

## 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  | Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.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  | Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.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  | Withdrawn – confirmed in writing.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  | R <sub>3</sub> | Parishioner    | Objection to allocation of green space T <sub>7</sub> (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  | R <sub>3</sub> | Parishioner    | Objection to allocation of green spaces S <sub>3</sub> (should be S <sub>5</sub> ) and F <sub>1</sub> . These spaces are allotments on land which is privately owned and should not be allocated. | Two allotment plots have been withdrawn.  | R <sub>3</sub> has been modified to remove S <sub>5</sub> and F <sub>1</sub> .                 |
| 52  | R <sub>3</sub> | Parishioner    | Objection to allocation of green space T <sub>7</sub> (owned by Mr and Mrs Spencer).  | The pond and not the land to the south are to be included, not the garden curtilage.  | R <sub>3</sub> has been modified to clarify what green spaces are and are not.                 |
| 14  | R <sub>4</sub> | 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. | R <sub>4</sub> has been modified to focus on footpath connection over fields rather than road. |
| 23  | H <sub>1</sub> | 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.<br><br>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).<br><br>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. | 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.<br><br>Meetings with ESCC and Rother DC are on-going to try and address the traffic issues. | 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.<br><br>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.  |