

BTC responses on Regulation 16 comments made to RDC

(Please note that the comments below from respondents to Regulation 16 have been copied verbatim as they appear on the RDC website.)

Text in black is the original comments from respondents at RDC Regulation 16 consultation

Text in blue is editorial instruction

Text in red is further actions required

Text in green is new edited text

BCPNP/R16/2020/5

East Sussex County Council

Commenting on the Whole Plan

Although many of the changes that we suggested have been made, we would like to highlight the recommended changes at Regulation 14 which have not been included in the Submission Version of the plan

Minerals Planning Authority - Our Regulation 14 response included the following comment: The area identified as a 'Proposed Addition to the Netherfield Development Boundary' on map 2 (page 56) of the draft Battle Neighbourhood Plan, is located partially within the Minerals Safeguarding Area SP-MSA/C British Gypsum as depicted on map 65 (page 145) of the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan (WMSP) see following link <http://consult.eastsussex.gov.uk/file/4409374>

We recommend that the advisory text is added to the written part of 'Policy HD1: Development Boundaries' in order to make it clear that the proposed additional development boundary for Netherfield (Map 2) is an 'Area with permission for underground mining'.

For HD1, we suggest inserting following as a last new paragraph to 5.1.1:

"The development boundary extension in Netherfield includes an area with permission for underground mining, where there is already some adjacent housing. Anyone undertaking or considering operations/developments within the proposed development boundary at Netherfield, as extended by this Plan, are advised to contact British Gypsum regarding the existing and future extent of the mine and land-stability in that area."

With regards to 'Map 2: Proposed Development Boundary -Netherfield' on page 70 (of the submission version) the foot note is somewhat misleading by stating that "the site (in yellow) already has Planning Permission". In actual fact the Planning Permissions which are referenced only cover about 40% of the yellow area; they only relate to the field area labelled West House. The remaining area does not have planning permission for new development.

For Map 2, We had previously noted that the Map caption is incorrect, so it needs to be changed and I suggest following to encompass both that and the above response suggestion:

Map 2: Proposed Development Boundary - Netherfield

The area shown in yellow shows the boundary extension proposed in this Plan. NOTE: The area shown with the text "West House" superimposed on it (though not referring to it) already has Planning Permission granted for development (RR/2017/2308/P and RR/2019/921/P – land to south-west of Darvel Down. *Anyone undertaking or considering operations/developments within the development boundary, as extended by this Plan, are advised to contact British Gypsum regarding the existing and future extent of the mine and land-stability in that area.*

Biodiversity

Whilst we are glad to see that some of our Regulation 14 comments have been taken onboard, we would like to reiterate the following points:

Natural heritage and ancient woodland: There is still nothing on this included within the text of the plan, although we do note the inclusion of the map (Figure 7) on page 32 of the constraints section.

We will ask D.Moles NP SG consultant to insert the relevant text, at an appropriate point.

Site allocations and Ecological Impact Assessment: Policy HD2 - All sites should also be subject to an Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) which should identify potential impacts on biodiversity, follow the mitigation hierarchy and provide a net gain for biodiversity in line with Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, paragraphs 170 and 175 of the NPPF and commitments made by the government in the 25 Year Environment Plan, expected to be made mandatory through the forthcoming Environment Act. This has largely been taken into account, but the wording of the policy needs to be adjusted to make it clearer with regard to Biodiversity Net Gains (BNG) and the requirements of the Environment Bill. At point 4 the policy states that Biodiversity Net Gain should be provided as on-site or off-site enhancements. The wording needs to reflect the fact that the Environment Bill states that BNG should be provided on-site, and it is only in cases where this is not possible that off-site enhancements can be made.

We will ask D.Moles NP SG consultant to insert the relevant text, at an appropriate point

Policy EN1 - Local Green Space Designations. Two of the LGS (Kingsmead Open Space and Coronation Gardens) have been identified as receptor sites for reptiles from the Blackfriars site. As such, they must be protected and managed for reptiles in perpetuity. This point has still not been addressed. It is an important and relevant point which needs to be acknowledged in the plan.

We will ask D.Moles NP SG consultant to insert the relevant text, at an appropriate point
BTC response: It should also be noted that BTC has taken the opportunity for LGS BA GS 04 and BA GS 17 both to be progressed for designation as Town and Village Greens status.

Policy EN2: Natural Environment - Generally supported, but should also make reference to the protection of Local Wildlife Sites and protected and notable species and habitats. Trees and hedgerows which are of biodiversity value should also be retained and protected. It is good to see that this has been addressed. From a biodiversity point of view we support Policy EN2. It is disappointing to see that the Sussex Local Nature Partnership's Natural Capital Investment Strategy still has not been used as part of the key evidence base.

We will ask D.Moles NP SG consultant to insert the relevant text, at an appropriate point

Historic Environment The updated document is much improved. However, we still feel that Figure 8 on page 33 of the revised document is difficult to interpret as there are too many overlapping layers, separate figures with few layers on would definitely help with the visual clarity.

BTC response: As this is a "Figure style" map we are presenting it as for general narrative information and we feel that, where necessary, details are given elsewhere, so there does not seem to a need to edit.

The legend still uses incorrect terminology: 'Archaeological Sensitive Areas' should be 'Archaeological Notification Areas'; 'Ancient Monuments' should be 'Scheduled Monuments' – refer to comments 4.6 & 4.7 on page 36 of the 'consultation statement' document provided).

BTC response: We will ask RDC (Julia to ask Chris) to edit the Key on the map graphic. When it is delivered to BTC it will be forwarded to D.Moles for editing.

We are not clear on what 'Map 8: Heritage Assets' on page 77 of the revised document is showing. We believe it relates to entries tabulated in 'Schedule 2: Battle CP Local Heritage List – non-designated heritage assets' on pages 89-92.

BTC response: That is a correct understanding, so we agree that changing the title of Map 8 and adding a description will improve readers' comprehension.

We think it would be helpful if the map could be retitled to match the title of Schedule 2, with Schedule 2 making direct reference to this map to avoid any confusion with other classes of non-designated heritage assets.

BTC response: map title and new caption will be edited as follows:

Map 8: Battle CP Local Heritage – non-designated assets

This map is presented to show the geo-location of the assets listed in Schedule 2. This provides a spatial understanding that assets are located all over the CP and not just in the built environment.

BCPNP/R16/2020/10

David Furness

Commenting on the Whole Plan

The process was corrupt

BTC Response: Battle Town Council, using their complaints procedure, addressed the issues raised by this potential local developer and found no basis for supporting the assertion. Accordingly this was formally relayed to the respondent.

BCPNP/R16/2020/16a

Adam Clegg / Alex Yearsley / JLL

Objecting to the section: Strategic Environmental Assessment, para 1.25

We disagree. There are sites, such as that promoted by Wates Developments that are unconstrained and readily available and should be actively encouraged for development via an allocation in the Plan. It is considered the incorrect approach for the NP to do the bare minimum in terms of meeting housing need. There should be a more thorough assessment of sites available in Battle and identification of these in the plan would give more control to the Parish on what additional sites they would like to see come forward.

BTC Response: A professional assessment of sites suitable for development was conducted by AECOM. The bare minimum has not been allocated at Regulation 15. Oversupply in Battle of 7 dwellings and an oversupply of 10 dwellings in Netherfield.

BCPNP/R16/2020/20

Sharon Wyburgh Davis

Commenting on Neighbourhood Plan, Chpt 3.52

Transport in Netherfield: The plan should clarify its explanation of limited bus service. The voluntary bus service runs Monday to Friday. The timetable slightly fluctuates depending on which day of the week & sometimes having no voluntary driver can impact the service. The timetable means that working people cannot use the bus service. There are school buses that come up to Netherfield but no other buses. I have contacted Huw Merriman about lack of transport & he said contact the local councillor which I did & received no response.

BTC Response: This has been logged in section 7 (Community Aspirations) in the Submission Plan. The Plan cannot predetermine National Policies

BCPNP/R16/2020/23a

Maurice Holmes – Netherfield Residents Opposition Group

Comment on the Neighbourhood Plan

Part 2 Development, taking due account of historic factors, does not seem to be addressed in this plan. The list of objections put forward by over 60 homes in Netherfield in the latest Feedback situation, specifically mentioned, under Item 6 (see attachment), the historic Post Office situated within Sites NE5a and NE5r. This building is due to be demolished to erect 10 houses, over and above the total expounded by Rother as appropriate for Netherfield. As engagement with the local community is supposed to underpin this Neighbourhood Plan, how does AECOM appear to have more influence than the local community residents?

SWOT Analysis on page 34 Section 3.10. How is it possible to list a series of threats, such as "development which might not meet the needs of the community" and "lack of resources", when clear visions of the communities needs have been provided over the years in many formats, when none of these threats have been addressed or taken into consideration?

Section 4.1 (page 35) provides statistics on response rates. The return rates are below what should be considered as being acceptable to implement a Neighbourhood Plan. Given the response rate in Netherfield against the proposals, which have not changed, what evidence does the Steering Group bring forward to support the statement in 4.2 "To reflect the nature of the Parish and the direction the local community wants the plan to take"? For the apparent flawed application on Site NE1, 100 Netherfield homes sent in objections, overwhelming negativity was received at the Memorial meeting in 2017 and 60+ objections in the latest feedback.

Objective 1 (Page 36) states "The community acknowledges at least 48 for Netherfield". and "Development boundaries to reflect not only the AONB character of the locality". There is no evidence that the community acknowledges 48 for Netherfield. The proposals are also outside of the current development boundary, which is classed as another determinant for dismissal.

Therefore, "reflection on the character" would be impossible and is contradictory to the Rother Policy OSS1(b). How is this compliant with OSS1(e) on restricting new development and sensitive diversification?

Objective 2 in the plan would also be unable to be met with the Plan's own assessment that Netherfield would have approximately 200+ new cars associated with the development of these 58 new houses.

The character requirements of OSS1(c) in this rural location, such as small-scale infill, would be the preferred option of the community in Netherfield.

Objective 5 -The Protection of Open Spaces and the Countryside, is also completely undermined by the Plan currently being assessed. The 33 houses in the plan, trying to capitalise on the

Site NE1 agreement which has questions to answer on its validity, will be built on green belt, AONB and destroy historic buildings to meet the needs of unidentified residents.

BCPNP/R16/2020/23b

Maurice Holmes – Netherfield Residents Opposition Group

Comment on the Neighbourhood Plan, pg. 37-43

Part 3 - Objective No 8 has not been shown to be substantive in this proposed Plan. The statement “whether social, sporting or otherwise” appears to have no proposals within the Plan. The village is in dire need of a Doctor's Surgery along similar lines to the practice in Catsfield. A proposal which would have required tarmac to be laid at the village hall, and supported by residents was vetoed by the District Council stating that it was on AONB. Yet this plan, and its extra 33 houses does just that, with roadways and tarmacadam,.

Objective No 9 seeks to alleviate where possible traffic congestion. How can the plan, with an estimated 200+ extra cars originating from the 58 houses on Darvel Down be considered to address that objective?

It states under a Policy HD1 ; “The Plan designates development boundaries for Battle and Netherfield”. The enclosed Inset Map No 24 of Netherfield, indicates the current and adopted development boundary for Netherfield which has been in place as a Rother policy since 2006. The rest of Map 24 shows that it is all AONB . The Plan's Map No 2 (enclosed) provides a picture to what is apparently factual. It states under Map 2 “site (in yellow) already has planning permission: RR/2017/2308/P and RR/2019/921/P”. This implies that the entire site stretching from the western-most extremities of Whitehouse Farm to the Eastern-most extremities of Swallow Barn already have planning permission. They do not. Site NE1 has planning permissions which are going through the process of re-evaluation due to the issues on possession and ownership. There is no other Planning Permission on these sites.

The site allocation (48 for Netherfield) was an arbitrary figure imposed on Netherfield, yet resisted for Telham. I challenge the assumption that the figure for Netherfield is a fixed commodity.

Section 5.1.2. Policy Intent. Given the detail laid out within the plan and the Rother figure for Netherfield of 48, how do the Steering Group arrive at 33 instead of 23. This will increase the 100 houses already on Darvel Down by an extra 60%.

On page 43 under Policy HD5 item I indicates integrating new development sympathetically with its surrounds. The Plan does not reflect this.

Included in that assessment by the Steering Group is the Section which offers the Maintenance of Green Gaps. Netherfield currently has a green gap Site NE1 (AONB), currently now known as Darwell Hill (from 1500). Is putting 58 new house in that space achieving that objective?

BCPNP/R16/2020/23c

Maurice Holmes – Netherfield Residents Opposition Group

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg. 52-56

Part 4 -Section 5.3.1 and Objective 5 (page 52) indicates to all residents and others alike, that “Plans must restrict the use of land for development which is primarily already outside of the development boundaries and has been designated as AONB.” The Plan put forward by the Steering Group indicates in Map 2, that they are not abiding by their own determinations. This Plan runs contrary to the wishes of the majority of residents, who provided 60+ Feedback Forms with their objections in the recent discussions with the Steering Group at the Netherfield Village Stores and the Village Hall prior to completion of the Plan.

How can the Steering Group justify that this Plan also meets the policy outlined in 5.3.3 and Policy EN3 where it states that development will only be supported where it: (2) reflects the settlement pattern of the neighbourhood (the 58 house are exceeding the 16 per hectare on the estate that it adjoins by a minimum of 56.25%), and not result in the degradation of historic features (such as the removal of the Post Office from Site NE5a).

Page 56 Section 5.4.1, Policy ET2 and 5.4.2 indicates that the Plan will be supportive to “encourage employment opportunities” and “enhance the role of Tourism in the Parish”. Both of those “intents” are unrealistic for the Village of Netherfield. Access to our Village Hall can only be safely undertaken by a vehicle, which restricts even the local residents from attending functions, and sites that might have been available for small business opportunities are in this plan for development.

BCPNP/R16/2020/23d

**Maurice Holmes (NROG) – Netherfield Residents Opposition Group
Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg. 57-58**

Part 5 - The Plan states that the Rother Core Strategy omitted Netherfield in any call for employment sites for the village. The 48 houses (Rother's figures) will generate 150 -200 cars, which will increase the potential number of cars to 230 if you use the 58 houses identified in the Plan, yet neither Rother or the Steering Group has provided facilities to enable all those extra people to work locally, save the environment and be sustainable.

Objective 8. The only option for a Doctor's surgery, would have been to use the facilities at the Village Hall. This was vetoed by RDC due to the AONB location, however tarmacadam was allowed at site NE1. This objective also indicates how CIL funds will be spent. Proposals will be sent to Battle Town Hall. Residents were unaware of this requirement and so no proposals have been set before the council. This should be rejected in the Plan.

BCPNP/R16/2020/23e

**Maurice Holmes (NROG) – Netherfield Residents Opposition Group
Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg. 61-67**

Part 6- Community Aspirations - The residents of Netherfield provided a 10 point breakdown of the issues, on the feedback form, that the consultations had raised as troubling. The consultation document by the Steering Group addresses none of those issues. The Plans housing target is incorrect and inconsistent with the Core Strategy.

Ambitions section: 3 -reen corridors are only necessary for a brownfield site. The 58 dwellings will remove what is already a 3 hectare green corridor between the old and new parts of Netherfield. 6 - Improve local public transport. The economics of running a public transport system from Netherfield to Heathfield and Battle, do not provide an incentive to any transport organisation, that their efforts will be rewarded from a financial perspective. 7 - Will parents whose children go to the School on Darvel Down, but don't live there, be asked to remove their children so the new families in the 58 houses can get in? There has always been a bus for Children to Claverham. The problem lies with schooling elsewhere which has never been addressed except by the individual families, using car journeys. 8- How do the Steering Group justify this ambition when the Site proposed by the Residents, NE2, giving access to the Hall and Church was vetoed? 9- The only option from a venue point of view is the Village Hall. There are no other facilities that would be suitable. It would require tarmac on the car park for wheelchairs and prams etc and would have included a footpath in the plan from Darvel Down to the Hall. This was vetoed by Rother.

None of Section 4 - Main Issues, pages 17-19 from the Rother Core Strategy 2014 have been met by this Plan as identified in the 6 parts of Objections submitted as representations.

BTC Response to all the above comments relating to Maurice Holmes (Netherfield Residents Opposition Group):

We have not been made aware of the status of the Netherfield Residents Opposition Group, its constitution or membership. The respondent organised a petition which was used as a response to the Regulation 14 consultation and is recorded in the Consultation Statement pages 172-181

The respondent has a personal undeclared interest in this and earlier submissions because his property is adjacent to a site where planning permission has been granted (RR/2017/2308/P and RR/2019/921/P) and which also abuts a Neighbourhood Plan, site NE05a/r.

BCPNP/R16/2020/25

Graham Bishop

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, policy HD2

Action Requested: Provision of information requested on 14 December 2020 under Freedom of Information Act to enable a proper review of the sources of information used by AECOM in their flawed assessment process.

A completely fresh review of BA3 and BA NS107 by Rother Council's own planning staff in close co-operation with the owners so that the actual plans can be analysed.

BTC Response: An FOI, triggered during the Reg15/16 processes was issued by this respondent and Battle Town Council is currently responding.

The access to this land is the subject of a longstanding and ongoing "technical matter" dating back several years and due to this, the sites could not be included in the Plan.

Of course, the respondent could "test" the development viability of sites BA3 and BANS107 by making an outline planning application to the LPA.

BCPNP/R16/2020/30

James Spires

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.69

Appendix C does not include certain developments already approved. eg RR/2019/1597/P is listed but not shown in yellow on the map; RR/2017/2390/P is shown in yellow on the map but is not listed; RR/2018/2666P is neither listed or shown in yellow on the map.

BTC Response: Regarding Map 1 page 69 - The respondent appears to have misinterpreted the data as this map shows the proposed development boundary. Those sites marked in yellow show extensions beyond the Local Plan 2006 development boundary, caused by recent planning permissions and other sites nominated within the Plan.

BCPNP/R16/2020/33

Sharon Margutti

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.39, Policy HD2

More housing should be allocated to the Blackfriars site, originally up to 220-240 houses were discussed for this site. If the upper limit was selected then there would be no need to build on the Caldbeck House (ba36a) or Glengorse (ba31a) sites. By not building at the maximum density at Blackfriars, the Plan is not meeting its own objective 5, to limit development outside of the existing development boundary.

BTC Response: RDC have given planning permission for up to 220 houses only.

BCPNP/R16/2020/34a

Barry Holdsworth

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.25, Chpt 3, Policy BA NS118

Land to the SW of Cedarwood Care Home should not be included in the shortlist for sites as the AECOM site report states that the access is 'constrained by a narrow lane which has no safe pedestrian access along it'. In addition AECOM states for site BA28 which is opposite BA NS 118 with both using the same lane to access Hastings Rd that 'ESCC Highways advise eastern access is not suitable due to substandard visibility in both directions (onto Hastings Road).

In the Strategic Environmental Assessment produced for the Neighbourhood Plan, in table 3 (p25), site BA NS118, objective 10 (reduce road congestion & pollution.... reduce car travel) is categorised as 'green'. How can this be listed as green as the site is over 2.5km from the main facilities in Battle High Street. People will not be walking into town / cycle from this location, as it takes approx 1hr 15mins to complete a return walk trip. site BA23 is categorised as 'red', for the same objective despite being ½ the distance that BA NS118 is from Battle centre, this makes no logical sense.

Table 3 (p25), for objective 11 (reduce emissions of greenhouse gases), all sites are rated as 'amber', this scoring is flawed as surely those sites that are close to the town centre / the rail station are more likely to encourage trips to be made which do not create greenhouse gases / pollution (eg walk / cycle), compared to those sites that are far from facilities.

table 4 (p27), the text for site BA NS118 states that 'The capacity of the site is a relatively small figure, therefore should not significantly increase the concentration of vehicle traffic. Listed building adjacent to the site. It is a green field site.', as such it is given a 'green' rating. As noted above this seems to be based on flawed logic, that it is fine to build on locations that are poorly served by public transport / far from public facilities on foot, as long as they are small in number. The 'Red Amber Green' scoring of the shortlisted sites should be performed again to see which sites should be shortlisted for the Neighbourhood Plan.

Surface water is an issue from the proposed BA NS 118 site which will be exacerbated by development.

BTC Response: This land has not been included in the NP Submission Plan.

BCPNP/R16/2020/34d

Barry Holdsworth

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.90, Chpt 2, Policy 46, para 2, Map 2

Schedule 2: Battle CP Local Heritage List – non-designated heritage assets 46 Small Barn, Great Barn, 3 Loose Farm Barns TQ 76169 14731/TQ 76106 14723

I specifically asked the Council not to come on our land, take photos or list our property. But they disregarded my request and entered through a private road. Our property is featured on page 32 of Annexe 1: Battle CP Design Guidelines against our wishes. The representatives are not qualified to assess our property and we do not want our property to be on a public list and this will invite people to enter our private road and trespass our land, to 'see' the properties of interest on the list. It is unsettling that they wilfully disregard our wishes.

BTC Response: An architect who has qualifications in heritage buildings advised on the local heritage list. The complaint about members of the Heritage Charter Working Group entering a private road was a matter raised as a complaint with BTC and addressed.

The photograph was taken by an employee of AECOM outside the site boundary. This is the first time we have been made aware of an objection to this photograph which was published in the Battle CP Design Guidelines as part of the Regulation 15 consultation and we hereby agree to remove the photograph.

BCPNP/R16/2020/35c

Neil Georgeson

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.90

Local Heritage - Non designated sites. For site 46, 3 properties are listed (Small Barn, 3 Loose Farm Barns & Great Barn), the list should include Selenex which is joined to the aforementioned three buildings and is built also out of stone and brick. These 4 properties make up the set of previously farm related buildings. The adjacent Cedarwood House should be added as this was the Victorian/ Edwardian farm house for the set of farm buildings that are proposed to be designated, and the adjacent 3 Loose Farm Cottages should be added as this is a 18th Century farm workers cottage. Next door is 4 Loose Farm Cottage which is grade 2 listed, as it is the 17thC farm house. Together these buildings reflect 400 years of farming at this location.

BTC Response: These building were thoroughly investigated by an architect with specialist knowledge in heritage buildings.

BCPNP/R16/2020/37a

Stephen France

Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, pg. 70

I wish to oppose the inclusion of the brownfield area to the South of NE06 (White house farm) within the proposed Netherfield development boundary, which will make it significantly easier to develop in the future as there is generally a 'presumption in favor of development' for land within the boundary. The decision to include it appears to have been made behind closed doors, in contradiction to the evidence presented for the plan, and in opposition to local opinion. My specific objections to the inclusion of the area, are that it is not-needed to achieve the housing target, the evidence shows it to be unsuitable for development, and future development in this area is not wanted by the villagers of Netherfield.

BTC Response: Far from decisions being made behind closed doors, details of the numerous public engagements on this site and all others in the Neighbourhood Plan have been subject to extensive consultations as detailed in the Regulation 15 Consultation Statement and subsequently adopted by Battle Town Council at its advertised meetings.

BCPNP/R16/2020/38b

Leslie Robinson

Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, Policy HD1, para 5.1, App.C

I object the the inclusion of Area D in the development boundary. This land makes a contribution to the semi-rural part of Calbec Hil.If the frontages to the roads are included within the development framework it will lead to the deelopment of open land and more intensive development of only partly developed land. If Area D remains outside the boundary, the LPA will be beter able to control change to the frontage.

BTC Response: We contend, with several recent planning permissions granted, in this area that it is now "semi-urban". Battle Town Council have agreed with RDC that site BA36a is suitable for up to 6 dwellings.

BCPNP/R16/2020/39a

**J Lovering & G Lines - New Farmhouse Ltd - Polly Canning - Kember Loudan Williams
Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, HD1, Map 1**

We do not agree with the Development Boundary as currently drafted and ask that further changes are made in order to allow additional housing and employment sites to come forward during the plan period. We respectfully request that the following two sites are reconsidered for housing and included within the Development Boundary:

BA NS 117: Land East of and adjacent to Cherry Gardens Allotments and Mount Street Car Park;

BA NS116/BA28: Land North of Loose Farm.

As no new employment sites have been identified in the Neighbourhood Plan, we wish to also bring to your attention two new sites which we believe are entirely suitable for employment type uses:

Land to the north of Battle Wastewater Treatment Works, Marley Lane, TN33 ORA; and

Land and buildings at Marley Farm, Marley Lane, TN33 this continuing support for “modest peripheral growth” on the edge of the development boundary the Neighbourhood Plan will not be in general conformity with the spatial policies of the development plan. We therefore object to both the wording of the draft policy HD1 and the development boundary itself as currently drafted on Map 1.

BTC Response: Objections were raised on site BA NS117 from many statutory consultees including RDC and was removed from the Plan at Regulation 15.

Site BA NS116 was not considered by AECOM for consideration for allocation.

The land owner of site BA28 did not wish to develop the land.

The sites mentioned in the final paragraph were not offered during the Employment and Retail call-for-sites in June 2020 and not included in the Regulation 15 Submission Plan.

BCPNP/R16/2020/39c

**J Lovering & G Lines - New Farmhouse Ltd - Polly Canning - Kember Loudan Williams
Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, HD8, App.D**

We wish to question therefore the justification for these Green Gaps and the additional protection that it would provide. These “Green Gaps” are simply not necessary. These areas already benefit from other layers of protection (being located in the AONB and outside of the Development Boundary) and so we do not understand the justification for adding any additional layers of protection. Rother District Council removed a large part land to the south of Battle near Telham from their Strategic Gap policy in the Development and Site Allocation Local Plan, now the Neighbourhood Plan are seeking to reintroducing it in Telham and proposing three new Green Gaps around Battle.

BTC Response: Green Gaps we will deal with a generic comment to the Independent Examiner’s request.

BCPNP/R16/2020/39d

**J Lovering & G Lines - New Farmhouse Ltd - Polly Canning - Kember Loudan Williams
Comment on Neighbourhood Plan, ET2**

We wish to therefore draw your attention to two particular sites that are suitable, available and deliverable for employment uses and ask that they are given due consideration:

1) Land north of Battle wastewater treatment works – there are two large and modern agricultural buildings on this site which could be reused and adapted for employment type uses. The land

surrounding these buildings could also be developed to create a new business park suitable for a mix of employment uses.

2) Land at Marley Farm – The site contains an extensive range of ruined former agricultural buildings. It is considered ideally suited for a modest employment type use as the development of this site would tidy it up and it benefits from good and direct access to the A21 trunk road.

BTC Response: These sites were not offered during the Employment and Retail Call for Sites in June 2020 and not included in the Regulation 15 Submission Plan.

BCPNP/R16/2020/43

Shelagh Weir

Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.85

Objection to BTC support for ESCC Highways plan 'to provide roadside protection fence' at the Open Space (GS05) on Caldbec Hill. The small parking space on the Open Space is essential for 10 dwellings opposite, which include several elderly and infirm residents and families with small children.

BTC Response: Regarding GS 05, this is a matter for ESCC to resolve as they own all of this land.

BCPNP/R16/2020/44

Bradley Caine – Rother Investment Group - Nick Ide - Ide Planning

Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, Inset map 4b

Objection is made to the proposed allocation of land at Glengorse as non-designated heritage assets (NDHA) as shown on Appendix C Inset Map 4b under ref. BLL48. The objection divides into three parts: 1 - Only the former school building and its immediate grounds to the east, encircled by the access road, should be designated as a NDHA. Designations elsewhere over the Estate are not justified by reference to Historic England Advice Note 7. 2 - the area originally shown as BA31a in the LPA's 2013 dated SHLAA is attached to the cover email. This parcel is one submitted to the LPA in response to its recent call for sites.

Appendix C map 7 which also shows existing employment sites should square with the p29 map in the main document.

Objection is made to the designation of the balance of the BA31a area as a NDHA.

3. Objection is also made to the designation of two parcels of land to the north of the former school at (centre point) grid ref. TQ75642 15073 (land off the existing highway also named Glengorse) and abutting this to the west at TQ75510 15077) - neither contributes to the setting of the former school and nor do they meet the Historic England criteria.

BTC Response: The allocation of buildings and land was conducted independent of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group by a working group comprising of local historians and an architect with specialist expertise in heritage buildings and was submitted to RDC for their consideration as they are the final arbiter in deciding what is included. There have been opportunities at previous consultations for representations to be made by the respondent but this opportunity was not taken up.

BCPNP/R16/2020/45

Hilary Sexton

Objection on Neighbourhood Plan, pg.85, policy BA GS05

The residents that use the parking welcome a wild flower meadow, but feel a small part should be designated parking, leaving a large area for the meadow. There are elderly residents here with carers, and those with young children, who require parking close by.

BTC Response: For this and the following 4 representations (BCPNP/R16/2020/46, BCPNP/R16/2020/47, BCPNP/R16/2020/48 and BCPNP/R16/2020/49), this is a matter for ESCC to resolve as they own all of this land

BCPNP/R16/2020/50

Nicholas Whistler

Comment on Neighbourhood Plan

I am presently resident in Canada, but from now am living in Caldbec House for the winters, 3-4 months. I do not wish my home to be included as a heritage asset. We have owned and preserved it for centuries, I have owned it since 1992, this well-intentioned designation is likely to have unintended negative consequences. Our garden and field opposite Caldbec House, is now nearly a parking lot, and the BTC would be better to assist me to buy it back.. It was seized 1968-74 as it was thought to be unsafe to have a bend in the road on the top of a hill, and that is now where all my neighbours who had no parking, park free on our old kitchen garden, at liability to Highways, and the continuing ruination of our home, and the entry to old Battle.

BTC Response: This land was legally compulsory purchased by ESCC and is adjacent to land on which the respondent recently made a failed planning application at appeal.