support Biodiversity policy has been added.
69	ESCC written comments 4.9 H5	Developments should show how they will enhance biodiversity. Their Design and Access statement should demonstrate a net gain in natural capital.	The Parish Council agrees.	R5 Support Biodiversity policy has been added.
70	ESCC written comments 4.10–4.11 SEA	No reference to Local Wildlife Sites or Species and Habitats of Principle Importance (Sec 41 of NERC Act).	The Sussex biodiversity plan has enabled the Parish Council to deal with these comments. There are no SSSIs in the Parish and very little other than Bewl as special for wildlife.	SEA has been revised.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
71	ESCC written comments 4.12 SEA	SEA only considers two sites for housing in Ticehurst whereas H2 refers to 3 sites (NB one is in Flimwell).	The Parish Council agrees that the SEA needs revision.	SEA has been revised.
72	ESCC written comments 5.1 and 5.2 H6 and SEA	Neither Policy H6 nor the SEA recognise archaeological remains. HER does not seem to have been consulted. No recognition of archaeological potential.	HER has been consulted. There is very little of archaeological interest in the Parish, as far as has been found so far, largely Roman iron-working around Bardown.	H6 has been modified.
73	ESCC written comments SEA	Sites 5, 8, 11 and 14 have not been investigated archeologically and therefore the statement that there are no heritage assets within or adjacent to these sites is incorrect. Site 13 archaeological remains have been found. Site 15 has been investigated and is of low archaeological interest.	The Parish Council accept this, and the amended SEA should address these points.	SEA has been revised.
74	ESCC written comments 6.1–6.6 SEA	Concerned with general statements that accompany the SEA assessments of housing sites. Issues may arise because of development therefore assessment is premature.	The Parish Council agrees that methods of drainage, water collection may well be needed at Banky Field. Thakeham Homes may have more information. The Village Study done in 2010/11 did have some information on this.	SEA has been revised.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
75	ESCC written comments 6.7–6.8	The area comprises impermeable geologies which will affect drainage design, so ground investigations are needed before developing a drainage strategy. Drainage design can be informed by the East Sussex SuDS tool.	The Parish Council agrees that drainage is important due to the geology of the area.	H5 has been modified to add a requirement for a drainage strategy.
76	National Grid	No comments.		No change.



Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
77	Southern Water	<p>We propose the following additional text to Policy R2 (new text underlined)</p> <p><i>1) Land between Rosemary Lane and Berners Hill junction, Flimwell, and Steellands Rise and Lower Platts junction, Ticehurst, shall be kept free of further development <u>unless it is essential to meet specific necessary utility infrastructure needs and no alternative feasible site is available.</u></i></p> <p><i>2) Development along Wardsbrook Road, Ticehurst, towards Cottenden Road, Stonegate will be resisted, as will development beyond the Vineyard Lane and High Street junction, Ticehurst, towards Wallcrouch, <u>unless it is essential to meet specific necessary utility infrastructure needs and no alternative feasible site is available.</u></i></p>	The Parish Council accepts these amendments.	R2 has been modified.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
78	Historic England	<p>The SEA (Environmental Report) should also ensure that all policies and proposals within the plan that have not been subject to formal assessment under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 as part of a higher-level plan (e.g. the District Local Plan) are adequately assessed for their impacts on the heritage at this stage.</p> <p>No specific comments on the Plan.</p>	To be covered in specification required of the revised SEA to ensure that these points are covered.	SEA has been revised.
79	Rother DC Estates Team	Objection to Green Space T5 on Farthing Hill – preferred extending development boundary to cover this site in order to give the option of development of a few houses.	The Parish Council would have concerns due to the water run-off and springs at the bottom. At one time the Parish Council was offered a long-term lease on the land by RDC but, despite it being willing, this was not followed up. This space is an important natural recreation area for Springfields and Farthing Hill.	No change.
80	Wealden DC	Plan should have a Habitats Regulations screening, otherwise it does not meet European Regulations.	Rother DC will provide this report.	Draft of this has been provided by RDC.

Ref	Org. / Method	Summary of issues concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
81	High Weald AONB	<p>Object to inclusion of Singehurst, even if reduced to 10 houses. Should have been considered in SEA.</p> <p>High Weald AONB is preparing Design Guidance, primarily on-site layout, but will not be ready until autumn.</p>	<p>The site has received favourable reaction locally and would mean that Upper Platts area would be drawn back into the 30-mph limit. Design for the site has considered all of the inspector's objections – views to the south from listed buildings, design is low-lying, looking like converted farm buildings and a good buffer of land to the north to lessen the impact on the entrance to the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council considers it suitable for development of a limited number of dwellings.</p>	No change.
82	ESCC Property Services	School playing fields are covered by other legislation and ESCC objects to the inclusion of Green Spaces T6 (Ticehurst CEP playing field) and S2 (Stonegate CEP playing field).	Locality interpret this differently. The Parish Council would prefer to leave them in.	No change.
83	Natural England	Object to policy H2(2) Singehurst allocation due to lack of information/assessment in the SEA of the impact of the policy on AONB protection.	The site assessment document has been rewritten and the SEA is being revised.	SEA has been revised.

## 03 Survey Responses to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan

### Q31 General Support for the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan

- Yes 96.21%
- No 3.79%

### Q1 Do You Agree with the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan Objectives?

- Yes 94.90%
- No 2.04%
- Don't know 3.06%

## Q2 What Do You Like Best About the Neighbourhood Plan?

Answered 294 | Skipped 20

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Ticehurst to have more control about the siting and size of future housing development.</p>	<p>The over-riding principle when embarking on the neighbourhood plan process was to deliver as much control as possible to the local community about where development might take place and how big those settlements might be. The neighbourhood plan (NP), however, must be compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the Rother District Council Local Plan. Once the plan has gone successfully through referendum, the Ticehurst NP will become a statutory document, and the policies contained therein should be taken into account by the planning authority and any appeal process. The Parish Council remain open to enabling permissions that would reduce the affordable housing percentage if the resultant benefit to the community is felt to be preferable. (e.g. provision of a hall and shop at Corner Farm, Flimwell).</p>	<p>No change.</p>



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The ambition to press for more affordable housing.	During the neighbourhood plan process, Banky Field has been purchased by Optivo and they currently plan to build 20 affordable houses for rent and 20 shared equity homes. This is a larger number than the village expected but it is understood that this provision will not reduce the requirement for any other development to deliver 40% affordable housing if there are to be 10 houses or more.	H4 has been modified to take account of new figures for Banky Field.
Design guidance for inclusion in future development especially sustainable development.	The Parish Council supports the individual site-specific designs drawn up by members of the Council and the NP Steering Committee. This refers to local historic architecture, the use of good quality tiles for roofing and tile cladding, the provision of chimneys for open fires, low lighting within developments, and Windsor lamp lighting for street lighting to match the Parish Council recent investments.	Site-specific design guidance has been added to H5.
The aim to conserve and protect the historic character of the village.	The Parish Council have a plan for the centre of Ticehurst village, which will enhance the historical features, whilst also making it a safer place to enjoy. The planning committee are vigorous in their planning deliberations to support good design (which can sometimes be modern if it complements its surroundings) to ensure that the three villages of the Ticehurst Parish do not lose their defining characteristics.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Concern to conserve and protect AONB. Respect for our environment.	Ticehurst Parish Council is conscious of the importance of the AONB and will continue to protect that special heritage for the area.	No change.
Protect Green Gaps.	The Parish Council have identified specific green gaps between the hamlets and the villages to ensure that they remain identifiable places in their own right. This has been reflected in the NP and recognised at planning appeal level, for example the Rosemary Lane/Berners Hill appeal.	R2 and its accompanying map have been modified.
Encouraging connectivity between villages. Cycle and footpaths, especially Flimwell to Ticehurst, are important.	The Parish Council has pressurised East Sussex County Council (ESCC) for years about providing a safe pedestrian route linking Ticehurst and Flimwell; however, the Parish has no legislative powers on the highway. With the development of Banky Field and the s106 agreement attached, there might be a possibility of creating a cross-country path from Tinkers Lane to the school if the owners of the land remain agreeable.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Impact of traffic and speed of traffic through the village need more control.	The plan for the Ticehurst village centre is synchronised with a plan to slow the traffic, making the village centre a place for pedestrians that traffic can slowly pass through. The Parish Council supports this whilst acknowledging that this is a working village and that the main road is integral to the economic vitality of the Parish.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Improving the heart of the villages.</p>	<p><u>Stonegate:</u> The playground equipment has been replaced with new wooden equipment. Stonegate pond area has been cleared and is being managed by coppicing woodland, hedge-laying and installing an all-weather path. The Parish Council provides some financial support to the village hall each year.</p> <p><u>Flimwell:</u> The playground now has new equipment. The provision of a hall has long been negotiated with Rother DC and the addition of a room that can be used as a shop is now included. The development of Flimwell Park, coupled with the other improvements, should provide a heart for the community.</p> <p><u>Ticehurst:</u> The final piece of playground equipment has now been replaced at the recreation ground. The Beatrice Drewe Trust runs a busy hall offering many activities to the community. The plan for the centre of the village is moving forward. The well and pumphouse have been repaired and restored, with new tree plantings to replace the trees that have had to be removed.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Time limited car parking and no parking on pavements.	The Parish Council has asked ESCC to implement hourly parking limits within the village square; however, until Rother DC adopt civil parking enforcement, this will not happen. The Parish Council has nearly doubled the car parking capacity to the rear of the Bell Hotel and has plans when the finances are in place to create further parking areas on the headland of the Bell Field.	No change.



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Developing local leisure facilities.	<p>The Parish Council has a history of supporting leisure facilities for all residents. Over the last ten years, extended litigation resulted in the multi-court being kept open for residents and the skate park re-instated. Outdoor gym equipment has been installed for all age groups. A new play park was installed at Farthing Hill for the youngest children in the Parish. The Queen's 90th birthday was celebrated in style in the village square which many people enjoyed.</p> <p>The Parish Council has recently made a financial pledge to assist with the renovation of the bird-watching hide at Bewl. The Parish Council purchased the changing rooms for the local football club; this enabled the club to set up a second team on the recreation ground and allowed the Wadhurst juniors to use the facilities to promote local football for the younger players. The Parish Council makes a substantial financial contribution to the Beatrice Drewe Trust so that local organisations can run events, such as lunches for the elderly.</p>	No change.
Promoting tourism.	The Parish Council normally supports applications for tourist accommodation unless it is considered that there might be a negative impact on the AONB.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Encouraging local business and a vibrant local economy.</p>	<p>The Parish Council supports providing additional parking, so that people stop and use the local shops – limited parking hours would assist with this. The provision of a pedestrian crossing to assist safe pedestrian passage to the village centre is part of the plan. Instead of A boards which require planning consent, a more attractive signage system is being worked on to show visitors how many varied businesses there are in the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council is aware that any improvements must take into account the size of lorries and agricultural machines that need to use the road infrastructure.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Summary</p> <p>Overall the Draft Plan was met with majority approval and support (over 96%). “A thoughtful and thorough plan”, “this is well presented, well written and informative” and “a balanced approach”.</p> <p>Small developments of affordable housing with local design guidance were considered vital for the future wellbeing of the residents and the protection of the Parish’s unique rural character within the AONB.</p> <p>There was considerable concern over the speed of traffic through the Parish, and the consequent need to keep pedestrians safe. Pedestrians need to be able to move safely, not only within the villages, but between Flimwell and Ticehurst. There was strong support for a pedestrian crossing in Ticehurst High Street.</p> <p>The community was very supportive about improvements to the village centre.</p>		<p>The following policies have been modified:</p> <p>R2 – Green Gaps</p> <p>H2 – Site Allocations</p> <p>H4 – Affordable Housing</p>

## Q3 What Could Be Improved?

Answered 202 | Skipped 112

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
No mention of how the plan is to be implemented and monitored.	<p>The views of the public have been used to draw up a ‘wish list’ that the Parish Council can plan its policies around for the next decade. It should be noted that the budgetary implications of this wish list are considerable, and the list will need to be prioritised.</p> <p>Some “wishes” that have been expressed are beyond the powers of the Parish Council, but pressure can be put on the District and County Councillors to push for the provision of these services – for example the pedestrian crossing on the High Street in Ticehurst village centre.</p>	No change.
The quality of the maps in the draft plan needs improving.	This has been acknowledged and the maps will be replaced with those subsequently provided by Rother District Council.	Maps replaced.
More plans to increase pedestrian safety are required especially in Ticehurst centre.	The Parish Council is working with ESCC to provide a safe crossing within the first stage of the village centre plans.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Increase short term parking, reduce permanent parking, reduce VW garage parking in the Square and Bell Car Park.</p>	<p>ESCC has been asked to implement a limited parking scheme within the centre of the village. The Parish Council has asked shop owners and their staff to park in the car park behind The Bell, rather than outside the shops as it limits spaces for shoppers.</p> <p>The VW garage tries to keep the number of spaces it uses to the minimum, but its contribution to the economic vibrancy of the village is also important. Limited parking, once achieved, will assist the shops. The Parish Council took over the lease on the Bell Car Park to maintain a free parking area and it would be reluctant to move from this position.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>More mention is needed of measures to reduce traffic volume, traffic speeds, challenge large lorries using rural roads.</p>	<p>The Parish Council cannot control the amount of traffic that uses the High Street. Steps are being taken to work with East Sussex Highways to designate certain lanes as quiet roads, installing “unsuitable for large vehicles” at the access points – e.g. Lynden Lane and Church Street.</p>	<p>“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1.</p>
<p>Measures are needed to prevent dangerous parking at road junctions.</p>	<p>The plan for the village centre includes slight humps that provide informal crossing points, making parking difficult. Strategically-placed attractive bollards will prevent junction and pavement parking in places.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Need to challenge the poor state of our roads, potholes are a danger to cyclists and cars.	The High Street is in the ESCC programme to be resurfaced in Spring 2019. The road is surveyed monthly by the ESCC Highway Stewards. Pressure is being applied by our County Councillor, John Barnes, to move this programming forward.	No change.
Improve overstretched surgery facilities to meet additional demands as Parish grows.	The Parish Council has no authority over the NHS provisions and the GP practice has said that the service is coping with increased numbers.	No change.
Vision for Flimwell does not address geographical imbalance, fails to give enough focus to east side of Flimwell.	The eastern side of Flimwell is seeing development of the old Bird Park. This will provide small workshops for local businesses, a teaching school attracting architectural students from the Bartlett school in London, a café and in time a cookery school and retail outlets for local crafts people.	Information about Flimwell Park has been added to E4.
Villages should always be mentioned in alphabetical order: Flimwell before Stonegate in plan.	The Parish Council does not support this statement, as it could indicate an unwarranted preference.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>The importance of transport links should be emphasised, for example Wadhurst Station to Flimwell for commuters.</p> <p>Protect train and bus services.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has always robustly contributed to any consultation about potential alterations to the public transport system, especially the bus service that meets the in-coming trains.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Stonegate needs small developments to prevent decline.</p>	<p>Stonegate residents have strongly indicated that they do not want to see any more development of the village and Rother have classified it as unsuitable as there is no infrastructure to support it.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Development at Stonegate Station could be positive for Stonegate.</p>	<p>An application for car parking and housing at Stonegate has been suggested to the Parish Council. As this came in long after the NP 'Call for Sites' period, advice has been provided to the agent that they should put forward their case to Rother as an enabling permission.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Plan needs to look to future requirements, more energy efficiency, less reliance on motor cars, electric charging points for the village square.</p>	<p>Ticehurst village centre improvements may include an electric charging point. The specific design details for developments should include energy-saving strategies.</p>	<p>INF2 has been modified.</p>



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The sewage system is substandard. When it rains heavily, the street drains have overflowed.	The Parish Council has on several occasions questioned the efficiency of the system but has always been assured by Southern Water that there is no problem. The Council has no authority over the utility companies.	No change
Assessment of development sites is inconsistent and needs reviewing.	The assessment has been re-evaluated and some limited changes made.	H2 has been modified.
<p>Summary</p> <p>Whilst responsibility for all items does not rest with the Parish Council, there are several valid and helpful points for the Parish Council and neighbourhood plan Steering Group to address from the 202 responses received.</p>		<p>The following policies have been modified:</p> <p>E4 – Business Sites</p> <p>H2 – Site Allocation</p> <p>INF2 – Energy Projects</p> <p>Maps have been replaced.</p>

## Q4 Rural Policy R1 – Conserve & Enhance the Landscape & Scenic Beauty of the AONB

Yes 97.07% | No 1.30% | Don't know 1.63%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
We need a protection plan for of our part of the AONB. Once the countryside is spoiled, there is no going back.	The Parish Council takes its responsibilities to protect the environment and the AONB and fully agrees with this statement.	No change.
Would it be possible to arrange for developers to engage with the Parish Council for informal discussions at the pre-planning stage?	The Parish Council has engaged with developers when requested to do so (for example, Optivo, the owners of Banky Field) and provided guidance about what might be acceptable locally. However, many developers and land owners have not agreed to engage in this process.	H5 has been modified to suggest an approach to engaging with developers.
How will developers demonstrate that developments will not have an adverse impact on the environment?	Developers have to provide impact statements with their applications. The Parish Council does not always agree with the professional reports they provide, as these often do not show first-hand knowledge of the area.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Can we encourage green and sustainable development with low carbon impact?	The neighbourhood plan actively encourages this (for example, Sustainability and Resource Efficiency within the Design Guide).	No change.
Could it be mandatory for all applications to be accompanied with a design & access statement?	Design and Access statements are required for larger developments. Landscape & Visual Impact Assessments (LVIAs) and Biodiversity Reports will be expected for all new developments.	R1 has been modified.
Concern with site selection at Wardsdown & Flimwell development.	Wardsdown was identified by Rother DC as a limited site. This would circumvent any growth into a wider area.	No change.
More footpaths and bridleways are needed so people can enjoy the outdoors.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and has reported any obstruction by owners or fallen trees to the relevant authority – ESCC – who maintains the historic footpaths.	No change.
Can we stop the verges being cut in Spring and protect our wild flowers?	ESCC have reduced the verge cuts to twice a year, but Rother have resolved to maintain the current six cuts for 2018. Thereafter, the Parish Council will have to determine if they will pay for the additional cuts. Certain areas (for example, Hillbury Bank) are not cut until the wild flowers have seeded. Parishioners can notify East Sussex Highways of wildflower-rich verges to protect them from early cutting.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Farmland must be protected in order to feed the growing population.	The Parish Council has no authority over the use of farmland.	No change.
The village should have a plan of action to reduce unsightly litter.	The Parish Council have a considerable budget for litter picking. However, the use of Parish bins for household waste has increased and challenges to that use are currently underway. As this might lead to litigation, it would be wrong to comment more on this subject here.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>The High Weald AONB is highly valued by our respondents and there is considerable support for protecting our rural environment and the special character of the area, especially the biodiversity among our verges and hedgerows.</p> <p>The Parish Council needs a plan to maintain and improve our environment; to support plant biodiversity and habitats in the local hedgerows and verges; and to ensure any development reflects the character of the area and does not have an adverse impact on our environment.</p>		R1 – has been modified to add requirements for LVIA and biodiversity report on all developments.

## Q5 Rural Policy R2 – Maintain Green Gaps Between Settlements

Yes 92.86% | No 3.25% | Don't know 3.90%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The farming community needs to be protected.	The Parish Council has no authority over the farming community.	No change.
Green gaps may be the most suitable location for development.	The Parish Council does not agree with this statement. The identity of individual hamlets should be maintained.  There is over 92% support for this policy.	No change.
Extend area for green gaps to include Shovers Green to Wallcrouch. Cottenden to Stonegate, Pashley Manor Road to protect the area from ribbon development and the blurring of boundaries.	The Parish Council agrees with the principle of this statement and would resist development in between settlements. The definition of the green gaps in the plan is being reviewed.	R2 and accompanying map have been modified.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Pavements to link villages should be extended alongside green gaps e.g. Flimwell to Ticehurst.	The Parish Council agrees that attempts to provide pedestrian paths between settlements are desirable. Historically when the roads were first conceived, there was no need as Flimwell, Stonegate and Ticehurst were independent identities and were self-sufficient. ESCC oppose footpaths on the B2087 as they see them as impractical.	No change.
Village signs should be installed at all entrances to villages to define the boundaries.	The Parish Council agrees with this suggestion and will be taking it up with ESCC.	No change.
Stonegate needs some development for young people to be able to stay in the village. It has good links via railway station to elsewhere.	There are two small industrial estates in Stonegate that provide local employment, in addition to many opportunities within the Parish in general. The railway links offer the chance for young people to work in the Tunbridge Wells or Hastings areas. Rother District Council have made no allocation for houses in Stonegate.	No change.
How big is a green gap? Definition please.	There is no definition; a significant green gap is an area that can be defined in the neighbourhood plan as a gap between settlements.	No change.



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 92% of respondents to this policy support the maintenance of green gaps between settlements to prevent ribbon development, protect the distinctive characters of the Parish settlements and help to maintain wildlife corridors. However, they did ask that this did not preclude good, safe pedestrian and cycle access between villages.</p>		<p>R2 has been modified to clarify green gaps with a new accompanying map.</p>

## Q6 Rural Policy R3 – Protect & Enhance Green Spaces

Yes 94.74% | No 2.63% | Don't know 2.63%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
There was general misconception of what a green space is. Greater clarity on the definition of a green space is required.	The definition of a green space will be revised in the neighbourhood plan.	Modify R3 with clearer definition and better justification for green spaces included
There were objections by landowners to privately-owned land being included or that the designated area is not accurate. Fears were expressed that this land would become accessible to the community as a right.	The Parish Council acknowledge the concerns of owners, and three areas are being removed from the neighbourhood plan. However, it should be clear that designation of a green space does not mean that it becomes accessible to the community.	R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.
There was strong support from the respondents for protected green spaces for leisure and recreation and that this designation would protect them from inappropriate development.	The inclusion of land designated as sports fields within school premises was queried by ESCC. This is being followed up due to contradictory advice from different planning bodies.	R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>The Parish Council and the Parochial Church Council could do more to preserve plant and wildlife habitats on these sites.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has received a Biodiversity Report from the Sussex Biodiversity Record Centre.</p> <p>The Parish Council has commissioned environmental studies on land that has been considered as important during the consultation period to ascertain the biodiversity value. The AONB unit also provides important data.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified with biodiversity information on green spaces and other areas.</p> <p>A new policy R5 Support Biodiversity has been added.</p>
<p>The following suggestions were made to add or extend green spaces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why were Stonegate and Flimwell Churchyards not included?</li> </ul>	<p>The two churchyards were not included as they are protected by the local planning authority and the Parish Council does not have any jurisdiction over them (St Mary's churchyard in Ticehurst is owned by Rother DC). Consideration will be given to including them within the final Plan.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• T2 – The allocation of a green space should not preclude more car parking provision in the Sports Ground.</li> </ul>	<p>T2 – The potential to extend the car parking would be sympathetic to the principle of green space, using grasscrete rather than tarmac.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F2 – Extend to east to protect and maintain land behind Wardsdown House.</li> </ul>	<p>F2 – The inclusion of a small area to the rear of Wardsdown House, in accordance with the planning authority’s SHLAA plan, will set the boundary and exclude further development.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Should ancient woodlands be included?</li> </ul>	<p>Ancient Woodlands already have protection from development (except in very exceptional circumstances which would not apply here). All Ancient Woodland must have a buffer zone between it and a housing development of at least 15m.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.</p>
<p>Recommended alterations to text.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>P34 Definition of NPPF required.</li> <li>P35 The word “criteria” should be added above the list on P35 so that the use of criteria makes sense on page 38/39.</li> <li>P38 Pickford should be Pickforde (T2).</li> <li>P38 2d should be added to T9.</li> </ul>	<p>“The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the Government’s planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied.” (Introduction to NPPF, Para 1).</p> <p>The Parish Council accepts these alterations.</p>	<p>R3 has been modified.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 94% agreed with this Policy but the Policy requires some additional revision and supporting evidence, including what is locally distinctive about the designated sites. More attention needs to be given to biodiversity.</p> <p>A review of the privately-owned sites and a further discussion with their owners is necessary. There should be clarity on the reasons for the inclusion of some but not all churchyards.</p> <p>Errors in the text of the neighbourhood plan have also been pointed out and will be addressed.</p>		<p>R<sub>3</sub> has been modified with clearer definition of a green space and better justification for those included.</p>

## Q7 Rural Policy R4 – Develop Footpath & Cycle Networks

Yes 91.25% | No 2.69% | Don't know 6.06%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Keep hedges and verges cut back so as not to impede movement. Flimwell lights to St Augustine's Church, High St Flimwell and the west end of the High Street Ticehurst were specifically mentioned.	The Parish Council regularly informs ESCC of overgrown hedges that intrude onto their footpaths. Letters are then sent to owners to request that they are cut back. If they do not respond, ESCC will send out contractors to do the work and invoice them accordingly.	No change.
<p>How do we achieve safe links between settlements to access essential services, especially a footpath between Flimwell and Ticehurst?</p> <p>The plan should emphasise this as a priority.</p> <p>The essential services for Flimwell are all based in Ticehurst –e.g. GP, School, Shops.</p>	The Parish Council has pressurised ESCC for years about providing a safe pedestrian route linking Ticehurst and Flimwell, however the Parish has no legislative powers on the highway. With the development of Banky Field and the s106 agreement attached, there might be a possibility of creating a cross-country path from Tinkers Lane to the school if the owners of the land are agreeable.	R4 has been modified to define the footpath link as a cross-country path rather than as part of the B2087.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
A cycle lane linking Wadhurst and Ticehurst would be desirable.	It is agreed that this would be a good asset for the Parish, however as mentioned earlier, the Parish Council has no authority over the highway. East Sussex Highways feels that the current width of the road is insufficient to provide this facility.	No change.
A footpath between Ticehurst and Pashley Manor.	The provision of a path to a particular business or tourist attraction should be entirely dependent on private landowners. ESCC are the relevant authority for the maintenance and provision of footpaths.	No change.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The speed of the traffic needs to be reduced to ensure safe passage.</li> <li>• Traffic calming measures are needed particularly in the village centres.</li> </ul>	The plans for Ticehurst village centre include means of slowing the speed of traffic. The Parish Council has provided the equipment for the Speed Watch team who voluntarily monitor traffic speeds with the support of the local police.	No change.



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Further information on existing local public rights of way would be desirable. The development of circular, accessible walks for families with pushchairs, mobility vehicles or wheelchairs was mentioned together with the suggestion that a Parish Group could be established.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and aims to produce a map of paths, to encourage the use of the extensive footpath network. When members of the public report any deficiencies in access to footpath, the Parish Council reports this to ESCC (who are responsible for maintaining the footpaths).	No change.
The Parish was asked to remember the maintenance of bridleways for horse riders in the Parish.	When members of the public report any deficiencies in bridleways, the Parish Council reports this to ESCC (who are responsible for maintaining the bridleways).	No change.
The Parish Council needs to ensure the protection of the footpath that leads from Flimwell through Wardsdown Woods to Bewl Water.	Footpaths are automatically protected when any planning application is made. When members of the public report any deficiencies in access to footpaths, this is reported to ESCC (who are responsible for maintaining the footpaths).	No change.
There should be no parking on footpaths or pavements.	<p>The Parish Council agree with this statement. However, the police no longer enforce parking matters unless in their opinion the parking is causing a danger to others.</p> <p>Rother have not yet adopted civil parking enforcement.</p>	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>This policy is well supported. It was felt that there could be benefits for the health and well-being of the community if footpaths and cycle ways were well maintained or developed along narrow roads. More information, maps and general improvements were needed and could attract more visitors to the area. Cycling is becoming an increasingly popular sport and there are also several groups of keen walkers in the Parish.</p> <p>There was strong support for a footpath between Ticehurst and Flimwell for the safe passage of pedestrians who regularly use this route, in particular children who attend the primary school. 33 respondents mentioned this need, specifically.</p>		<p>R4 has been modified to define the footpath link as a cross-country path rather than as part of the B2087.</p>

## Q8 Rural Community Action – Protect & Enhance Roadsides

Yes 93.46% | No 98% | Don't know 5.56%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
What is the policy for keeping the pavements clear of parked cars and management of overgrown hedges?	The Parish Council has no jurisdiction over parking. The police no longer enforce parking matters unless in their opinion the parking is causing a danger to others. Rother District Council has not yet adopted civil parking enforcement. The Parish Council regularly informs ESCC of overgrown hedges that intrude onto their footpaths. Letters are then sent to owners to request that they are cut back. If they do not respond, ESCC will send out contractors to do the work and invoice them accordingly.	No change.
Metal railings in the centre of villages are more traditional than hedges.	The Parish Council does not necessarily agree with this statement – natural verges would pre-date metal railings, but each site should be assessed to ascertain what is aesthetically acceptable and practicable.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Poorly maintained roads and pavements are dangerous.	ESCC are responsible for the maintenance of the roads and pavements. The Parish Council repeatedly inform them of dangerous areas. It is agreed by all parties that the state of the highway running between Wadhurst and the A21 is particularly bad. ESCC has given a provisional date for this to be resurfaced in April 2019.	No change.
Residents should be encouraged to cut their hedges.	The Parish Council regularly informs ESCC of overgrown hedges that intrude onto their footpaths. Letters are then sent to owners to request that they are cut back. If they do not respond, ESCC will send out contractors to do the work and invoice them accordingly.	No change.
More publicity on hedgerow and verge management is needed. Perhaps the Parish Council should consult Plant Life or High Weald Hedgerow Management Guidance for advice on the management of Parish verges.	The Parish Council is not responsible for any grass verges. These are owned by private landowners or most commonly by ESCC and the years of local government austerity have led to cut backs in their maintenance.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
In order to encourage more roadside flower areas, do not cut verges until the flowers have seeded. Cut hedges later in the season to allow birds to nest and feed on the berries.	ESCC has resolved to only cut back verges and hedges within their ownership twice a year in rural areas rather than six times which may assist those with the opinions expressed here. Parishioners can notify East Sussex Highways of wildflower-rich verges to protect them from early cutting.	No change.
There is a threat to ancient woodland and hedgerows by the proposed development of the site at Wardsdown.	A buffer zone of at least 15m to the north of the proposed development meets NPPF guidelines and would also exclude development into woodland. It has been suggested to the owner that the woodland can be further protected if he were to get it designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).	No change.
ESCC Council tip should be kept open to reduce risk of fly tipping.	The Parish Council has made strong representation to ESCC about their proposal to close the tip at Wadhurst. The partial closure a few years ago resulted in more incidents of fly-tipping and the use of private skips. As Rother DC are responsible for clearing fly-tipping, the ESCC proposals to save money are pushing the economic problem onto the lower authority but the cost will ultimately come out of local taxes.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
More waste bins should be provided to reduce litter.	The Parish Council are aware that the use of Parish bins for household waste has increased and challenges to that use are currently underway. As this might lead to litigation, it would be wrong to comment more on this subject here.	No change.
Hedgerows and verges should be cut where there is a blind spot or dangerous junction.	<p>The Parish Council regularly informs ESCC of overgrown hedges that intrude onto their footpaths. Letters are then sent to owners to request that they are cut back. If they do not respond, ESCC will send out contractors to do the work and invoice them accordingly.</p> <p>The Parish Council relies on local knowledge to let them know of areas where there are problems. Individuals can equally report issues through the ESCC web site.</p>	No change.
Reinstate ditches to reduce surface water on the roads.	The Parish Council supports this statement and has taken up the issue of blocked drainage with East Sussex Highways, for example on the Wallcrouch road and Vineyard Lane.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
There is no mention of the conservation of trees in the policy.	Trees within the conservation area of the Parish and those with individual tree preservation orders are automatically protected. The Parish Council accept this comment and will review what might be legitimately included in the final plan.	Tree conservation with regard to new developments is included in new policy R5 Support Biodiversity.
Discourage parking on pavements and parking on verges.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement. However, the police no longer enforce parking matters unless in their opinion the parking is causing a danger to others. Rother DC have not yet adopted civil parking enforcement.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was a majority support for this community action with a helpful suggestion that the Parish Council should seek advice on the best management plan. Protection of our wildlife was essential and it was pointed out by many respondents that, without protection, the natural habitat would be in severe decline. The cutting schedule of our hedgerows and verges needs to be timed so as not to endanger wild life. Traffic speed and parking on verges and pavements were problems that needed solutions.</p>		R5 Support Biodiversity includes tree conservation on new development sites.



## Q9 Rural Community Action – Enhance Footpath & Cycle Networks

Yes 89.74% | No 2.65% | Don't know 7.62%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
A feasibility plan is needed for development of cycle tracks.	The Parish Council encourages cycling but has been informed by East Sussex Highways that the roads within the Parish are not wide enough to provide dedicated cycle routes.	No change.
The need for a footpath between Flimwell and Ticehurst is mentioned again by several people.	The Parish Council has pressurised ESCC for years about providing a safe pedestrian route linking Ticehurst and Flimwell, however the Parish has no legislative powers on the highway. With the development of Banky Field and the S106 agreement attached, there might be a possibility of creating a cross-country path from Tinkers Lane to the school if the owners of the land remain agreeable.	No change.
Stiles on footpaths need to be replaced to improve access for all.	The Parish Council informs ESCC when faults are reported concerning footpaths or stiles. Members of the public are also able to report this directly to ESCC (who are responsible for footpaths) via their web site or by telephoning them.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The Parish Council needs to work with Southern Water (Bewl Leisure) to provide all-access footpaths to the reservoir.	Bewl Water is in private ownership and has met with local Parishes about the improvements they intend to make for public accessibility. However, the Parish Council, whilst supportive of some of their plans, has no authority over their land.	No change.
A linking footpath between Stonegate Village and Stonegate Station is requested.	The Parish Council would welcome a route, but this could only be achieved if the private landowners and ESCC were to enter into negotiation.	No change.
Cycling networks need to be kept away from cars.	The Parish Council encourages cycling but has been informed by East Sussex Highways that the roads within the Parish are not wide enough to provide dedicated cycle routes.	No change.
ESCC does not have the resources so should there be an increase in the precept at Parish level to achieve these goals?	The Parish Council tries to keep the precept at an acceptable level.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
ESCC does not have the money to maintain existing roads and footpaths. Existing paths need to be made safe before adding more.	The High Street is in the ESCC programme to be resurfaced in Spring 2019. The road is surveyed monthly by the ESCC Highway Stewards. Pressure is being applied by our County Councillor, John Barnes, to move this programming forward.	No change.
A linking footpath from Milk Maid's Alley to Lower Platts is requested and a cycle path from Ticehurst High Street to Bewl.	This land is in private ownership and the Parish Council, whilst supportive of this proposal, has no authority over the land.	No change.
Improvements to pathways around Bewl are requested.	Bewl Water is in private ownership and has met with local Parishes about the improvements they intend to make for public accessibility. However, the Parish Council, whilst supportive of some of their plans, has no authority over their land (it does not support the holiday homes development in the boat park).	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>91 people responded to this question. The majority thought there would be considerable benefit to the community and to visitors to the Parish if the footpaths were well maintained. In some cases, additional paths could be developed. The Parish Council must be vigilant in informing ESCC if footpaths on roads become overgrown so that action can be taken. They should consider suggestions for new paths when the budget allows further development. The public can report problems to ESCC on their website.</p> <p>It would be advantageous to establish contact with the Leisure Management Team at Bewl, to highlight areas around the reservoir that are within the Parish.</p>		<p>RCA2 – No change.</p>

## Q10 Employment Policy E1 – Protect & Enhance Local Services & Facilities

Yes 95.32% | No 0.67% | Don't know 4.01%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The local mix of shops and small enterprises is applauded. However, there is a need for more development in Stonegate to keep it thriving. It is very important to have a shop in Flimwell.	The Parish Council are working with Rother DC and the owner of Corner Farm to provide a room for a shop and are providing the finances to achieve this aim. There is no plan for more development in Stonegate – a recent approach to provide car parking and housing near the station resulted in the agents being advised to approach the planning authority (Rother DC) as an enabling exception site.	No change.
Clarity on development plans for A21 would be helpful for future expansion. Flimwell has several large successful businesses. The value of large businesses being located near the A21 for easy access and to protect congestion in village centres should be promoted.	The Parish Council sent two representatives to Westminster to meet with the Roads Minister, Amber Rudd, and the local MP, Huw Merriman, to discuss future dualling of the A21 through to Hastings. Whilst this is not currently in the Government's budget proposals, the MPs hoped to clarify plans, in order to improve the route and to protect village centres.	No change.
Whilst the new telephone mast is welcomed, there is a need to improve rural broadband to support small enterprises.	Within the last two years, BT has made several applications to upgrade broadband. The Parish Council have been supportive but sometimes critical of the sites chosen for the roadside boxes.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Traffic issues:</p> <p>Traffic volume will increase because of further development.</p> <p>The impact of large HGV on narrow rural roads is significant.</p> <p>Diversification of farm buildings may lead to more commercial traffic in rural areas.</p>	<p>The Parish Council agrees with these statements. The Parish Council is working to get narrow lanes designated as unsuitable for heavy traffic, Lynden Lane and Church Street in particular.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1</p>
<p>Retain basic essential services at affordable prices and try to bring back the butcher.</p>	<p>The Parish Council resists attempt to change retail units into residential (e.g. Forge Yard at Stonegate). It would also welcome a reinstatement of a butchery business.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Editing comments</p> <p>P42 Is Objective 4 in the right place in the document?</p> <p>Should Flimwell Park be given a mention?</p>	<p>The Parish Council is happy that Objective 4 is in this section – facilities such as schools, doctors and retail shops provide employment.</p> <p>We are adding a section on Flimwell Park.</p>	<p>E4 has been modified to include information on Flimwell Park.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Transport. We need to fight to retain our local bus service. People who do not drive cannot work out of the village as the bus service is poor.	The Parish Council has historically robustly opposed any reduction in the bus services. The Parish Council makes a significant financial contribution to the Battle Community Bus that provides cheap trips to nearby towns and is regularly used by residents.	No change.
Parking. Ensure we have enough parking for visitors to villages.	The Parish Council significantly increased the parking to the north of the Bell Public House and has plans to achieve more in the coming couple of years.	No change.
Can we support businesses to move to more suitable sites when they outgrow their premises? (e.g. Advartex & Ticehurst Motors).	The Parish Council supported Ticehurst Motors' proposal to move part of its business to the Old Coachworks site, but negotiations between the owners did not reach a successful conclusion. The Parish Council has no authority over private businesses.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was a lot of support for this policy. The general opinion is reflected in the comment: “anything that retains and helps to promote the working life of the village is important”. The range and choice of local services is valued, particularly within Ticehurst Village Centre. The response confirmed that Flimwell and Stonegate want access to a local shop also.</p> <p>Limited growth is accepted as a necessary part of this policy, especially in suitably placed ‘business zones’ where apprenticeships could be offered to young people. However, the increase in general and commercial traffic servicing business premises is a problem to many people (see E4).</p> <p>Infrastructure, such as satisfactory broadband speeds and adequate parking places, needs to be able to support local enterprise.</p>		<p>E1 has being combined with E5 and will cover the villages’ retail centres.</p>



## Q11 Employment Policy E2 – Support Local Tourism & Recreation

Yes 85.47% | No 3.38% | Don't know 11.15%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Limited expansion would be useful for the area, provided it does not have a negative effect on residents due to an increase in traffic. Tourism needs to be proportionate and tastefully implemented. It should not threaten the tranquillity of the area (several mentioned their dislike of recent proposed development for holiday accommodation at Bewl Reservoir).	The Parish Council supports local tourism and hopes that the plans for an improved village centre will encourage visitors. Planning applications to support tourism and recreation are supported if they would not have an adverse impact on the AONB and local village life.	No change.
Parking might be a problem if tourism increases the number of cars in the Parish.	Additional parking has been provided in recent years and the surface of the recreation ground car park has been renewed to encourage more use of that facility by visitors.	No change.
The Parish Council should promote local tourism and improve pedestrian access.	The Parish Council has no authority or land to provide additional footpaths. Safer access across the High Street to the village centre is being worked on in conjunction with ESCC.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>Whilst more than 85% of the respondents supported this policy, there were more “don’t knows” than for most other policies (11.15%). It was recognised that tourism and recreation were important to the local economy. Respondents also highlighted how fortunate we are to be living in an AONB with Bewl and Bedgebury close by.</p> <p>However, there is recognition that an increase in visitor numbers brings an increase in traffic and that and the parking issues need to be managed.</p>		<p>E2 has been modified with information on Bewl Water added.</p>

## Q12 Employment Policy E3 – Promote the Diversification of Agricultural Businesses

Yes 82.72% | No 4.98% | Don't Know 11.30%

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The Parish Council should promote agricultural apprenticeships to develop employment in the area.	Local businesses such as Ticehurst Motors and Mick Gould Commercials do offer apprenticeships in the village. The Parish Council has no authority over promoting apprenticeships but will engage with the local agricultural colleges (Hadlow and Plumpton) to explore how this might be managed. The Employment Community Action – Work with Local Businesses – will explore how the Parish Council and businesses can provide more experience and training for young people.	No change.
There should be more emphasis on organic farming.	The Parish Council has no authority over the methods of farming that individual landowners decide to use.	No change.
Food production is seen as important especially after Brexit.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and would discourage the loss of agricultural land but has no authority over this if landowners decide to change land use.	No change.
Encouragement should be given to supporting local farmers by buying local food.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and recommends supporting the local shops and the Farmers' Market.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Diversification does not mean selling lots of houses.	The Parish Council would not support a large development on farmland.	No change.
Support for the reuse of redundant agricultural buildings (with provisos).	The NPPF provides guidance on this subject. It has become easier to gain planning permission for the conversion of redundant traditional agricultural buildings to dwellings.	No change.
No glamping, no large solar farms.	The Parish Council would have to consider any application on its merits but would advise against any application that would have an adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB.	No change.
Care with access required by heavy lorries.	The Parish Council is working to have narrow lanes designated as quiet lanes, with signage discouraging use by large vehicles, with particular reference to Lynden Lane and Church Street (and Rosemary Lane?)	“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action.
No unsightly new buildings.	The Parish Council would have to consider any application on its merits but would advise against any application that would have an adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The NP does not deal with the increasing problem of land being left unmanaged (thus vulnerable to speculators).	The Parish Council has no authority over private land usage.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There is a clear view that this is an agricultural area and that farms (and farmers) are essential to maintain its character. Equally there is a view that farmers must diversify to survive. There was no mention in the Policy of Flimwell Park which has the potential to offer more local employment and is well-sited to serve the area but close to the A21.</p> <p>Some policy revision may be required to consider some of the above comments and provide greater clarity.</p>		<p>E<sub>3</sub> has been modified.</p> <p>Flimwell Park will be covered in the revision of E<sub>4</sub>.</p>

## Q13 Employment Policy E4 – Protect & Enhance Existing Business Employment Sites & Encourage Additional Employment Sites

Yes 79.87% | No 5.70% | Don't Know 14.93%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Ticehurst House does not feature much within the Plan. It is one of our largest employers and more contact with the management of some of our larger employers might benefit Ticehurst people.	The Parish Council has an appointed liaison contact with Ticehurst House and is supportive of their ability to employ residents.	No change.
Reference to Flimwell Park needed.	The Parish Council has worked with the owners and architect for the old Bird Park, supporting their plans to create a new employment centre for Flimwell. A statement outlining the work and how it fits in with the principles of the NP has been drafted for inclusion in the final plan.	E4 has been modified to emphasise Flimwell Park and its plans.
Many people mentioned Ticehurst as a working village and how fortunate the Parish is to have so many sources of employment. Promotion of opportunities for a variety of skills should be our focus.	The Parish Council supports this statement and any applications for employment sites are encouraged, so long as they would not have an adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB and the local infrastructure.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The guidance on siting units should use the word “must” rather than “should”.	The wording of this policy is being reviewed prior to publication of the final plan, but the NP policies must be legally worded.	No change.
Concerns about increase of heavy traffic and insufficient parking in the villages.	The Parish Council is working to have narrow lanes designated as quiet lanes, with signage discouraging use by large vehicles.	“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1.
Small sites were preferred in keeping with the rural environment.	The Parish Council supports this statement and any applications for employment sites are encouraged, if they would not have an adverse impact on the landscape of the AONB and the local infrastructure.	No change.
Businesses should not be allowed to grow without proper planning control.	The Parish Council would not want to hamper the success of a business but would encourage a geographical move to more suitable premises if it were applied for e.g. Mick Gould’s move from Darbys Lane to east of the A21.	No change.
Several comments mentioned that present sites should be fully occupied before expansion is considered.	The Parish Council has no authority over private sites and would consider, as a consultee, an application made through the proper planning route.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
The development of “quiet lanes” as per CPRE should be considered by Parish Council to promote enjoyment and safety in the rural lanes inappropriate for large HGV.	The Parish Council is working to have narrow lanes designated as quiet lanes with signage discouraging use by large vehicles.	“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1.
There was support for the expansion of Whiligh into a business unit.	The Parish Council would consider any application impartially on the merits/adverse impacts of a proposed scheme but believes there are sufficient commercial premises in the Parish at present (see Employment map).	The reference to the Whiligh site has been omitted.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was general support for this policy but concern about the increase of traffic, especially HGVs, down our country lanes.</p> <p>In general, respondents preferred small, varied developments, well designed and carefully landscaped into the surrounding countryside. Large developments were not felt to fit into the rural environment, nor businesses which grew too large for the vicinity in which they operated. The policy could be strengthened to incorporate some of the items mentioned above, including liaison with our larger employers to promote training opportunities for residents.</p>		E4 has been modified to include Flimwell Bird Park and a map of all the commercial sites in the Parish.



## Q14 Employment Policy E5 – Protect & Enhance the Village Centres

Yes 95.35% | No 1.00% | Don't Know 3.65%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Further consultation on how the centre of Flimwell and services could be promoted and improved. Strong support for a shop, a visitor attraction and safe pedestrian access to Ticehurst services.	Flimwell will shortly have a hall and a room for a shop. A safe pedestrian access from Tinkers Lane might be a possibility with the development of Banky Field, but this would not be road-side. East Sussex Highways has examined the road on many occasions and does not feel that there is room for a pavement.	E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres. E4 has also been revised to cover the commercial sites.
Better use of existing halls in Flimwell was proposed – Cricket pavilion and Woodnet.	Flimwell Park is being worked on and will provide a place for the public, with an architectural school, cookery school and artisan workshops with outlets for their produce. The better use of halls is dependent on people booking them, both are available for private functions.	E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres. E4 has also been revised to cover the commercial sites.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Two halves of Flimwell could be reunited by tunnelling under the A21 or by creating a bypass.	The Highways Agency is the authority with control of the A21 and the roads linking in with it. The Parish Council sent two representatives to Westminster to meet with the Roads Minister, Amber Rudd, and the local MP, Huw Merriman, to discuss future dualling of the A21 through to Hastings. Whilst this is not currently in the Government's budget proposals, the MPs hoped to clarify plans, to assist those living along the route and to protect village centres.	E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres. E4 has also been revised to cover the commercial sites.
Stonegate junction is more complicated than indicated in the draft plan. Further thought is needed to control traffic speed in the centre.	East Sussex Highways have indicated that they will not make alterations to the junction in Stonegate. Measures to control speeding traffic are being reviewed by the Parish Council.	E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres.
More focus should be made of the fact that we have a mainline railway station in Stonegate serving the Parish.	Stonegate station is well used with passengers from other villages such as Burwash and Heathfield using it as their preferred stop. However, trains stop there less frequently than at Wadhurst.	E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres.
Traffic calming measures are essential. A safe crossing in Ticehurst High St is required. Parking in the centre of Ticehurst is an issue. More off-road parking is needed.	The Parish Council is working with ESCC and Rother DC on how to improve the village centre and slow the traffic passing through it. A formal pedestrian crossing is being considered slightly east of the village square where ESCC safety requirements would allow an installation.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Parking on one side of Church St only was proposed.</p>	<p>Parking capacities were increased to the rear of the Bell by the Parish Council. Further areas are being looked at (and prices are being obtained) to create more parking spaces. ESCC are considering the best use of the parking capacities within Ticehurst Village centre.</p> <p>The Parish Council have reminded central businesses that it would be advantageous to them to ensure that they and their staff did not park all day in Ticehurst Village centre as it makes accessing the shops more difficult for potential customers.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Ticehurst Village Square. The Square is in a poor condition. Improvements to the Ticehurst village Square are strongly supported. "It does not do justice to the site". "It needs a facelift".</p> <p>There were proposals for limited parking (short term and disabled parking only) and a better surface to improve pedestrian safety and attractiveness.</p>	<p>A refurbishment scheme for the centre of Ticehurst Village is being worked on with ESCC, the Parish Council and the conservation officer from Rother DC to provide very short-term parking and the ability to hold village events in the square, making pedestrians as important as vehicles.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>The dominance of Ticehurst Motors in the Square was mentioned. There is a general view that while they give a good service to the villages, they have outgrown their premises.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has no authority over individual businesses. Limited parking in the village square is under consideration; this will inhibit long-term parking of any vehicles.</p> <p>The eastern part of the Square is owned by Ticehurst Motors. The Parish Council also recognises that many residents who own cars bought from Ticehurst Motors may park these in the village centre and it is difficult to distinguish these cars from those owned by Ticehurst Motors.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Provide visitor information in an extended Bell car park.</p>	<p>This is an interesting proposal and will be considered by the Parish Council.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>This policy was popular. The Parish Council should make every effort to engage with East Sussex Highways, as pedestrian safety and traffic speeds were a concern in all villages. It was important that there were plans to ensure that the villages remained rural and were not urbanised.</p> <p>There was strong support for improving Ticehurst Village Square and for developing its potential as an attractive centre without the current level of parking. Respondents commented on the perceived way that Ticehurst Motors dominate the parking spaces in the Square.</p>		<p>E5 has been combined with E1 to cover the village retail centres.</p>

## Q15 Employment Policy E6 – Improve Essential Infrastructure

Yes 92.72% | No 1.32% | Don't Know 5.96%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Improved infrastructure is often better achieved as a response to new development rather than being used as a reason for resisting it.	<p>The Parish Council considers the pressure that any new development will bring to the community and seeks to gain improvements as a planning condition. Connectivity to the village centre is important to the village infrastructure.</p> <p>Monies obtained from developers through the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will also be used to enhance village facilities. Once the neighbourhood plan is complete, the Parish's share of the CIL increases from 15% to 25%.</p>	No change.
10 respondents pressed for improvements to mobile and broadband coverage. There is currently poor service or none at all in the valleys and away from village centres.	The Parish Council and Bell Field Ltd responded to the request for the mast at the Bell Field. This is meant to provide a 5-mile service for O2 and Vodaphone. The Parish Council has not resisted the applications for broad band cabinets around the Parish but has made comments on their positions to lessen the impact on the rural areas.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Bus service</p> <p>Restore Sunday service.</p> <p>Request to divert Ticehurst – Tunbridge Wells bus via Stonegate.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has no authority over the bus companies. The best way to apply pressure would be for individuals to send letters lobbying for an increased service. This would enable the companies to ascertain the financial viability of running additional buses.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Car Parking – more facilities, better sign posting.</p>	<p>Improved signage is being considered by the Parish Council and additional parking quotations are being obtained.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Pressure on the Doctors Surgery. Residents still have to go to Wadhurst for appointments.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has no authority over the NHS and the GP practice has said that the service is coping with increased numbers.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Roads are in a poor condition.</p>	<p>The High Street is in the ESCC programme to be resurfaced in Spring 2019. The road is surveyed on a monthly basis by the ESCC Highway Stewards. Pressure is being applied by our County Councillor, John Barnes, to move this programming forward.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Inadequate water and sewage infrastructure, especially after stormy weather.</p>	<p>The Parish Council recently had a meeting with East Sussex Highways (ESH) pointing out the areas where drains might be broken or blocked that cause flooding. ESH are looking into each area and will report back.</p> <p>The Parish Council has on several occasions questioned the efficiency of the sewage system but has always been assured by Southern Water that there is no problem. The Council has no authority over the utility companies.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was concern about the extra pressure new developments would place on the villages, especially Ticehurst. Current infrastructure needs to be protected. The Parish Council should ensure that it presses for infrastructure improvements when new developments are planned.</p>		<p>E6</p> <p>No change (becomes E5).</p>

## Q16 Employment Community Action – Work with Local Businesses

Yes 94.33% | No 1.33% | Don't Know 4.34%

Summary of Community Concerns/ Main Issues and Responses	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Support local young people into employment including apprenticeships, plus provision of affordable starter homes.	Several businesses in the village offer local young people apprenticeships and the Parish Council is grateful for their support.  Optivo – the housing association – have informed the Parish Council that they have purchased Banky Field with outline permission for 40 homes. 20 of these will be affordable rented and 20 will be shared equity.	No change.
General support for local business, especially essential services but not many ideas as to how this should be achieved.	The Parish Council resists any planning applications for the change of use of buildings from commercial to residential.	No change.
Advertise range of services in the villages.	The Parish Council produces a booklet listing services such as GPs, dentists, churches, schools, business, and organisations; this is given to people who move into the Parish. Ticehurst News and Views gives businesses a local medium for advertising their services.	No change.



Summary of Community Concerns/ Main Issues and Responses	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was agreement with the idea of supporting local businesses as an essential part of a vibrant community. It was suggested that the Parish Council should consult them more as to how this could be done.</p> <p>There was strong support for measures to ensure local young people were equipped with the skills required to be successfully employed.</p>		<p>No change.</p>

## Q17 Housing Policy H1 – The Spatial Plan

Yes 83.78% | No 4.73% | Don't know 11.49%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
I like the word “small”, it suggests hamlets.	The Parish Council supports the retention of recognisable hamlets.	No change.
Policy H1 does nothing to address Housing Policy objective 5, to provide affordable housing.	Optivo – the housing association – have informed the Parish Council that they have purchased Banky Field with outline permission for 40 homes. 20 of these will be affordable rented and 20 will be shared equity. This will provide 40 affordable homes.  The obligation remains for developers to provide 40% affordable dwellings on sites of over 10 units.	No change.
The small developments will not remain small as they will be attached to other developments making them larger overall.	The Parish Council cannot agree with this speculative statement. The neighbourhood plan seeks to prevent such expansion.	No change.
Not if it means tacking on groups of houses and blotting out the green spaces.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and will support the retention of green space and avoid site expansion.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
I strongly disagree that Stonegate should be excluded. It has a mainline train station accessing London...The use of the train is a government policy and is environmentally sustainable.	The planning authority, Rother District Council, does not currently consider Stonegate suitable for development due to the lack of infrastructure.	No change.
As long as the infrastructure can cope. Roads etc.	The Parish Council agrees that all developments need to be considered in the context of the infrastructure.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 83% of the respondents support this policy. They emphasise the need to have small developments that are designed well and fit into the character of the village. However, they are concerned that this will make them not affordable. They are also concerned that they will not stay small but will grow and that green spaces between the villages will be lost. They express concern about the demands on the existing infrastructure: roads, drains, GP surgeries, schools, employment and shops.</p>		<p>H1</p> <p>Development boundary maps need revision.</p>

## Q18 Housing Policy H2 – Housing Site Allocations

Yes 64.60% | No 14.43% | Don't know 20.96%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
I have grave concerns about the allocation of Singehurst for housing, for all the reasons put forward by Rother DC.	There has been little adverse comment from Parishioners on the previous application on the Singehurst site and at appeal. The Parish Council understands that the agents and owners of the site are engaging in pre-application talks with the local planning authority to see if a smaller scheme with different design might address their objections.	H2 has been revised to take account of the new Site Assessment document.
We need houses for those working in the villages.	The Parish Council supports this statement and the neighbourhood plan is designed to provide the required allocation given to us by Rother DC and to promote housing for locals. Policy H4 says that, as far as possible, affordable housing should be allocated to people with a strong connection to Ticehurst.	No change.
Stonegate really, really needs more houses. It has a railway station but has lost its bus service and	The planning authority, Rother District Council, does not currently consider Stonegate suitable for development due to the lack of infrastructure.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
shop. Also, with no centre it has become a stagnating backwater.		
Flimwell – unacceptable plan will destroy everything of rural existence.	The housing allocation by Rother DC of 43 new dwellings at Flimwell will be met by the 25 properties currently being built at Corner Farm, the 9 already built at Old Wardsdown and potentially 9 to the north of Wardsdown House. Negotiations by the Parish Council and the Flimwell Hall Trust over the last 20 years have resulted in the provision of a new village hall and a new shop.	H2 has been revised to take account of the new Site Assessment document.
There is concern that the 9 houses allocated in Flimwell north of Wardsdown House would create access to a site for further development up to the A21.	The area proposed for development would not provide an access to Site 02 on the A21. The Parish Council will not support the development of land to the north of Fruitfields and will robustly oppose any development suggested there.	H2 has been revised to take account of the new Site Assessment document.
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 64% supported this policy stating the reality that “It’s important for us to choose the sites before they are chosen for us”. However, there was concern about the development at Singehurst and the lack of development at Stonegate. Most of the opposing comments related to the allocation of the Wardsdown House site at Flimwell.</p>		H2 has been revised to take account of the new Site Assessment document. Site maps also revised.

## Q19 Housing Policy H3 – Mix of Housing Sizes & Tenures

Yes 81.42% | No 5.74% | Don't know 12.84%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Smaller homes are needed for those downsizing, not just for starter homes.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures (also justification for this in supporting text). Emphasis on smaller houses – data from Rother Strategic Housing Research Project (published after the TNP draft was completed).
We need a balance of mixed sized housing.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and would encourage a wide range of types of properties, including single-storey dwellings.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
More part ownership to be provided so the younger generation can aspire to own their own home eventually.	Optivo – the housing association – have informed the Parish Council that they have purchased Banky Field with outline permission for 40 homes. 20 of these will be affordable rented and 20 will be shared equity (part ownership). This will provide 40 affordable homes.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures.
On every development we hear about affordable housing, but not much sign of them, the young people in the villages still have to move out to be able to rent or buy.	The Parish Council supports the requirement for 40% affordable housing provision on sites of over 10 properties. Banky Field is to provide 100% affordable housing stock.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures.
As long as the balance reflects social housing needs.	The Parish Council has some reservations about a large site (Banky Field) consisting of only affordable housing but will consider any application on its merits and design.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures.
Important to avoid the “us” and “them” atmosphere by mixing housing tenures on each site.	The Parish Council supports this statement.	H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 81% support this policy, emphasising the need for the housing stock to reflect the needs of the community. New housing should include smaller units for downsizing and for single young people and couples setting up their first home. It was recognised that there is a natural movement as family groupings change.</p>		<p>H3 has been revised with the addition of a table suggesting the mix of housing sizes and tenures (also justification for this in supporting text).</p>



## Q20 Housing Policy H4 – Affordable Housing

Yes 82.71% | No 5.42% | Don't know 11.86%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>The design of buildings needs to be in keeping with the village, we do not want badly designed boxes.</p> <p>Houses should be only for people with a strong connection to Ticehurst.</p>	<p>The Parish Council has asked to be able to provide input into the local criteria necessary for occupancy. It has compiled a confidential list of those looking for homes.</p> <p>Rother DC is legally bound to prioritise homeless families, but priority should be given to local residents and workers, and social developments phased according to local need.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Part affordable housing is essential for the younger generation and low-income families wishing to stay in the village.</p>	<p>The Parish Council supports the provision of affordable housing on each development site. Optivo – the housing association – have informed the Parish Council that they have purchased Banky Field with outline permission for 40 homes. 20 of these will be affordable rented and 20 will be shared equity. This will provide 40 affordable homes.</p>	<p>H4 has been revised with the addition of data from Rother Strategic Housing Research Project and with the addition of a table suggesting the split in affordable housing tenures.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
A supply of affordable housing is very important if we wish to have a local population of all ages.	The Parish Council supports the provision of affordable housing on each development site.	No change.
While I agree that we should think of those with Ticehurst connections first, it's important that we don't exclude newcomers who will bring life and energy to the village. Being inclusive is what really matters.	The Parish Council has asked to be able to provide input into the local criteria necessary for occupancy. It has compiled a confidential list of those looking for homes.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 82% support the policy, agreeing that it is important to have homes that are affordable for young people, young families and the elderly. They also recognise that it is difficult to ensure that they are exclusively available for those who live in Ticehurst but would like the Parish Council to try and find a way to prioritise them.</p>		H4 has been revised with the addition of data from Rother Strategic Housing Research Project and with the addition of a table suggesting the split in affordable housing tenures.

## Q21 Housing Policy H5 – The Design of New Buildings

Yes 85.86% | No 3.10% | Don't Know 11.03%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Taking reference to the character that makes the area unique is very welcome. Some reference to sustainability (such as water collection or solar panels) should also be included.	The site-specific guidance will include recommendations for buildings to be in keeping with the historic village centre. It will also promote green and sustainable features (e.g. water collection).	H5 has been revised with the addition of site-specific guidance on planned sites (Banky Field, Hillbury Field, Orchard Farm, Singehurst and Wardsdown House.
All new building should be of a contemporary design, with due reference to local style and materials.	The Parish Council agrees. Buildings of great architectural merit can comprise new and historic features without compromising the quality of the finished dwelling. The use of local materials will always be encouraged.	No change.
There is no particular vernacular in Ticehurst apart from the listed conservation area. Design should be skewed towards very low carbon, high efficiency design.	The Parish Council believes that the tile-hung and weather-boarded features of the centre of the village are important and should be referenced in new developments. This will assist with the blending in of new pockets of residential development.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
New buildings must be in keeping with the existing buildings. If the look and the feel of the village is lost, then we will lose the tourists and walkers who enjoy what we have in Ticehurst and we will end up as another urban sprawl.	The Parish Council agrees. The above comments reflect this view point. The strategic green gaps and protected green spaces are designed to avoid sprawl and ribbon development within the Parish.	No change.
All new buildings must be developed with sensitivity for the area in which they are being constructed.	The Parish Council agrees.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 85% of respondents support the policy on design of new buildings. They think that it is important to ensure that the design reflects the existing architecture and that every new development uses the neighbourhood plan Design Guidance.</p>		H5 has been revised with the addition of site-specific guidance on planned sites (Banky Field, Hillbury Field, Orchard Farm, Singehurst and Wardsdown House).

## Q22 Housing Policy H6 – Conservation & Heritage

Yes 93.92% | No 1.35% | Don't Know 4.73%

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Particularly agree that the Village Institute needs renovation to draw out its finer features.	The Parish Council agrees. Internal works in the last six months have improved the building, whilst the renovation of the historic herringbone block flooring in the hall some years ago has assisted with the internal appearance of the building. Thought is being given to opening the blocked windows.	No change
Vitally important that we conserve our heritage, both for us and for all future generations.	The Parish Council agrees. The books on the history of Ticehurst serve the Parish well, celebrating the development of the village. The renovation of the well in the centre of the village is part of the village conservation project.	No change
Conserve the heritage of our village centre.	The Parish Council agrees. The plans for Ticehurst Village centre are based on restoring it as a place for meeting and gathering as well as a viable economic centre.	No change

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Fund an on-line photo library of all village buildings and rural life over time.	The archives in Lewes hold valuable photographic records of the Parish. From time to time exhibitions are held of this material; the last one was housed in the Bell about two years ago as part of the celebrations for the Queen's 90th birthday.	No change
Summary		H6
More than 93% of respondents supported this policy, feeling that it was essential that we conserve our heritage.		No change

## Q23 Housing Community Action – Prepare a Conservation Area Appraisal & Management Plan

Yes 89.66% | No 0.69% | Don't Know 9.66%

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Share progress of this plan through your You-Tube channel, email and other social media.	The Parish Council currently share information through the web site for the neighbourhood plan and through News and Views. This suggestion will be considered.	No change.
This is an excellent proposal.	Thank you.	No change.
Important for current and future local businesses and development plans to take this onto account	The Parish Council agrees.	No change.
Conservation is the key to the future of this planet.	The Parish Council sees conservation of our essential resources as of prime importance. This community action emphasises the need for this.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>Almost 90% of respondents support the idea of a conservation area appraisal and management plan being produced. However, there was a question concerning the cost of the ongoing management of the plan.</p>		No change.



## Q24 Housing Design Guidance

Yes 79.51% | No 2.43% | Don't Know 18.06%

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Commend and very strongly agree.	Thank you. Site-specific design guidance is being worked on and will be included within the neighbourhood plan.	No change.
This is a very well thought through design guidance.	Thank you. The comments of the public during the consultation processes have been used to formulate the guidance.	No change.
Important that the built environment is controlled by the Parish Council in line with this policy.	The Parish Council supports limited expansion of the village but wants to ensure that the services can cope with the expansion and that development is phased and sensitive to the needs of its residents.	No change.
Design Guidance is essential.	The Parish Council agrees.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Would like to see the design guidance being specific to the three sites allocated and the three sites which already have planning permission.</p>	<p>Site-specific design guidance will be included on the three sites that are currently allocated within the plan.</p>	<p>H5 has been revised with the addition of site-specific guidance on planned sites (Banky Field, Hillbury Field, Orchard Farm, Singehurst and Wardsdown House).</p>
<p>Summary</p> <p>More than 79% of respondents supported this policy. They commented on the paucity of the design of recent developments, seeing this policy as a way of ensuring that future developments are in keeping with the requirements of the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan.</p>		<p>No change.</p>

## Q25 Social and Community Infrastructure Policy INF1 – Improvements to the Village Centres

Yes 92.88% | No 3.39% | Don't Know 3.73%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<u>Flimwell</u> – Does not have a village centre.	The Parish Council has, in conjunction with the Flimwell Village Trust, negotiated the provision of a hall on the Corner Farm site and has recently obtained permission to provide a shop on the site. The playground will be refurbished in the next few months, providing a centre for the ward of Flimwell.	No change.
The single exit from the proposed site at Corner Farm, Flimwell, will cause chaos.	The Parish Council made strong representations to East Sussex Highways and Rother DC about their concerns – the latest response, received on 4 <sup>th</sup> June 2018 from ESH, reports that anticipated traffic flows will not be significantly more than when the nursery was running on the site and that it is likely that “no parking” restrictions will be imposed on the western side of the crossroads to assist. The suggested access onto the A21 was rejected as unsafe.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
There is support for a village shop in Flimwell.	The Parish Council made an application for an additional room with a separate entrance to be provided as an extension to the hall; this can be used as a shop. The planning application for this has been approved. The Parish Council has pledged £50,000 for this provision.	No change.
<u>Stonegate</u> – A roundabout is good in theory. This might be a safety improvement but are there other designs more in character with the rural environment?	East Sussex Highways are not happy with the provision of a roundabout due to the lack of sight lines from two of the approaches. There are no current plans for alterations to the junction.	Stonegate roundabout illustration removed.
Stonegate roundabout is unnecessary as there have been no accidents.	There is a history of minor accidents.	Stonegate roundabout illustration removed.
Parking outside the village school causes congestion and is dangerous for children leaving school and creates problems for local residents. Could the section of land between the Church and the playing field be turned into a car parking area with grasscrete?	The Parish Council has no authority over the piece of land and understands that it might belong to Southern Water. The parked cars force vehicles to slow down, which may in turn make the four-way junction less dangerous. If the school were to make enquiries about the piece of land for parking, the Parish Council would support this unless other factors came to light through the application process.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p><u>Ticehurst</u> – Should retain its historical features &amp; character. A radical rethink would create a vibrant space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhance the Square as a focal point for the village.</li> <li>• Parking must be affordable.</li> <li>• The design must be suitable for a rural environment.</li> <li>• Would like to see community events/markets held in the Square.</li> </ul>	<p>The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council, together with the Rother DC Conservation Officer and ESCC, are drawing up deliverable plans for the village centre.</p> <p>The Parish Council ran a successful celebration for the Queen's birthday, closing the square for the afternoon. It is hoped to be able to hold more events and make the village centre as much a place for gatherings as well as a transport route.</p>	No change.
<p>Please provide somewhere to park a mobility vehicle when catching the bus.</p>	<p>The parking areas are available to all vehicles in the village square. It is intended to introduce limited time for parking to assist the shops.</p>	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Additional car parking is needed in Ticehurst to relieve congestion in the Square and surrounding area.</li> <li>• Short term parking in the Square only.</li> <li>• Too many cars in the Square makes navigating on foot dangerous.</li> <li>• People will not shop in Ticehurst if they do not have anywhere to park.</li> </ul>	<p>The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council negotiated the successful addition to the free car park behind the Bell, providing an additional 25-30 spaces. Quotations to extend the car park again have been requested. The Parish Council has asked ESCC to introduce limited parking in the Square. Shop owners have been asked to tell their staff not to park outside their shops all day as that limits the opportunity for potential customers.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Reduce the speed of traffic through Ticehurst village and provide a safe crossing points for 'old folk' &amp; mobility vehicles.</p>	<p>The Parish Council are working with East Sussex Highways to provide a safe crossing – it is likely to be to the east of the square near Cutting Corners due to Highway regulations.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Remove 40mph sign at Vineyard Lane and seek to extend 30mph area up to Ticehurst House.</p>	<p>East Sussex Highways have been asked about this but maintain that they will not reduce speed restrictions unless there is a strong likelihood of being able to slow the traffic to that speed. They currently take the view that this is unlikely.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
We prefer flashing speed lights that give information on speed travelled and are polite – “smile” or say, “thank you”.	The Parish Council is looking at possibly purchasing a flashing light system that can be moved around the village as needed.	No change.
Road surfaces that make the road noisier would not be welcomed. Even surface is much better than cobbles to walk across.	The Parish Council agrees with this statement and is looking at materials that look attractive but would not impede safe pedestrian passage.	No change.
The road surface through the High Street is bad.	The High Street is in the ESCC programme to be resurfaced in Spring 2019. The road is surveyed monthly by the ESCC Highway Stewards. Pressure is being applied by our County Councillor, John Barnes, to move this programming forward.	No change.
A bus service direct to North Farm would enable people to access the shops, bowling alley and cinema. The present service via T/Wells takes too long.	The Parish Council has no authority over the Stage Coach Bus Company. Individual letters to the Bus Company would have more effect, as new routes would only be considered if they would be economically viable.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
<p>Summary</p> <p>Overall there was strong support for improvements to Ticehurst Village Centre and for providing more off-road car parking and safe crossing points across the Ticehurst High Street. There were mixed feelings about the suitability of a proposed roundabout at Stonegate centre. Flimwell hopes that a village hall and shop will provide more of a village centre. There were proposals for extending the 30mph to Ticehurst House, for the installation of flashing lights and for a parking area for Stonegate school and church users.</p>		<p>INF1 has been modified by removal of proposed Stonegate roundabout. Drawings of Ticehurst and Flimwell crossings have also been modified.</p>



## Q26 Social & Community Infrastructure Policy INF2 – Community Energy Projects

Yes 78.26% | No 1.38% | Don't know 20.34%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
More green energy is needed and the installation of alternative sources of energy is supported.	The Parish Council agrees.	No change.
Support and educate on green water harvesting and include in new builds.	Site-specific recommendations have been included in the plan. Developers who seek discussions with the PC have been advised that energy-saving methods of building are preferable: rain water harvesting, and water recycling should be included.	No change.
Set up electric car charge points.	Thought is being given within the village centre plans for electric charging points.	INF2 has been modified to include text on electric charging points.
Promote eco schemes for family houses.	The Parish Council agrees. Site-specific recommendations are included in the final neighbourhood plan.	No change.

Agriculture yes but no solar panels on agricultural land or on older listed buildings.	The Parish Council is not the planning authority but would not support any unsightly alterations to the listed buildings in the Parish. Any applications for solar panel installations on agricultural land would have to be considered on the merits of the application.	No change.
Promote solar panels on new builds and industrial buildings.	Individual applications would be considered on their own merits. This would include the views of those overlooking them and their impact within the AONB.	No change.
Aim for a dark sky area.	The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council resolved to switch off the street lights after midnight as the necessity for them was low.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was strong support for this policy but the number of “don’t knows” appears to indicate that people need more information before committing themselves. Perhaps the role of the Parish Council to educate and enable people to weigh up the possibilities needs to be strengthened.</p>		INF2 has been modified to include text on electric charging points.

## Q27 Social and Community Infrastructure Policy INF3 – Community Areas within Housing Developments

Yes 77.82% | No 5.12% | Don't Know 17.06%

Summary of community comments/ main issues and concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Keep area green, clean, safe and clutter free.	The Parish Council agrees. The neighbourhood plan Design Guidance proposes areas of green that properties will look out over, where neighbours can gather, and children play. This would promote safety for users and it is hoped would instigate a sense of belonging and ownership which may also keep them litter free.	No change.
Careful planning is required so that the all ages can meet informally and socialise. Communication in a community is very important.	The Parish Council agrees and supports community areas of green space. News & Views also helps to spread ideas.	No change.
More garden-like areas with mounds, hedges and secret areas to allow children to use the spaces imaginatively. These need to blend in and be visually pleasing.	The Parish Council will actively promote and support open, green and interesting areas for community use.	No change.

Outdoor play areas close to home are important to families.	The Parish Council agrees. The installation of an additional playground for younger children at Farthing Hill was intended to provide play facilities for families closer to home. The proposed development at Banky Field will also include more facilities.	No change.
Will these areas be properly looked after? How will these areas be maintained and who will pay for them?	The playgrounds are inspected monthly and written reports submitted to the Parish Council. Action is taken if repairs are needed. There is an annual safety inspection carried out on each site by an external professional body and all recommendations are followed. The Parish Council pay for inspections, repairs and new equipment.	No change.
Green focus for the enjoyment of local people should also be applied to the village Square.	Four new trees have been planted and, if it is possible, the plans for the village square will include more trees. An irrigation system has been included as part of the well restoration to ensure a water supply for planted areas. New trees have also been supplied by the Parish Council along the frontage of Marlpit Gardens to replace trees that have died over the years.	No change.
Also, plenty of parking places are needed.	The car park at the recreation ground is not used to capacity and signage might assist with this. The increased parking facilities in the Bell Field car park are used to capacity and quotations are being sought to provide more parking there.	No change.

<p>Are sites of less than 10 dwellings likely to reap community benefits?</p>	<p>The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) applies to all sites, so there will be a financial gain that the Parish Council can use to assist in the provision of community benefits. Once the neighbourhood plan is agreed, the Parish's share of the CIL increases from 15% to 25%.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Summary</p> <p>This policy was largely supported provided the spaces were well designed and encouraged informal community contacts for all ages. There were concerns that the cost of maintenance of such areas would fall on the Parish Council.</p>		<p>No change.</p>

## Q28 Social and Community Infrastructure Community Action – Pursue Shared Space and Traffic Calming Plans with Rother DC and ESCC

Yes 83.78% | No 5.07% | Don't Know 11.15%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Early in the morning and late at night, speed through the High Street is a serious problem.	The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council is working with ESCC, the police and the Speed-watch team to lessen speeds. Methods of slowing traffic are being considered.	No change.
Do not use our cars for traffic calming. We have had two cars written off in the High Street. Cars are forced to park on pavements to protect themselves.	The Parish Council does not have a policy of using parking areas as a traffic calming measure. However, it cannot endorse parking on pavements as this can endanger pedestrians.	No change.
Shared space schemes elsewhere have not been universally successful especially on busy roads.	The proposal for shared space would be within the village square, with limited parking and the ability to temporarily remove all parking for particular events.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Coloured road surfaces for Ticehurst are too modern.	There is no plan for a coloured surface in Ticehurst village square. Consideration is being given to mixing a light-coloured stone into the tarmac mix before it is laid to create a gentler and more rural look to the road surface.	No change.
<p>Speed should be limited:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In the centre of Ticehurst.</li> <li>• East side of Flimwell traffic lights – reduce to 40 mph from 50 mph.</li> <li>• Continuous speed limit of 30mph from Ticehurst through to Flimwell is needed.</li> </ul>	All traffic calming measures are being considered in conjunction with East Sussex Highways, who are not willing to consider reductions in the speed limits at this time. A request for a 20-mph limit within the centre of Ticehurst has been made to East Sussex Highways.	No change.
Improve access to the village hall from the rear and people might be encouraged to use the car park.	The Parish Council will consider and cost this suggestion.	No change.
Create a layby opposite the church in Flimwell.	The Parish Council has no authority over the highways and pavements. This suggestion will be put forward to East Sussex Highways.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Create a roundabout at the junction of B2087 and B2099.	East Sussex Highways has, at the request of the Parish Council, carried out extensive examinations of this junction regarding the request for a roundabout. Their safety team consider it would be dangerous and will not countenance it.	No change.
Slow the traffic coming down the hill into Springfield.	This has become an increasing problem and the Parish Council will consider measures to slow the traffic. Speed humps were installed at the request of the Parish Council but do not appear to be enough to slow the traffic safely.	No change.
Parking for residents and deliveries, in the centre of Stonegate, is a problem because of school staff and parents. Off road parking should be available.	The Parish Council does not own any land in this area and has no powers to provide off-road parking. If Stonegate School were to make enquiries about a piece of land for parking, the Parish Council would support this (unless other factors came to light through the application process).	No change.



Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
How do we restrict the size of lorries coming through the villages?	The Parish Council have made representation to ESCC about the size of vehicles using the lanes and Church Street, where lorries frequently block the road. The increase in industrial units in farm premises has exacerbated this problem. “Unsuitable for large vehicle” signs have been requested but are not enforceable. Satnavs suitable for larger vehicle are available but it would appear are not widely used due to the additional expense.	“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1.
Maximum speed 20mph should be enforced through villages and for all B, C and D roads in the Parish.	East Sussex Highways will only consider 20-mph restrictions for small areas and will not make a blanket restriction.	No change.
Safe crossings for the village square and to the recreation ground.	A formal crossing is being considered for the village square by East Sussex Highways. The Parish Council would like to provide one near the Village Institute, but they are informed that the cost would be in the region of £80,000 which is prohibitive.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There was a strong response and support for this policy. The speed and volume of traffic and the size of lorries threaten the safety, peace and enjoyment of villagers, who press for clearer pedestrian pathways and limits to traffic speed. There were several helpful suggestions which the Parish Council will consider.</p>		“Quiet lanes” are now included in Infrastructure Community Action 1.

## Q29 Social and Community Infrastructure Community Action – Complete an Open Space, Sport & Recreational Audit

Yes 89.60% | No 9.18% | Don't know 1.02%

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Ensure areas are accessible for people with disabilities and facilities for young teenagers.	A Youth Club was started in 2017 for teenagers and is supported financially by the Parish Council. Any improvements or new play areas will be disability-friendly.	No change.
Must have information boards.	There are notice boards in each ward of the Parish.	No change.
An annual litter pick would be a good idea.	The Parish Council spends over £5000 a year on litter picking, provision of waste bins and dog bins and the emptying service. There are a number of volunteer litter pickers who organise road picks and the PC is grateful to them for their work – additional volunteers are always welcome. The Parish Council feels that the focus should be on the prevention of littering; residents using the village bins for their household litter should be firmly discouraged.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/ Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Improve the base for the adult gym – too muddy in winter.	The Parish Council takes this comment on board and will obtain quotations for this work.	No change.
Recreational sport needs to be encouraged to keep a healthy community.	The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council entered lengthy negotiation to secure the use of the Bell Field as a sports ground, defended legal action against the closure of part of the Village Institute recreational facilities, and encourages the use of these fields for sporting teams. The Parish Council provides the recreation ground at Flimwell (which hosts the local cricket team) and the sports field at Stonegate.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>There is almost 90% support for ensuring our Parish is an attractive, litter-free and modern recreational environment, suitable for all ages.</p>		No change.

## Q30 Social & Community Infrastructure Community Action – Encourage Recreational Use of the AONB

Yes 84.35% | No 3.74% | Don't Know 11.90%

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Display boards about local places of interest should be set up.	As part of the Ticehurst Village centre refurbishment plans, the Parish Council hopes to provide more information about the Parish. The map on the window of the village shop was commissioned by the Parish Council.	No change.
The Information pack provided to new comers to the village is welcomed and maps of footpath walks in the area would be useful.	Welcome folders are provided to new residents, including the footpath maps and a booklet of local shops, services, clubs and schools. The Parish Council does rely on local people assisting to distribute them to new neighbours.	No change.
News and Views is a good vehicle to provide information.	The neighbourhood plan team has regular updates in News and Views, and the Parish Council use the magazine to update residents on their work and to canvass opinion.	No change.

Summary of Community Comments/Main Issues and Concerns	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
Footpath groups have been great for the villages.	The Parish Council agrees. The Parish Council are very grateful for the information from the Footpath Groups on paths that need attention. This is passed on to ESCC and to the volunteers who run the healthy walks in the Parish.	No change.
<p>Summary</p> <p>Respondents felt privileged to live in such a lovely part of the country. Promotion of the Parish was felt to be good so long as it did not have a negative impact on quiet enjoyment or on wildlife</p>		No change.

## 04 Written Responses to the Pre-Submission Draft Plan

### Policy-Related Comments

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
3	R2	Parishioner	Clarification of green gaps between settlements – extend green gap past Rosemary Lane to Bewl Close. Clarify map.	The green gaps are important to identify settlements, to give them a sense of place, and to avoid ribbon development.	R2 has been modified with revised map of green gaps.
14	R2	Parishioner	Improved plan of green gap which should be extended towards Flimwell.	Agreed – this is being reviewed and better maps are being obtained through Rother DC.	R2 has been modified with revised map of green gaps.
7, 9	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green space S1 (owned by Mr Cameron).	Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.	R3 has been modified to remove S1.
16	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green space S5 (owned by Mr Smith).	Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.	R3 has been modified to remove S5.
27	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green space S5 (owned by Mr Smith).	Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.	R3 has been modified to remove S5.

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
45	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green space T7 (owned by Mr Everett's family).	The Parish Council has written to explain why it has been retained as a green space.	No action.
46	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green spaces S3 (should be S5) and F1. These spaces are allotments on land which is privately owned and should not be allocated.	Two allotment plots have been withdrawn.	R3 has been modified to remove S5 and F1.
52	R3	Parishioner	Objection to allocation of green space T7 (owned by Mr and Mrs Spencer).	The pond and not the land to the south are to be included, not the garden curtilage.	R3 has been modified to clarify what green spaces are and are not.
14	R4	Parishioner	A footpath on the road between Flimwell and Ticehurst is not viable – too dangerous.	ESCC have also made this point. The Parish Council is investigating a route from Banky Field to Tinkers Lane avoiding the road.	R4 has been modified to focus on footpath connection over fields rather than road.
23	H1	Thakeham Homes	Ticehurst PC should allocate sites, rather than RDC in the DaSA	RDC is not allocating sites for Ticehurst in the DaSA, this is being done in the Ticehurst Neighbourhood Plan.	No action.

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
10, 48, 49	H1	Parishioners	Offer of land near Stonegate station made on behalf of owner Mr Enville. Parish Clerk letter rejected it as outside timescale for Call for Sites.	The Parish Council has written explaining that this offer arrived after the call for sites deadline and suggested approaching RDC to see if this can be an enabling exception site.	No action.
1	H2	Parishioner	Mistake in map of Orchard farm site.	Map is revised – apologies for the mistake.	H2 map has been modified.
8, 24	H2	Parishioner	House (Maxima) adjacent to Wardsdown House refused planning permission on grounds of AONB, so why is Wardsdown House being allocated?	Maxima went to appeal which was refused.  Wardsdown House was identified in the SHLAA. Flimwell must provide a minimum of 9 houses to meet the Rother DC allocation.	The Site Assessment document has been revised and the SEA has been revised.



Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
15	H2	Parishioner	Why allocate houses in Ticehurst village when its quota has been met?	Orchard Farm has been recognised by Rother DC as suitable for up to 6 houses. Hillbury Field has not sold to date. The allocation of the Singehurst site has received little objection from Parishioners and the latest outline plan meets all the points raised by the planning inspector.	No action.
			Social housing should be allocated only to people with a proven connection to the Parish. Even 5 houses are too large a site for allocation.	Policy H4 states that people with a strong connection to Ticehurst should be allocated affordable housing (as far as possible).  Less than 5 houses do not count towards the number of houses allocated by RDC.	No action.

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
11, 21, 22, 25, 29, 30, 31, 32, 35, 44	H2	Parishioners	<p><i>Objection to allocation of Wardsdown House site for 9 dwellings.</i></p> <p><i>These residents, many of whom live adjacent to the Wardsdown site, essentially gave similar objections as follows (see following boxes, below).</i></p>		
			The development will be on a greenfield site in the AONB.	Corner Farm, Banky Field and Hillbury Field have all been given planning permission for sites which were greenfield, sadly a necessity to meet target housing figures.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.
			It would open up the eastern end of the site for development later. It would also open up the possibility of access to Site 02, which has the same owners.	The owners do not own the land between Site 01 and Site 02, so could not link these two sites.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.
			It is adjacent to ancient woodland (to the north) which is an important habitat and should be protected.	There will be a buffer of at least 15m between the housing and the ancient woodland.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
			If the site were extended, it would have a major impact on the residents of Fruitfields.	H2 has been revised to oppose building behind Fruitfields.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.
			Flimwell has no facilities (school, shop, village hall, doctor) to accommodate the extra residents.	The Corner Farm site in Flimwell is now being built and will provide a village hall and shop.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.
			The track to the west is too narrow to accommodate traffic. The track is also a PRow (part of the Sussex Border Path), used as a local footpath to walk down to Bewl Water.	East Sussex Highways believe the track can be improved for traffic.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.
			It would be better to site Flimwell development either on the east side of the A21 or in Stonegate.	Sites for new housing in Flimwell (as in other villages) must be within or adjacent to the old development boundary, which is being revised in the neighbourhood plan.	The Site Assessment document has been written and the SEA has been revised to address these concerns.

Ref	Policy	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
31	H2	DHA Planning for Peer Group (owners of Wardsdown House)	Asks for Wardsdown House site to be allocated for more houses (23).	<p>The Site Assessment document has been revised and gives reasons for not allocating more houses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H1 prefers smaller sites of 10 or fewer houses.</li> <li>• Developing to the east would have a major impact on the houses in Fruitfields.</li> <li>• The western end of the site is well screened with minimal impact on the AONB.</li> </ul>	<p>The Site Assessment document has been revised.</p> <p>The SEA has been revised.</p>
23	H4	Thakeham Homes	Supports policy H4. Suggests amendment to policy H4 wording “acknowledging scheme viability in respect to affordable housing”.	The Parish Council has not accepted the wording amendment suggested.	H4 has been modified.

## Comments Not Related to Policies

Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
2, 6	Parishioner	Bewl Water needs far more emphasis.	Accepted and will re-draft	New policy R5 Support Biodiversity has been added.
4	Price Whitehead	Dale Hill Farm site. Information on TNP has been forwarded to owners	Noted.	No action.
12	Parishioner	Supportive comment on Ticehurst draft neighbourhood plan.	Thank you.	No action.
13, 17	Parishioner	Will parking in Ticehurst Square be restricted to shoppers and residents?	Aim is to achieve limited half hour or hour parking in the square between 8am and 6pm to assist businesses.	No action.

Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
18	Parishioner	Not feasible to include a plan of action to create durable, year-round safe footpaths. Plan should not use “local authority speak”.	The Parish Council accept this but will aim for improvement and better monitoring.	R4 has been modified to focus on footpath connection over fields rather than road.
20	Parishioner	Query on financial viability of Flimwell Park owners.	The Parish Council is not authorised to question personal finances. Good building progress is now being made on the Flimwell Park site.	No action.
28	Parishioners	Supportive comments. No more housing needed in Ticehurst village. Traffic control, road and pavement improvements are the major issues.	<p>The housing allocation to 2028 needs to be met. It is likely, with the revisions to the NPPF, that there will be a further increase in this allocation, hence the need to get the NP in place before this happens.</p> <p>Meetings with ESCC and Rother DC are on-going to try and address the traffic issues.</p>	No action.

Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
37	Parishioners	Protection of trees needed, too many are being cut down and not replaced.	The Parish Council agree. Two horse chestnuts in Ticehurst Square were not viable, 4 trees have replaced them. The Parish is also planting on the approach from the east at Marlpit. Tree works at the Village Hall were necessary and will enhance the trees' longevity.	No action.
38	Parishioner	Generally supportive. Better connections between rail and bus would mean less dependence on cars.	The Parish Council agree and are planning to talk to Stage Coach.	No action.
41	Parishioners	Generally supportive. Concerned that there is no plan to implement these policies.	A plan to implement the policies will follow.	No action.
		More car parking needed for Ticehurst village.	There is a plan to extend the Bell Field car park again, still being discussed.	No action.

Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
		Footpath Flimwell to Ticehurst needs local landowners to give land – will they?	The Parish Council has had discussions with local landowners and will continue to do so on this subject.	No action.
		Bewl cycle path is dangerous – are there plans to make it safer?	Bewl Water is in private ownership, but they have pledged to improve cycle routes.	No action.
		Does the plan dovetail with neighbouring villages?	All Parish Councils working on neighbourhood plans have an obligation to report what they are doing and seek input from neighbouring parishes.	No action.
42	Parishioner	Concerned that the assessment of Homan Wood (Linda Sutton is owner) is biased compared to Wardsdown House.	Access for Homan Wood is not seen as viable. Covenants were not supplied by the owner with documentation as requested.	The Site Assessment document has been revised.



Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
43	Parishioners	R1(2) is village-centric – AONB is the whole Parish.	Housing development will inevitably be in or adjacent to the villages.	No action.
		Any new cycle or footpaths need to be careful not to add to landscape clutter.	The Parish Council agrees.	No action.
		Support cars not parked on pavements.	The Parish Council agrees that this is unacceptable but no enforcement on parking is being done by police or Rother DC.	No action.
		New masts are a major concern to residents and need to be properly consulted on – do not give “in principle” support.	Any new masts are subject to full planning consultation.	No action.
		Do not like the new road layouts proposed in Ticehurst and Stonegate.	The drawings demonstrated ways that have been successful at calming traffic elsewhere rather than a plan.	No action.

Ref	Person	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council response	Resultant changes to draft plan
47	Parishioner	Objection to Whiligh Corn Store being considered for development.	Whiligh Corn Store was considered only for commercial development, not housing. It is now omitted.	E4 policy support has been modified to delete mention of Whiligh Corn Store site.
50	Parishioner	Petition to put 30mph speed limit on the whole of Lynden Lane.	The Parish Council is working to make it a “quiet lane”.	No action.
51	Parishioner	Need flashing speed sign to slow down traffic entering Ticehurst. Concerned that there is too much affordable housing being planned and that it will go to people from outside Ticehurst who do not want to live in a rural village.	This is being considered by the Parish Council amongst other measures.  The Parish Council have requested that it is able to contribute to affordable housing allocation, but it cannot control what land usage purchasers apply for when submitting a planning application.	No action.

## 05 Evidence Based Review Comments (AECOM)

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
R1 AONB	No documents on “active travel” (cycling, walking) in Evidence Base,	Add the following documents:  Hastings and Rother Accessibility Assessment (2007)  ESCC Local Transport Plan (2016/17-2020/21).	Added documents to Evidence base.
	Add value to this policy by local distinctiveness (e.g. with Local Landscape Character Assessment).	The Parish Council does not feel that a Local Landscape Character Assessment would add value to that in the High Weald AONB Management Plan – Ticehurst is a typical AONB Parish.	No change.
R2 Green Gaps	Call for Sites document criteria should reference consultation statements.	Call for Sites document replaced by Site Assessment document. References to consultation statements to be added.	New Site Assessment document.

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
R <sub>3</sub> Green Spaces	Insufficient evidence on why each area should be designated and how its qualities would endure beyond the plan period. Policy CF <sub>2</sub> of Rother local plan protects recreational facilities.	Add the following document: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rother DC Green Infrastructure Background Paper Addendum (2016).</li> <li>Strengthen reasons for designating particular green spaces.</li> <li>Cross-reference AONB plan landscape character assessments.</li> </ul>	Add document to Evidence base. R <sub>3</sub> has been modified.
R <sub>4</sub> Footpaths & Cycle paths	No major problems but would benefit from correlating with AONB maps of Historic Routeways and ESCC maps of PRoW	This would be a major task.	No change.
E <sub>1</sub> Protect local services	No major problems	Reference Rother Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy EC<sub>7</sub> Retail Development</li> <li>Policy EC<sub>3</sub> Existing Employment Sites.</li> </ul>	E <sub>1</sub> has been modified.

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
E2 Support tourism	No major problems	Reference Rother Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy EC6 Tourism Activities and Facilities.</li> </ul>	E2 has been modified.
E3 Promote agricultural diversification	No major problems	Reference source of data – 2% of jobs within the Parish.	E3 has been modified.
E4 Protect Business Sites	No major problems	Reference source of data – 50% of jobs done by local people Reference Rother Local Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Policy EC2 Business Land and Premises</li> <li>Policy EC3 Existing Employment Sites</li> <li>Reference DaSA Local Plan Employment Sites Review</li> <li>Reference Hastings and Rother Employment Strategy and Land Review (2008).</li> </ul>	E4 has been modified.  Added documents to the Evidence base.

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
E5 Protect and enhance village centres	No major problems	Reference survey of Flimwell residents on village hall and shop.  Add “protection of facilities from change of use” to policy.	E5 has been amalgamated with E1 and incorporates the changes suggested.
E6 Improve essential infrastructure	No major problems	Policy description could be broadened to include objectives from TNP and planning policies referred to.	E6 has been modified.
H1 Spatial Plan	Universal policy of max 30 houses per ha has no evidence.	Change wording to “seek 30 dwellings per ha to be applied on a case-by-case basis”.	H1 has been modified.
	Poor choice of words in third criteria “priority will be given”	Change wording to “smaller in-fill schemes on brownfield sites are supported”.	H1 has been modified.
H2 Housing site allocations	Concern over the robustness of Site Allocation	Rewrite Call for Sites document as Site Assessment, using AECOM’s Site Assessment tool.	H2 has been modified. New Site Assessment document has been written.

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
H3 Mix of housing	Policy wording vague and open to wide interpretation.	Rewrite policy using data from Rother Strategic Housing Research Report (2018) to review and justify the mix of housing.	H3 has been modified.
		Add the Report to the Evidence Base.	Added Rother Strategic Housing report to Evidence base.
H4 Affordable Housing	Figures for houses built since 2011 do not tally.	Review houses completed since 2010.	Documents in Evidence base on housing have been reviewed and modified.
	Local connection test is weakly worded.	Rewrite local connection test with more evidence if possible.	H4 has been modified.
H5 Design of Buildings	No reference to PLACE and Visioning exercises	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference early consultations (PLACE and Visioning).</li> <li>Design Guidance should refer to The Design Council's Building for Life 12 (2012)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H5 has been modified</li> <li>Design Guidance has been modified.</li> </ul>

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
H5 Design of Buildings	Policy on light pollution adds nothing to the Local Plan policies. Additions to existing buildings may be exempt from planning permission.	Reword on light pollution to be more local.	Design Guidance has been modified.
H6 Conservation and Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient evidence for this policy.</li> <li>• Part 1 of the policy is too broad and lacks detail as to how it will be achieved.</li> <li>• Suggest changing Part 2 “will be carried out in conjunction with” to “will conform to”.</li> </ul>	Review the policy wording.	H6 has been modified.



Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
INF <sub>1</sub> Improvements to village centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient evidence.</li> <li>Public realm strategy referred to is not yet documented.</li> <li>Policy should define priorities for public realm improvements.</li> <li>Policy does not define how to manage change in this area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reference early consultations (PLACE and Visioning)</li> <li>Reference Rother Policy EN<sub>2</sub>, EN<sub>3</sub> and TR<sub>3</sub>.</li> <li>Tie in Design Guidance and Conservation Area Appraisal to give one strategy and design guidance document.</li> </ul>	INF <sub>1</sub> has been modified.
INF <sub>2</sub> Community energy projects	<p>Two minor wording changes in supporting text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Omit “A secondary goal would be to provide help and advice on energy efficiency.”</li> <li>Elaborate “working in partnership”.</li> </ul>	Reference Rother Policy SRM <sub>1</sub> and modify supporting text wording.	INF <sub>2</sub> has been modified.

Policy	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Parish Council Response	Resultant changes to Draft Plan
INF <sub>3</sub> Community areas	Is there a local requirement for developers to produce maintenance plans? (Reference is to South Cambs DC).	<p>Add the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rother Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation Study (2007).</li> <li>• Reference Rother Policy CO6.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• INF<sub>3</sub> has been modified.</li> <li>• Added documents suggested to Evidence base.</li> </ul>



