

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 LVIAs 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	www.ticehurstonline.org 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 Er	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>Er 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 ₃	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 ₃ 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 ₃	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 ₃ has been modified.
25	RDC written comments 25 p.74	Refer to LHN ₂ 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 ₄ has been modified.
26	RDC written comments 26 p.76 H ₅	Refer to Design Guidance in part 1. Combine parts 1 and 2 using suggested text?	Adopt the paragraph suggested by RDC	H ₅ 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 INF ₂	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). INF ₂ 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 INF3	Reword policy to tighten and clarify.	<p>Policy INF 1):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less than 10 homes = informal open spaces to be provided. <p>Policy INF 2) and 3):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LEAP re maintenance of play. <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>	INF2 has been modified.
39	ESCC written comments 1.3 and 2.1 R4	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.	R4 and RCA2 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.	www.ticehurstonline.org	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 zone 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 (https://www.eastsussex.gov.uk/leisureandtours/countryside/rightsofway/map/map.aspx) 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.