

Development and Site Allocations Local Plan

Summary for Council - Options and preferred options:

Summary	Options
<p>WATER EFFICIENCY Rother is identified as an area of 'serious' water stress. Building Reg standard is 125 litres/person/day. Water efficiency and the reduction in household water demand are crucial elements of good water resource management.</p>	<p>A – apply the base water efficiency standard.</p> <p>B – apply the higher optional water efficiency standard. RDC favour option B 'all new dwellings are required to be designed to achieve water consumption of no more than 110 litres/person/day.</p> <p>Question 2: Do you agreed that the optional water efficiency standard should be adopted? Suggestion: Yes</p>
<p>RENEWABLE AND LOW CARBON ENERGY Core strategy supports renewable and low carbon energy generation schemes, particularly those utilising solar, biomass and wind energy technologies that do not have an adverse impact on local amenities, ecological and heritage assets or landscape character and in respect of locations in or adjacent to the High Weald AONB, are generally small in scale. However, it has been recognised that there is a potential for wind turbines, based on prevailing wind speeds. Biomass as a fuel offers significant benefits – it is likely that the scale of a biomass burner would serve a single user eg schools. Solar energy is another source of heat - Larger housing schemes (100 dwellings or 50 flats) are required to consider the potential for</p>	<p>Question 3: Where, if anywhere do you think could be an appropriate location for wind turbine(s) to be sited in the Rother District?</p> <p>Question 4: What opportunities do you think there are to encourage biomass/woodfuel from local sources and how should these be reflected in planning policy? Suggestions: Houses to have open fires and chimneys? Promote agricultural colleges that encourage sustainable courses eg: Bird Park Flimwell? Protect agriculturally tied houses for those in farming and forestry? Promote business use of biomass fuels?</p> <p>Question 5: What thresholds should apply to the requirement on developers to submit an energy statement? Suggestions: Make it the norm to require the statement so that architectural designs will automatically take the requirement into account, providing well-designed schemes hidden into the roofs etc.</p>

<p>combining heat and power generation. It is proposed that guidance be issued advising on an energy statement.</p>	
<p>RETENTION OF SITES OF SOCIAL OR ECONOMIC VALUE: Shops, community facilities, tourism accommodation, and business premises all play an important social and economic role within Rother. Commercial pressure for such sites and premises to change to residential is strong. It is vital that a clear policy framework to ensure that such uses of social and economic value are normally retained. Premises should be offered for sale or rent for at least 18 months before a planning application is made at a realistic valuation.</p>	<p>Policy Options: A – No further policy – continue to use the core strategy policies. B – New policy for each type of use. C - New policy covering all types of economic and social uses. Suggestion: C – sites in Ticehurst Parish such as Forge Yard, were not sufficiently protected. Draft Policy wording (page 31) covers the relevant points and should not result in the loss of facilities or features which may undermine the viability of its use, including, but not limited to, car parks, gardens and function rooms. Question: Do you agree with the policy approach of Option C?</p>
<p>EQUESTRIAN DEVELOPMENTS Rother area is popular for equestrian activities. A balance needs to be struck between meeting the desires of the equestrian community and safeguarding the intrinsic value and locally distinctive rural character and landscape features of the countryside, especially in the AONB. High Weald landscape is particularly vulnerable to development – new buildings, hard surfaces, access roads or sand schools are not always easily accommodated without some impact on the fields. Associated development must be carefully controlled, primarily for landscape reasons and pressures from proposals for new isolated stables and concentrated development in other areas. Development should be sited close to existing</p>	<p>Policy Options: A – a positive promotional approach to equestrian development, encouraging both recreational and commercial proposals for the economic and leisure benefits, but with general safeguards. B – A more restrictive policy with more focused criteria to safeguard against the potential harm to the intrinsic character of the countryside and particularly the High Weald AONB. Preferred option B – page 34 – allowing more control. Question 7: Do you agree with the policy approach to equestrian developments?</p>

<p>built development, close to the bridleway system and should preferably utilise mobile field shelters. Where applications come forward in more remote areas and permanent buildings are required, new development will be expected to meet a number of criteria aimed at protecting the character of the countryside and the amenities of both local residents and users of the countryside. Floodlighting is not appropriate, nor are excessive roads or excavations. Stocking density is suggested at 1 horse per hectare to protect the ground.</p>	
<p>AFFORDABLE HOUSING Rother require between 30-40% affordable housing (30% in most areas but 40% in rural areas) in any development of over 5 dwellings in this area – under 5 dwellings are required to provide a financial contribution. 28.11.14 Ministers rules that this arrangement should not be inflicted on developments of under 10 houses – but financial contributions can be sought. Therefore RDC core strategy no longer complies with NPPF and therefore vulnerable to appeal.</p>	<p>Options: A – retain core strategy thresholds as is – but open to challenge B – Amend thresholds to meet NPPF – result less homes and less financial contributions. C – Amend thresholds to meet NPPF and seek financial contributions on 6 -10 houses . Option C is currently proposed. Suggestions – request land is set aside for the self-build option on sites drawn down from RDC's register?</p>
<p>ACCESS TO HOUSING AND HOUSING STANDARDS New homes need to meet the needs of new occupiers. March 2015 the Gov. Set out new national planning policy on the setting of technical standards for new dwellings. Minimum sized rooms for occupancy in single, double and three storey properties have been</p>	<p>Options: A – produce a new policy that adopts the new national standards. B – no policy relating to the adoption of nationally described space standards. RDC are recommending Option A</p>

set. Over 44% of existing housing stock in RDC would not now meet these requirements.	
ACCESS STANDARDS Gov. Introduced a three tier standard for accessibility to buildings to provide for accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair adaptable dwellings.	Options: A – new policy for all residential development to be built to the new standards B – requirement for 25% of developments to be built to new standard – 11 dwellings + C – requirement for 25% of developments to be built to new standard on 11 + developments plus additional 5% to be built to higher standard on developments of over 50+ dwellings. D – no policy relating to enhanced access standards. RDC are recommending Option C
SPECIALIST HOUSING FOR OLDER PEOPLE 22% of the Rother population are over 65. There will be an increase in the need for suitable housing. Currently there is not a wide choice of options in all parts of the District, but Bexhill and Sidley have better provisions than other area.	Options: A – Require schemes (over 100 units) to provide an element of residential development for older people. B – Set district-wide targets for care provision – what should the provision be? C – Promote extra care housing schemes in rural service centres Ticehurst is a service centre. D – Seek a proportion of affordable housing to be targeted for older people. E – Seek a proportion of market housing to be housing targeted at older people including bungalows. F – Promote development of a care hotel to assist transition from hospital care back to independent living. Question 9: Do you agree with the policy approaches to: a) Adoption of the national internal space standard? b) Adoption of the optional Building Regulations standards for accessible and adaptable housing? c) Housing for older persons, and the specific policy options highlighted? If not what changes would you like to see?
SELF BUILD AND CUSTOM BUILD Where an individual or group purchase a plot of land and design and build a house to live in. Councils hold a register about the demand for self build plots. Interest to date in Rother 43	Question 10: Is it appropriate to plan for about 1% of the total housing target for the District (55-60 new dwellings) as self-build and custom house-building, or if not, what would be appropriate approach?

<p>individuals – most of whom have not indicated a location preference. When the register was first opened in 2016 there was an initial rush to register which has now quietened.</p> <p>Current evidence shows a 60:40 split between self-build and custom build respectively.</p>	<p>Suggestion: Self-build should be viewed as windfall - small plots becoming available to private individuals.</p> <p>Options:</p> <p>A – New policy that seeks to encourage self-build on residential sites.</p> <p>B – New policy that seeks to require a proportion of self-build in strategic allocations.</p> <p>C – New policy that seeks to require a proportion of self-build in large residential sites (50+)</p> <p>D – new policy that allocates specific sites for self-build in the District.</p> <p>Question 11: Which policy approach (es) from the options do you consider to be most appropriate for providing sufficient plots for self and custom-build sector in RDC or is there an alternative?</p>
<p>EXTERNAL RESIDENTIAL AREAS</p> <p>Page 50</p> <p>External outdoor amenity space is important to occupiers and sufficient parking, practical needs and re-cycling facilities should be taken into account when planning development.</p> <p>Gardens should be of an appropriate size – family properties minimum of 10 m depth.</p> <p>Storage of re-cycling and refuse bins should be adequate and should not detract from the street scene.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A - No further policy needed – rely on general principles in Core Strategy OSS2</p> <p>B – New general policy that brings together the need to consider amenity space, parking and refuse/recycling.</p> <p>C- New detailed policy that sets standards for amenity space, parking and recycling.</p> <p>Question 12: Do you agree with the proposed policy approach to external residential areas and the proposed wording (page 52)? If not what changes would you like to see?</p> <p>RDC preferred option is a mixture of B and C.</p>
<p>EXTENSIONS TO RESIDENTIAL GARDENS</p> <p>Some households, especially in rural areas seek to enlarge the extent of land in residential use next to their dwelling as gardens or for outbuildings. This should not have a detrimental effect on the AONB, and it is suggested that extensions should be modest and create a logical new boundary.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A - Retain the existing local plan policy HG9</p> <p>B – A clear restriction on garden extensions into the countryside.</p> <p>RDC prefer option A</p> <p>Question 13: Do you agree with the proposed policy approach to extensions to residential gardens and the proposed policy wording? (page 54).</p>

<p>EXTENSIONS, ANNEXES, ALTERATIONS AND OUTBUILDINGS</p> <p>Often applied for to prevent the need to move. Smaller proposals do not need permission. Core Strategy OSS4 currently deals with this. These can sometimes impact upon neighbours. Over-bearing masses tend to come from two storey proposals. Either traditional or contemporary proposals can be appropriate in this context. With side extensions, care should be taken to avoid 'in-filling'. Alterations to roofs to provide attic accommodation and addition of dormer windows require careful design.</p>	<p>Options for extensions:</p> <p>A – Retain policy HG8 of the 2006 Local Plan B – A more detailed policy focusing on the practical implications of the need for a high design quality and response to local context. RDC prefer option B providing a practical check-list type approach for applicants.</p> <p>Options for Annexes:</p> <p>A – No specific residential annexe policy B – Policy to set out essential criteria regarding amenities C – Policy with a sequential approach to the building of annexes. RDC prefer option C</p> <p>Question 14: Do you agree with the policy approach to extensions, annexes, alterations and outbuildings and the wording of the respective policies? (page 60).</p>
<p>BOUNDARY TREATMENTS, ACCESSES AND DRIVES</p> <p>Boundary treatments, accesses and drives play a significant role in defining the character and appearance of a locality and play an important role in the successful integration of new development. Height, and style of boundary fencing should be appropriate and not detract from the AONB – historical boundaries, whether hard or natural should be preserved.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – New policy setting out criteria for both boundary treatments and new accesses and drives. B – No Policy – reply on general policies for landscape conservation, maintaining the local character and amenities and highway safety.</p> <p>RDC prefer Option A.</p> <p>Question 15: Do you agree with the policy approaches to boundary treatments and drives and accesses and to the wording of the proposed policies? (page 64).</p> <p>Suggestion that criteria for boundary lines should be clear and accessible.</p>
<p>ECONOMY</p> <p>Shop fronts and advertising: Play an important part in street scene. Valuable to promote businesses but should be carefully designed. Historical shop fronts should not be eroded by too much signage. New shop fronts should relate well to the building and overall setting of the street scene.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – A simple broad-brush policy setting out the general principles of considering impact on amenity and public safety with reference to the local context of conservation areas and other sensitive areas. B – A more detailed policy which sets out the different types of proposals as well as issues raised and provides detailed criteria against which proposals would be judged. RDC prefer Option B</p> <p>Question 16: Do you agree with the policy approach to shop fronts and advertising?</p>

<p>HOLIDAY SITES</p> <p>The Core Strategy supports tourism but also seeks to protect the area and coast line that make the area attractive to tourists.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – A more open approach to allowing new holiday development, positively supporting them for the economic benefits together with policies safeguarding the countryside.</p> <p>B – A more restrictive approach, with detailed criteria , preventing establishment of new large scale sites .. to ensure against harm to the AONB</p> <p>Question 16a: Do you agree with the policy approach B – to holiday sites? (page 71).</p>
<p>EXISTING EMPLOYMENT SITES AND PREMISES</p> <p>Planning for improved job opportunities is a fundamental part of the Council's development strategy.</p> <p>Employment Sites Review has been published. For rural areas the most appropriate approach is regarded as taking a criteria-based approach to further business development.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – Roll forward Core Strategy Policy EC3</p> <p>B – Replace Policy EC3 with a policy that simply requires consideration of both business and housing needs in determining future use.</p> <p>Option B is found to be likely to give a further boost to housing supply</p> <p>RDC prefer Option A</p> <p>Question 17: Do you agree with the policy approach to existing employment sites? (page 78).</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENT</p> <p>Landscape and the High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.</p> <p>Distinctive areas of Rother area</p> <p>High Weald</p> <p>Romney Marshes</p> <p>Pevensey Levels</p> <p>The levels and marshes enjoy nature conservation status and consequent very limited development.</p> <p>One aspect of the rurality is the existence of the dark skies. The High Weald enjoys ancient woodland and settlements, fields and streams.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – New policy setting out the basis for assessing local landscape character impacts.</p> <p>B – Rely on Core Strategy EN1 and national policies.</p> <p>RDC prefer option A</p> <p>Question 18: Do you agree with the policy approaches to maintaining the landscape character and the High Weald AONB?</p>
<p>STRATEGIC GAPS</p> <p>Strategic gaps are regarded as important in terms of guiding the location of development, maintaining the separate identity and distinctiveness between settlements,</p>	<p>Within these Gaps, development will be carefully controlled and development will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances. Any development must be unobtrusive and not detract from the openness of the area.</p> <p>Enhancement of the Gaps through effective landscape management which strengthens and reinforces their significance as protected landscape areas will be supported.</p>

<p>maintaining the strategic settlement pattern and preventing the coalescence of settlements. Gaps between Bexhill and Hastings, Crowhurst and Hastings, Battle and Hastings, Fairlight and Hastings, Rye and Rye Harbour should be protected.</p>	<p>Question 19: Do you agree with the proposed definition of the Strategic Gaps and the policy applying to them?</p> <p>Suggestion - strengthen policy to include gaps between wards within parishes and hamlets.</p>
<p>BIODIVERSITY AND GREEN SPACE Substantial and wide-ranging, some areas designated as being of international importance. Strategy EN5 provides an overarching policy commitment to protect and enhance the biodiversity, geodiversity and green infrastructure of the area. Aim – to develop a district-wide network to link areas of natural green space.</p>	<p>Options: A – Protection policy – this would take a typical development management approach of fulfilling requirements in respect of protected species and habitats and providing mitigation or compensation where necessary. B – Enhancement policy – This would take a more positive approach by both seeking biodiversity enhancement from development supported by details of appropriate opportunities. The SA/SEA supports the more positive approach.</p> <p>Question 20: Do you agree with the policy approach to supporting biodiversity and green space? (Page 98).</p>
<p>SUSTAINABLE DRAINAGE NPPF states that when considering major development, sustainable drainage systems should be provided unless inappropriate. Specific criteria for SuDS are provided and ground conditions will often dictate the appropriateness of this technique.</p>	<p>Options: A - Consideration has been given to whether it would be appropriate to either highlight the need to prioritise sustainable drainage in line with NPPF and other wise ensure adequate drainage. B – Whether drainage warrants further attention in response to local conditions, including regard to flows into ecologically sensitive areas. Sustainability appraisal has resulted in Option B being preferable.</p> <p>Question 21: Do you agree with the policy approach to sustainable drainage? (page 104)</p>
<p>LAND STABILITY Land stability and subsidence are affected by climate change. The NPPF looks to the planning system to play its part in ensuring that sites are suitable for their new use, taking into</p>	<p>Options: It is noted that a Neighbourhood Plan is in preparation for Fairlight that may address local issues, but coastal erosion is regarded as a strategic issue.</p> <p>The fundamental policy options considered through the sustainability appraisal are</p>

<p>account of ground conditions and land stability. Core Strategy Policy OSS3 already requires that issues of land stability, along with contamination, air quality, agricultural land quality and coastal erosion, are considered in assessing both the suitability of land for development and in determining the details of schemes. Locally the greatest issues of land stability are at Fairlight, where there are long standing issues of coastal erosion.</p>	<p>firstly whether a specific land stability policy, applicable across the District is needed and secondly whether a policy specific to the Fairlight/Pett area is needed. This concludes that both are appropriate given both the general and specific risks relating to potential ground on social and environmental objectives.</p> <p>British Geological Survey highlights a range of potential land stability issues across the District.</p> <p>Development will only be permitted on unstable or potentially unstable land including former landfill sites and coastal margins where:</p> <p>The nature of the instability has been properly assessed and Any remedial measures to ensure that the development does not add to the instability of the site or surrounding land are environmentally acceptable and normally implemented prior to the commencement of building works.</p> <p>Question 22: Do you agree with the policy approach to land stability and the proposed policy wording?</p>
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION</p> <p>Rother is a largely rural area with over 80% of land lying within the High Weald AONB. It is appropriate to consider the effect of proposals in terms of their potential to create pollution through lighting, noise, odour, hazardous and nonhazardous substances and airborne particles. General approach is to ensure that such impacts of new development are properly assessed at an early stage to keep their effects to a minimum. The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 assist this approach. It is necessary to manage development to ensure that noise does not give rise to unacceptable adverse effects on health and quality of life or on the character of areas.</p> <p>Lighting – CPRE estimated that between 1993</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – Rely on national and local guidance</p> <p>B – New policy drawing on local guidance and information.</p> <p>Option B is found of offer several mainly environmental as well as health benefits and no obvious dis-benefits. Hence this approach is preferred. (Page 114)</p> <p>Question 23: Do you agree with the policy approach to managing environmental pollution through the planning process?</p>

<p>and 2000, light pollution across England increased by 24%. Common sources of light pollution arise from sports grounds and nationally approximately half of all complaints regarding light nuisance arose from domestic external security lighting.</p> <p>No part of Rotehr is defined as an 'Air Quality Management Area', hence there is no expectation of focused planning policies to address air pollution.</p> <p>Sometimes pre-existing sources of pollution or specific hazards need to be taken into account by development proposals – key factors being the distance, risks and nature of the proposal.</p>	
<p>IMPLEMENTATION</p> <p>NPPF underlines the three roles of the planning system, highlighting that in order to achieve sustainable development, economic social and environmental gains should be sought jointly and simultaneously.</p> <p>This may involve bringing together different land owners to ensure that the range of needs are met or bringing together a mix of uses for an appropriate and sustainable approach to site development eg mixed commercial, and residential and recreational uses.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A - New policy that draws together the related elements of the NPPF, core strategy and former 2006 Local Plan</p> <p>B – No further policy but rely on the existing national and Core Strategy policies notably IM2, IM3, TR2 and EN5.</p> <p>Option A is deemed preferable - making explicit in the development plan policy and in a way that can be readily applied in Development Management, the clear expectation that, where different land interests exist, they must co-operate to achieve sustainable development.</p> <p>Question 24: Do you agree with the policy approach to comprehensive development?</p>
<p>DEVELOPMENT BOUNDARIES</p> <p>Development boundaries differentiate between the substantially built-up areas of towns and villages, where further development, including re-development or intensification, would be acceptable in principle and the countryside where it would not be acceptable.</p>	<p>Options:</p> <p>A – New policy that clarifies in policy terms, the use of development boundaries in development management.</p> <p>B – No further policy but rely on general principles implied in Core Strategy policy OSS2 and referred to in its supporting text.</p> <p>The relationship of a site to the relevant development boundary is a major factor in the</p>

Development boundaries both positively focus growth on sustainable settlements and help to protect the surrounding countryside from unnecessary and intrusive development. The principle of the continued use of development boundaries around settlements has been reaffirmed by Core Strategy Policy OSS2:	<p>determination of many applications; hence, it is evident that a specific development management policy as proposed under Option A which complements the broad statement of the principle in the Core Strategy is called for. Hence Option A is the preferred policy approach.</p> <p>Question 25: Do you agree with the proposed policy wording on the development boundaries? (page 119).</p>
--	--

The document further confirms that Ticehurst's minimum allocation of dwellings to 2028 is 87 and that this has been met.

Flimwell's allocation is 43, of which 34 have been granted outline permission leaving a residual minimum requirement of 9 properties to 2028.