

Qualifying Body Responses to: Regulation 16 Representations by Rother District Council

28 June 2017

1. **EC1** – agree with RDC suggestion.
2. **EC2** – no comment.
3. **EC3** – agree with RDC suggestion.
4. **EC4** -agree with RDC suggestion.
5. **EC5** – RDC had no comment. However, in the light of RDC comments on EC3 a), the word ‘and’ could be added to the end of paras 1 and 2.
6. **EC6** – Suggest agreement with the comments from RDC, except for their para (a).
7. **EC7:**
 - a) Suggest agreement with first amendment of RDC to read in para 1 ‘it is in keeping with the character of the area and the amenities of neighbouring properties and minimises visual impact through sensitive siting and design.’
 - b) We feel we could now write a positive new policy to designate the Mill Site as a site to produce 1200m² of employment space, together with an explanation that Robertsbridge’s contribution to the employment space required in rural Rother, set out in para 12.22 of the Core Strategy, will be met by this allocation and the extant permissions, rr/2013/2380 -Glyndebourne Estate land, and rr/2015/1874 -Extensions to Culverwells.
8. **ED1** – agree with RDC suggestion, except for retaining strike-out re RCS; plus explanatory text that RCS is not part of statutorily provided education, is a charity, is currently oversubscribed and will be for the next two to three years.
9. **ED2 and EN 1** – RDC had no comment.
10. **EN2** – Discuss later with DM.
11. **EN3** -agree comment from RDC.
12. **EN4:**
 - a) RDC do not like the heading – suggest ‘Conservation of Landscape and Natural Resources’; agree.
 - b) Agree addition RDC are suggesting to supporting text.
13. **EN5** – Accept RDC’s version with the addition of “and other polluting emissions” after “CO₂”.
14. **EN6** – Accept RDC’s version (a).
15. **EN7** - It seems to us that this policy was to refer to statutorily listed buildings and the following policy to locally listed buildings. If that is what people think, then perhaps it would be better to change the words and heading to ‘Listed Buildings and Scheduled Ancient Monuments’ I do not think it matters there is only one SAM in the parish at present. Accept RDC’s version (a).
16. **EN8** -agree the RDC amendments.
17. **EN9** -suggest adopting RDC suggestion with the addition of a final sentence: ‘The S and R Character Appraisal will be used as a reference to assess the impact of any relevant development proposals.’

Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan 2016-2028

18. **HO1** - Suggest amendments as follows:
 - a) 'designates a Development Boundary....Any housing or other development outside the D... B..'
 - b) agree the addition to the supporting text.
19. **HO2** – This policy needs extensive alterations. Agree RDC's suggestion to make reference to infill housing to Policy HO1. Place the first three sentences as a new explanatory para 3.4.2 to Policy HO1 and merge with existing 3.4.2 (suitably updated as RDC request to 1.4.16). The policy re a review should stand as a separate policy under a 'General' heading, as it does not simply apply to housing allocations. Wording as suggested by RDC.
20. **HO3** – We wish to retain the policy as much as possible. The reasons are the following:
 - This is a Plan, not a planning application.
 - The Mill Site owners and agents have confirmed to us that they are preparing a robust and comprehensive analysis to satisfy the sequential and exception tests required by NPPF.
 - The development of the site would enable proper restoration of the oast house to take place, together with restoration of a much loved, substantial village building, Hodson's Mill itself.
 - It would satisfy requirements for the NP for smaller dwellings, and in particular, housing for the elderly.
 - The Mill Site redevelopment is overwhelmingly supported by the community in all of the consultations undertaken by the NPSG.

Last para of HO3 – suggest be moved to explanatory para 3.4.3.

The request from RDC to consider specific allocation for employment land is satisfied by our comments in EC7 above.

Heathfield Gardens site - we are happy to accept a figure of 38, having seen a plan produced by the owners for 40 dwellings on site, which contains a high proportion of smaller units already. [** %]

Vicarage land - Accept RDC suggestion.

Sub-provisions - Accept RDC suggestion.

21. **HO4** and **HO7**-RDC did not comment on these.
22. **HO5** – Accept RDC's suggested changes.
23. **HO6** – Accept RDC's suggested changes. Our proposed policy would only have affected Vicarage land.
24. **HO8** – Agree RDC's suggested change to Infrastructure section of policies.
25. **IN1** – Accept RDC's suggested changes.
26. **IN2** – Support RDC's amendment.
27. **IN3/4/5/7** – RDC either support or make no comment.
28. **IN6** – Accept RDC's suggested changes.
29. **IN8** – Accept RDC's suggested changes.
30. **LE1** – no comment from RDC.
31. **LE2** – Accept suggestion (b) of RDC.
32. **LE3** – Accept RDC's title change suggestion.