



SALEHURST AND ROBERTSBRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN

2016-2028

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

PLAN SUBMISSION : Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012

December 2016

Introduction and Background

This Consultation Statement has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2). Part 5 of the Regulations sets out what a Consultation Statement should contain:

- (a) contains details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- (b) explains how they were consulted;
- (c) summarises the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted;
- (d) describes how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed neighbourhood development plan.

This statement has been prepared by Salehurst and Robertsbridge Steering Group on the behalf of Salehurst and Robertsbridge Parish council to accompany its submission to Rother District Council of the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan (SRNDP) under section 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. As part of the formal submission of the SRNDP for Examination, there is a requirement for the Parish Council, as the 'qualifying body' to illustrate that they have consulted with the community and relevant bodies.

01 Objectives of the communication and engagement strategy

1.0.1 The aim of the SRNDP communication strategy was to have a clear framework which showed how the Steering Group would involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages of Plan development so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process.

A communication strategy was established to:

1. promote a high degree of awareness of the project;
2. invite residents to join the team advising the Parish Council;
3. encourage everyone to contribute to the development of the Plan;
4. promote consultation events;
5. provide regular updates on the status of the Plan and its development.

1.0.2 The objectives of the Communication and Engagement Strategy are to:

- To achieve better communication, leading to better feedback and decision-making.
- Ensure that the implications of the development and adoption of the Neighbourhood Plan are understood by all stakeholders.
- Allow residents and other relevant stakeholders the opportunity to take part in defining the Salehurst and Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Plan.
- Ensure that all stakeholders are aware of the Neighbourhood Plan process to include:
 - ◆ the roles and responsibilities of the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group;
 - ◆ the process of creation of the Neighbourhood Plan;
 - ◆ the governance, approval, and acceptance of the Neighbourhood Plan;
 - ◆ the schedule for the Neighbourhood Plan.
- Ensure appropriate consultation with and communication to all stakeholders, so that:
 - ◆ Input into the development and approval of the Neighbourhood Plan has been included;
 - ◆ the current status of the Neighbourhood Plan is understood at all times;
 - ◆ appropriate approval is gained from key stakeholders;
- Ensure acceptance by Rother District Council (RDC) by providing, amongst other things:
 - ◆ A Consultation Statement setting out how consultation will be carried out;
 - ◆ A Statement of Community Involvement evidencing the engagement with the community.

1.0.3 The strategy was published on the website in November 2015. The full communication and engagement strategy document can be viewed in Appendix 1.

02 Consultation timeline

2.0.1 The table below outlines the key points of community engagement and consultation which has shaped the production of the SRNDP.

For copies of engagement literature and resources used, refer to the **SRNDP Consultation Statement Appendix**. It is important to note that minutes of steering group meetings have been published throughout the process and key documents published including results from the call for sites process.

Consultation and history timeline		
Date	Contact/event	Subject matter
2014		
Aug. 7	PC Planning Committee (PCPC) (Minute 7)	Discuss matters to proceed with an investigation into embarking on an NP
Sept. 4	PCPC (Minute 9)	Discuss Keith Marden's report – agree further meetings to recommend it appropriate to PC at Nov. 17 meeting
Sept. 5	Parish Council (PC) (Minute 2157.3)	Agreed to possible recommendation to next PC or earlier
Nov. 6	PCPC (Minute 9)	Agreed to form a Steering Group and to publicise idea in the Parish Newsletter to be delivered in December, if PC approves
Nov. 17	PC (Minute 2178.3)	Agreed to formation of Steering Group, to newsletter and open meeting on January 10 or 17
Dec. 4	Newsletter delivered to all households in parish	Publicising idea of NP and open meeting
2015		
Jan. 10	Open meeting attended by c.60	To gauge enthusiasm for embarking on the NP and explore ideas for it (things to keep, things to change)
Jan. 19	PC (Minute 2193.2)	Approved decision to produce an NP for the Parish, and to apply to RDC to have whole of Parish designated as a Neighbourhood Area
Jan. 27	Steering Group meeting	Planning for the future

Feb. 4	Steering Group meeting	Discussed January 10 open meeting results, terms of reference for the SG, audit of skills
Feb. 5	PCPC (Minute 8)	Reported on work started on NP
Feb. 11	Steering Group	Further start-up meeting for NP, including draft of Consultation Plan
Feb. 18	SG Training event	
Feb. 27	RDC publication of designated area map	Whole of parish declared to be the designated NP area. Consultation to close on April 10
Mar. 2	Annual Village Meeting	Presentation made to c.60 attendees, including representatives of many village clubs and societies, on NP project
Mar. 4	Economy Group meeting	
Mar. 5	Parish Newsletter	Delivered to all households in parish
Mar. 10	SG Meeting	Stating need for declarations of interest; discussion of consultation strategy; allocating theme group leaders to facilitate wider research and consultation
Mar. 10	Uth Voice funding	Report to SG by Sue Prochak that funding had been successfully applied for
Mar. 11	David Marlow	Email invitation to attend next SG meeting on Mar. 15
Mar. 15	SG meeting	Attended by David Marlow: discussion of housing sites
Mar. 16	PC (Minute 2202.6)	Approve membership of SG (17), its terms of reference and principle of declarations of interest
Mar. 20	Email to Mill site agents	Explaining NPSG is taking over from PC regarding consultations on the development and referring to Amicus Horizon as RSL
Apr. 1	Housing Group meeting	
Apr. 8	SG meeting	“Blue sky thinking” session
Apr. 10	Results of RDC boundary consultation	Approved
Apr. 17	Article in Battle Observer	General progress of plan and reporting developments with Uth Voice

Apr. 17	Posters re call for sites	Displayed in all prominent locations round village and on PC noticeboard
Apr. 30	Housing Group meeting	
Apr. 27 +	Leisure Group correspondence between Xand Church and local organisations	Sheila Rogers, Scouts
Apr. 28	“	Michael Salter, Bowls Club
Apr. 29	“	Trevor Woodgate, Aviation Society
May 7	“	Alastair Neill, Cricket Club
May 9	Church spring sale	Stall in Community Hall, discussion, information, gathering further details of interested parties
May 11	Site walkabout by Housing group	Viewing potential sites with all available members of SG
May 12	SG meeting	Decision to employ Moles Consultance
May 13	Economy Group meeting	
May 16	Leisure Group open session at Youth Centre	Consultation with village clubs and societies
May 19	Developer presentations (I)	SG and public
May 20	Developer presentations (II)	SG and public
May 25	Email from Moles to M. Higgins	Seeking answers to standard questions asked of all landowners with regard to his site at Heathfield Gardens East. Mr. Higgins lives in Geneva and could not be present for interview
May 25	Email to D. Marlow from Sue Prochak	Requesting advice re site questions for questionnaire
May 30	Housing Group meeting	
June 1	Parish Newsletter	Delivered to all households in Parish
June 1	Reply from D. Marlow to Sue Prochak	As above
June 2	End of series of emails between Tamara Strapp and British Horse Society	Re improvements to bridleway network following discussion she had with Rother Valley Railway
June 4	SH email to owners of site north of Mill site	Inviting contact with owners of Mill site, copied to Mill site agent

June 8	Email from M. Higgins	Answering questions raised by D. Moles on May 25
June 8	SH email to all adjoining Parish Councils (8)	Also to High Weald AONB and Plumpton College explaining NP progress and inviting consultation
June 9	Developer/site interviews	Third round
June 8/9	SH emails to developers	Invitation to July 4 Exhibition
June 9	Sue Prochak email to dentists	Re Exhibition, and discussions with Surgery
June 9	Housing Group meeting	Brief meeting before SG meeting
June 10	Economy Group meeting	Agreed format of questionnaire for businesses
June 11	SH email to Strutt & Parker	Re delivery of Glyndebourne site
June 16	Donna Moles email to D Marlow	Re housing allocation for Robertsbridge and exception sites
June 17	Housing Group meeting with Amicus Horizon (Angela Prickett and Vanessa)	To discuss housing sites
June 24	SH email to D Marlow	Seeking advice re responses to any relevant new planning applications
June 24	Donna Moles email to Evison re Vicarage site	Seeking responses to developer interview questions as they did not respond
June 24	SH meeting at Flimwell with Jason Lavender, Co-Director of High Weald AONB unit	Discussion of what the unit could provide for SRNP and other NPs
June 25	SH email to Batcheller Monkhouse	Offering opportunity to exhibit at July 4 exhibition for both their clients (Vicarage and Pound Platt)
June 30	Poster for July 4 exhibition	Survey to use at July 4 exhibition agreed
June 30	SH email to Stonor, neighbour to Pound Platt	Advising re consultation process in the NP
June 30	SH discussion with prospective employer	Re plans to move to new workshop in Robertsbridge
July 1	Economy Group meeting	
July 3	Donna Moles' report	All developer presentations

July 3	Conversations with Desmond Fisher, manager of Freeman Forman local estate agent	Discussion of housing market in Robertsbridge and prominent needs identified
July 4	Exhibition of sites, Youth Centre, 10-4	Questionnaire provided to all comers – approx. 400 attended. Photos.
July 6	Sue Prochak email to Surgery	Offering assistance to locate new premises with prospective developers
July 9/10	Correspondence between D Moles and D Marlow	Re possibility of Slides Farm as an exception site
July 14	SG meeting with Linda Jones	Re provision of Questionnaire
July 26	Sue Prochak submission to Centre for Alternative Technology	Registration of interest re hydro power at the Mill Site
July 30	Response from Environment Agency	Re hydro scheme feasibility
Aug. 11	SG meeting presentation by Hillary Watkins	Re Uth Voice
Aug. 18	Meeting with Street Champions	Held at Ostrich pub, to set up network for delivery of questionnaire
Sept. 2	Newsletter published	
Sept. 5 to 28	Questionnaire operation	Delivery and subsequent collection of questionnaires. Delivered by Street Champions to majority of households; 100+ posted, 100 given to Darvell Community. SH addressed Darvell representatives re the importance of the questionnaire, the NP in general and their participation
Sept 15	Poster for Uth Voice event	For October 10
Sept 7	Sue Prochak email to Rother Housing Department	Re possibility for Slides Farm to be used for alternative housing
Sept 8	SG meeting	
Sept 14	Meeting with Amicus Horizon (Jenny Zaluska)	Also on Sept. 15; supplying documentation re all possible housing sites and the blank questionnaire
Sept. 15	SH email to all potential developers	Re Amicus Horizon as a possible RSL partner
Sept. 16	SH email to all potential developers	Asking developers to consider possible additional employment allocation. Subsequent answers from some developers
Sept. 22	SH email to Strutt & Partner	Supplying contacts with Surgery re Glyndebourne site

Oct. 2	Uth Voice event	Led by Hillary Watkins
Oct. 10	Uth Voice Speak Out workshop	Led by Hillary Watkins
Oct. 20	SG meeting with Linda Jones	Results to questionnaire. Street Champions specially invited to meeting: cake celebration afterwards
Nov. 10	SG meeting	
Nov. 28	Uth Voice Speak Out gig, Robertsbridge Cloub	Also attended by our MP Huw Merriman, County, District and Parish Councillors
Dec. 6	Results of Young People consultation	Produced by Hillary Watkins
Dec. 10	Work with Year 6 primary school children	Sue Prochak spent half a day with Y6 at Salehurst Primary School, talking about the NP and getting ideas and work from them. (Subsequently displayed at public events)
Dec. 10	SG meeting	
Dec. - Jan.	Placecheck exercise	Members of SG throughout the village
2016		
Jan. 3	Newsletter	Delivered to all households in Parish
Jan. 12	SG meeting	
Jan. 15	Meeting with RDC Planning team at Bexhill Town Hall	Attended by Stephen Hardy, Sue Prochak and Karen Ripley. Discussion of NP progress generally, Croudace application and employment space provision
Jan. 26	Mill site exhibition by developers	Attended throughout by Stephen Hardy, who took a survey of as many visitors as possible on their views of the proposal
Jan. 29	Email from Strutt & Parker to SH re Glyndebourne site	Arranging meeting re site on February 15 with NMS agents
Feb. 2	SG meeting	Discussion on site allocation
Feb. 3	SH email to all developers re consultation day on Feb. 27	Re site selection

Feb. 11	SH email to Batcheller Monkhouse re Vicarage land	Asking to identify access details of site and whether there is an adverse possession issue
Feb. 11	Email from D Marlow re business space	Clarifying his interpretation of Core Strategy
Feb. 15	SH email to Strutt & Parker	Re dentists' interest in Glyndebourne site
Feb. 2/15	Emails between Croudace and SH	Re results in questionnaire
Feb. 25	D Marlow response about making new Conservation Area	
Feb. 27	Consultation Day, Youth Centre followed by short SG meeting	Feedback questionnaire on sites and Vision and Objectives
Mar. 1	Sue Prochak email to Historic England	Asking for advice on policy formulation
Mar. 2	Email from N Kwan of RDC	Providing information re Green Infrastructure
Mar. 2	Maps from High Weald AONB unit	Series of maps regarding historic routemap, geology, woodland and similar matters
Mar. 4/21	Email correspondence between SH and Croudace	Re assessment criteria for site selection
Mar. 8	SG meeting	Work on policies started
Mar. 10	Email from Bishops Lane agent	Critique of site assessment
Mar. 16	Meeting with owner of Mill site	To receive update on progress of their planning discussions with RDC and EA
Mar. 22	Contact from M Higgins	Confirmation that he and Strutt & Parker are preparing a joint proposal for Heathfield Gardens East and West
Apr. 5	Strutt & Parker re Glyndebourne site	Confirmation that discussions have started with the NHS re occupation of the site
Apr. 11/15	SH email re BT site	Enquiring about possible redevelopment of the site for employment purposes
Apr. 12	SG meeting	David Marlow in attendance

May 5	Call from Rapleys Surveyors	General enquiry re progress with NP
May 10	Enquiry from Amicus Horizon (Zoe Jackson)	Re shopping list for community facilities required in the village: reply from Sue Prochak
May 10	SG meeting	
May 10	SPARK award ceremony, Winter Gardens, Eastbourne, attended by Sue Prochak	Award for Uth Voice project
May 23	HM Government Walking and Cycling Strategy	Response by SH on behalf of SG
May 27	Revised Mill site proposal request for comment	Responded to by SH by email
May/June	Email correspondence with ESCC officers	Re highways and transport indications for the NP
June 14	SG meeting	
June 14	SH email response to Croudace	Re questions on site selection criteria
June 14	Email from Strutt & Parker	Update on Glyndebourne site and Heathfield Gardens sites
June 16	Email from Mill site owners	Update on their proposals
June 20	SH email to M Higgins	Re employment space provision for Heathfield Gardens East
July 12	SG meeting	July 21
July 21	Site visit at the Mill	With Huw Merriman MP, SH and Sheila Brazier
Aug. 1	Parish newsletter	Delivered to all households in Parish
Aug. 9	Email update from Strutt & Parker	Re progress on Heathfield Gardens sites
Aug. 9	SG meeting	
Aug. 12	Email update from Batcheller Monkhouse	Re Vicarage site
Aug. 13	Email update re Mill site from owner	
Aug. 15	Discussion between D Moles and Evison, agent for Chichester Diocese	Follow-up to previous discussion
Aug. 17	SH discussion with Evison	Re deliverability and scope of the Vicarage site

Aug. 18	SH meeting with owners of Mill site	For update on progress
Sept. 6	Meeting with Graham Furness, retired ESCC Highways Engineer	Onsite meeting to discuss feasibility of access to Vicarage and Heathfield Gardens sites
Sept. 6	SG meeting	Approval of Reg 14 draft NP
Sept. 12	D Moles to N Kwan, RDC	Re initial comments on pre-Reg 14 draft NP
Sept. 12	SH email to Annette Hawkins, newly appointed Vicar of ecclesiastical parish of Salehurst	Invitation to a meeting to discuss the NP
Sept. 14	Meeting between Sue Prochak and Tracey Johnson, freelance Youth Worker	Discussion of how to take the Uth Voice project further in conjunction with Parish Council
Sept. 15	SG meeting with D Marlow present	Offering RDC's view on progress of the NP so far
Sept. 17	SH email to all site developers	Requesting updated plans for use in next public exhibition to be held on Oct 7 and 8
Sept. 19	SH email re Heathfield Gardens East and West	Requesting updated specific housing figures
Sept. 22	Email from Strutt & Parker	Re commercial interest in employment provision for Glyndebourne site
Sept. 23	SH email to all "green space" owners	Informing owners of the designation of green spaces in the draft Reg 14 Plan
Sept. 23	Discussion with Desmond Fisher, Manager, Freeman Forman	Provided him with rough details of the Reg 14 Plan, general discussions
Sept. 26	100+ stakeholders	Email with details of Reg 14 consultation
Sept. 26	Press release to Battle Observer	Update re NP progress
Sept. 27	Meeting attended by Sue Prochak, Tracey Johnson and Karen Ripley	Further discussion of how to continue the Uth Voice project in conjunction with the Parish Council
Sept. 27	Personal letter from Stephen Hardy to people outside the village but who use facilities, encouraging responses to the Plan	Andrew Wedmore, Angus Gillougley, Rogers Plumbing, Lesley Abdella, D. Nicholls, Hugh Arbuthnott, jals@millwood , Millhouse Northiam, Mary Newington, B J Echlin, Carol Ward, O M O Bond, Steve Barrass, Sophia Bartleet, Christopher Bosney, Cllr. John Barnes, Jim Benson, G G Peters, Hannah Sassone, Jeremy and Kathryn Field, Mary Varrall, M. Swift, Mr. and

		Mrs. Barnes, Nicole Livingstone-Smith, R G Moore, Sally Bishop, Ann Moore, Charles Everett, Charlotte Moore, D Connolly, + 37 more
Sept. 28 onward	Notice of Reg 14 consultation, and exhibition on Oct 7/8	Delivered to all households in Parish via Street Champions network
Oct. 1	Village Market stall 10-12 a.m.	Advertising consultation (Photos)
Oct. 3	Further leaflet delivery to Glottenham, resulting from conversations at Village Market	Hamlet out of Salehurst parish, whose only access by vehicle is through the parish.
Oct. 8/9	Exhibition at Youth Centre, 12 hours in total	Reg 14 Plan (Photos)
Oct. 26	Meeting with Mill site agents	Latest update
Oct. 27	Correspondence with Claire Tester, Planning Adviser, High Weald AONB Unit	Following meeting re medieval field maps around Robertsbridge
Nov. 4	Meeting with Strutt & Parker	Latest update on Heathfield Gardens East and West
Ongoing	Meetings with other NP groups	Crowhurst, Rye, Battle, Ticehurst, Etchingham
Nov. 7	Q & A session with local Mother and Toddler group parents and grandparents at Youth Centre	Photos
Nov. 7 onwards	Responses to pre-submission consultation	ESCC, Chichester Diocese, Mountfield Estate (Heathfield Gardens West), David Marlow RDC (also suggesting meeting to discuss), Historic England, Highways England, Southern Water HWAONB, Ramblers, Sedlescombe PC, Croudace, Rapleys (Mill Site), Courtley re Devine Homes, Matt Higgins (HG East)
Nov. 9	Email reminder to Environment Agency re consultation	
Nov. 11	Emails to Diane Russell, Conservation & Design Officer, RDC	Trying to arrange meeting; decided not to proceed
Nov. 11	Email correspondence with Karen Rees, local holiday let owner	Re including this specific group in consultations
Nov. 11	SG meeting	With Donna Moles, to discuss consultation feedback and decide on

		changes
Nov. 14	Email from Huw Merriman, MP	Declining to comment specifically on SRNDP but expressing general support
Nov. 14	Steering Group meeting to discuss responses	Also attended by David Marlow
Nov. 14/15	Emails to Mill site and Heathfield Gardens developers	Informing them of what D.Marlow said re their sites
Nov. 15	Email to Strutt & Parker	Requesting update on Glyndebourne site
Nov. 16	Trees consultation letter	Owners of trees & wooded areas listed
Nov. 16	Emails from Stephen Hardy updating re David Marlow's comments on draft Plan	Agents for Heathfield Gardens sites, Mill site,
Nov. 16	Email response from Higgins (Heathfield Gardens)	
Nov. 17	Email response from Strutt & Parker (Heathfield Gardens)	
Nov. 17	Draft consultation letter re local listing of trees	Landowners and property owners on list
Nov. 21	Consultation letters/emails to all owners of trees on Schedule 4	
Nov. 21	Email from Strutt & Parker re Heathfield Gardens	Plus reply from Stephen Hardy
Nov. 22	Meeting with Cllr. Angharad Davies, ESCC	Stephen Hardy, Karl Taylor, Karen Ripley
Nov. 22	Email to owners of Heathfield Gardens	Re extended consultation re tree list
Nov. 22	Email response from Rapleys (Mill site)	
Sept. 28 2014 - Nov. 6 2016	29 notifications on various Facebook pages: "Family Info", S & R PC, S & R NP	Reminders of events, posters, deadlines, asking for comments etc. posted by Ruth Hardy
21 st Nov – 5 th Dec	Trees and hedgerow consultation	In our draft Neighbourhood Plan we listed for protection certain trees and hedgerows whose loss would harm the amenity of the area (Policy EN 9

		<p>(page 36) / Schedule 4 (page 76).</p> <p>In the light of comments received during the consultation period (26 September to 7 November 2016), we have reviewed the Schedule 4 list of trees and hedgerows and included the rationale behind the selection process. We have issued consultation letters to owners of the trees and hedgerows affected, seeking their views.</p>
	Parish Council meetings	<p>From January 2015, an update has been given to every single Parish Council meeting and every Planning Committee. These are recorded in minutes which are available on the PC website.</p>

03 Regulation 14 consultation responses

- 3.0.1 The NDP Regulation at Regulation 14 requires that the pre-submission Plan is taken to consultation by the Parish Council. This is a formal statutory consultation period of 6 weeks with the statutory bodies, stakeholders, the Local Planning Authority and the community. It then requires the Parish Council to consider those representations received and whether any further changes may be required because of these. The Reg.14 Pre-submission consultation and publicity was from 26th September to 7th November 2016. There were drop in consultation events at the Youth Centre: Friday 7th October: 2pm - 8pm and Saturday 8th October: 10am - 4pm. In addition to being emailed to the relevant people, the plan was also made available on <http://www.robertsbridgeneighbourhoodplan.org.uk> or by visiting the Parish Council Office on Tuesdays: 2pm - 4pm or Thursdays: 2pm - 4pm.
- 3.0.2 The table below outlines the key points of representation made at Regulation 14 community engagement and consultation which has shaped the changes to the SRNDP at Regulation 14 stage.

Details of the persons and bodies consulted	Consultation method	Summary of main issues and concerns raised (not verbatim)	Response to the concerns raised in the representation
ESCC	email	<p>Transport development control:</p> <p>Mill Site: satisfied that this is a brownfield site with presumption for development and has good transport links.</p> <p>Heathfield Gardens: Ideally access should be sought through Heathfield Gardens although there might be an issue with levels.</p> <p>Vicarage Land: Depending on where the access goes, the double yellow lines (DYLs) may need to be reconfigured so that the road space is protected for turning manoeuvres.</p>	<p>Heathfield Gardens: Speeds are derestricted on the section of John’s Cross Road between the A21 and the Heathfield Gardens Junction) therefore any new access onto this road would need a Traffic Regulation order (TRO) to reduce the speed limit and if necessary the installation of speed reduction features. Distance from each of the junctions (A21 and Heathfield Gardens) would need to be a minimum of 45 metres based on a 30 mph speed limit being authorised.</p> <p>Vicarage Land: There are difficulties to overcome with using the current access. If these cannot be resolved there may however be other possible options which would need to be considered. Therefore at this stage the site is not ruled out from a highway perspective.</p>

	<p>Transport policy</p> <p>Objectives (Page 20, 21 Paragraph 2.2.1) 1. Economy – Suggest cross reference to objective 5 - Infrastructure, it would be useful to demonstrate the linkage between the economy and accessibility to these. a) To sustain a thriving village centre with mixed use shopping and service provision offering a range of goods and services to the local community and visitors. b) To retain the local retail and service provision. c) To foster a sustainable and accessible community that promotes employment creation, across commercial, retail and industrial sites</p> <p>5. Infrastructure – Suggested amendments as tracked changes</p> <p>a) To promote cycling and walking e-networks to support local and non-vehicular connectivity to key services and local transport services (bus/rail), for a sustainable village life. b) To reduce the harmful impact of road traffic and parking on the local community, by promoting local travel choices. c) To seek timely and effective maintenance of existing infrastructure. d) To maintain and improve effective flood defences. e) To seek improvements for pedestrian safety on the high street, to improve access to key services.</p> <p>Land Use Policies -Economy (Page 24, Paragraph 3.1) - Suggested amendments as tracked changes: Policy EC5: Retail in the village centre and outskirts The provision of any new or additional retail floor-space in the retail core (refer to ANNEX 1 to the Plan: Map2) of Robertsbridge (High Street and immediate environs) will be supported provided that it enhances the village’s shopping offer and is accessible, to support its role as a Rural Service Centre.</p> <p>Additional provision outside the retail core will be supported if it enhances the village centre retail offer, is compatible with the</p>	<p>Amended as suggested in parts</p> <p>Objectives have not changed because the additions do not change the context but would involve changes in several documents.</p> <p>(note: the policy numbers referenced in the representation were incorrect so this has been corrected below)</p> <p>Policy EC1: Retail in the village centre and outskirts The provision of any new or additional retail floor-space in the retail core (refer to ANNEX 1 to the Plan: Map2) of Robertsbridge (High Street and immediate environs) will be supported provided that it enhances the village’s shopping offer and is accessible, to support its role as a Rural Service Centre.</p> <p>Additional provision outside the retail core will be supported if it enhances the village centre retail offer, is compatible with the size and scale of the existing village centre, and does not have unacceptable impacts on the operation of the road network and the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Policy EC5: Tourism development which includes any business activities that facilitate tourism and leisure related activities will be permitted where they: 1. make appropriate use of materials, scale, height, form and signage; 2. make use of the historic and geographic attributes of the area; and 3. actively promotes access by sustainable transport, and 4. are in keeping with the rural character of the AONB countryside.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>size and scale of the existing village centre, and does not have unacceptable impacts on the operation of the road network and the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>Tourism (Page 27) -Suggested amendments as tracked changes: Policy EC5: Tourism Tourism development which includes any business activities that facilitate tourism and leisure related activities will be permitted where they: 1. make appropriate use of materials, scale, height, form and signage; 2. make use of the historic and geographic attributes of the area; and 3. actively promotes access by sustainable transport, and 4. are in keeping with the rural character of the AONB countryside</p> <p>Rural businesses (Page 28) -Suggested amendments as tracked changes: Policy EC6: Rural businesses 3. the development should have good access to and from the A21 and not generate significant additional traffic through the centre of the village; and – Agree with the inclusion of this policy. Policy EC7: Encouraging employment Suggested amendments as tracked changes. Business development in the parish will be encouraged where: 3. it will not cause or exacerbate any traffic problems alongside promoting sustainable transport.</p> <p>Infrastructure (Page 44) Policy IN4: Non-car provision/ footpath / public transport provision -Agree with the inclusion of this policy</p> <p>Pedestrian safety -Suggested amendments as tracked changes: Policy IN5: Pedestrian safety All new housing developments must provide safe pedestrian access to link up with existing or proposed wider footpath networks, ensuring that residents can walk safely to public transport services bus stops, schools and other key village</p>	<p>Policy EC7: Encouraging employment Suggested amendments as tracked changes. Business development in the parish will be encouraged where: 3. it will not cause or exacerbate any traffic problems alongside promoting and will promote sustainable transport.</p> <p>Policy IN5: Pedestrian safety All new housing developments must provide safe pedestrian access to link up with existing or proposed wider footpath networks, ensuring that residents can walk safely to public transport services bus stops, schools and other key village services facilities, including retail and medical facilities. We will support highways or other transport improvements that facilitate safe access for pedestrians and cyclists on foot through and between all parts of the village, and the linkages between other settlements.</p> <p>Policy LE3: New facilities 3. the proposal would not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network and will actively promote access by sustainable transport.; and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>services facilities, including retail and medical facilities. We will support highways or other transport improvements that facilitate safe access for pedestrians and cyclists on foot through and between all parts of the village, and the linkages between other settlements.</p> <p>Leisure (Page 48) -Suggested amendments as tracked changes: Policy LE3: New facilities 3. the proposal would not have unacceptable impacts on the local road network and will actively promote access by sustainable transport.; and</p>	
		<p>Flood Risk Management It is not clear what points 1, 2 and 3 mean in the context of the aim of the policy? Are they developments that will be supported? Bearing in mind the sentence following 3, it is suggested that the policy would be clearer if 1, 2, and 3 were deleted.</p> <p>Replace “i.e.” with “e.g.”</p>	Noted but no amendment needed
		<p>Historic Environment including Archaeology The authors of the NP and their consultants may find the 2009 report by Roland Harris useful. It is an extensive urban survey of Robertsbridge and will help provide some background to the history and archaeology of the settlement. https://www.westsussex.gov.uk/media/1741/robertsbridge_eu_s_report_maps.pdf However, information needs to be updated through contact with the HE</p>	Reference is now made to 2009 Report by Roland Harris.
		<p>Ecology Para 2.2.1 Objectives. Although the environmental objectives refer to conserving natural resources, there is no mention of the need to maintain, conserve and enhance biodiversity</p>	See Policies EN3 and EN4 Reference is made in Policy EN3 to RDC’s Green Infrastructure network.

		<p>despite the recognition earlier in the report that the area is of significant importance for nature conservation.</p> <p>There is no policy for green infrastructure.</p>	
		<p>Older People’s Housing Furthermore, the Parish Council’s may wish to consider including a specific reference to ‘sheltered housing’ within Policy HO5 and/or Policy HO6.</p>	Amended as suggested
		<p>Education Page 13 – 1.4.4 Education: The wording should be updated to take account of the May 2016 pupil census data as below (the October 2016 census figures are not currently available). Salehurst CE Primary School – 200 (Capacity 210) Robertsbridge Community College – 655 (Capacity 650)</p> <p>Para 3.2.1 states that ‘all education sites are either near or full to capacity’. This is correct however the remainder of the paragraph is not a true reflection of the current situation therefore it is suggested that it is replaced with the following text:</p> <p>‘Pupil forecasts undertaken by ESCC in July 2016 show that schools can cope with the additional demand from the development proposed. ESCC is therefore not currently proposing expanding education provision in the area. If forecasts change then expansion may be required and in line with RDC’s CIL Charging Schedule Reg. 123 list either CIL monies or S106 contributions should be used to help address the shortfall in pupil places.’</p>	Amended as suggested
Rother District Council	email	It was noted previously and I thought agreed at the NP Steering Group, that the vision (following paragraph 2.1.1) would relate	Amended as suggested although village is inter used with parish but both are used to encompass the whole community within the parish boundary.

		to the parish rather than the “village”. Although not a major point perhaps, it goes to the scope of the NP.	
		The document is clearly structured and written; hence, it is quite accessible.	Noted
		The objectives appear suitably wide-ranging.	Noted
		Mention is made at paragraph 1.4.7 of the Rother Valley Railway proposal, it stating that a policy is not included as a planning application is currently before the District Council. Our view is that because this is the subject of an earlier Local Plan policy which is not yet a commitment and straddles three parishes, then it should be covered by the District Council’s Development and Site Allocations (DaSA) Local Plan, which it now is. A cross-reference would be appropriate.	Para 1.4.7 altered
		Economy policies: Policies EC1 – EC7 are intended to promote the local economy and are broadly welcomed. However, there are some issues: a) The wording of Policy EC3 appears, by the wording relating to “as identified by the market”, to open the door widely to losing employment sites being lost, contrary to Core Strategy policy EC3 b) Policy EC5 should be read alongside the policy for Holiday Sites contained in the emerging DaSA c) The scope of Policy EC6 is unclear and may benefit from a discussion on wording d) Policy EC7 relies on background reports, notably that relating to ‘employment provision’. That conclude that 2,495sqm adequately fulfils the Parish’s obligations, but relies on the permission at Culverwells which, as we have discussed, is likely to be lost to a medical use. It is note that existing rural business centres are actually fully occupied. Suggesting potential demand, which from a sustainability point of view, would be better met more centrally. I would again welcome discussion on the position.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Policy EC3 is not contrary to the core strategy, it supports but adds detail by adding a specific time frame for active marketing. b) The details of emerging DaSA was not known to us prior to reg.14 or at working draft level but in any event, EC5 is in general conformity. c) Policy EC6 does not allocate a specific site for employment but outlines the support for employment use. There is not sufficient evidence to allocate a particular site and given that no actual figure has been given, it has been left to the various parish councils to decide what proportion they will accommodate. However, we have had discussions with the allocated sites to provide employment space and can be further developed as part of the planning application process.

			<p>d) Policy EC7, it is important to note difference between 'employment' use and 'business' use. Also we may need to consider net employment gains if the surgery and dentists' premises revert to residential use.</p>
		<p>Environment policies: These are again wide-ranging and properly supportive of the High Weald AONB. Initial comments relate to:</p> <p>a) The number of Local Green Space designations (in Schedule 1) and the extent of them and their "specialness" to the parish</p> <p>b) I note that RDC is consulting shortly on renewable energy priorities, for which there are recent changes in the national policies</p> <p>c) I refer to our earlier comments on the historic environment</p> <p>d) We have not had the opportunity to review the local listing but would urge discussion with the Council's conservation officer</p>	<p>The conservation officer's comments were taken on board. The local listing was further assessed and consulted on.</p>
		<p>Housing policies: a) Policy HO2 usefully refers to monitoring of housing supply and is a sensible policy</p> <p>b) Policy HO3 essentially identifies 150 dwellings on new sites relative to the target of 130 dwellings remaining for large sites from the Core Strategy. This meets the minimum requirement. There are nonetheless concerns over the capacity of the Mill site, which officers initial view of the scheme shown at the exhibition is unduly dense in parts, aside from the issue of employment floorspace. Similarly, the capacity of Heathfield Gardens appears high, as mentioned at the SG meeting. We are not clear at this stage whether the Vicarage Land is likely to be deliverable and would need to understand this better, as well as having the Highways views, as believe this could be difficult in highways and amenity terms.</p> <p>c) Policy HO6 runs counter to the Government's PPG as well as the Core Strategy and needs a more substantial case we believe to be supported. It will also need viability evidence.</p>	<p>The owners of the Mill site have started pre-application consultation and are still proposing to deliver 100 dwellings on the site. This will no doubt be an issue for planning application stage and the level of detail in the evidence base studies to justify this quantum. There are indicative plans which shows that this can be accommodated so the application cannot be pre-determined.</p> <p>With the Vicarage, we have taken the view that given its proximity to the heart of the village and because of the lack of specific provision for elderly persons' accommodation in the parish, we would like to see this site being used for this purpose. The highways issues can be mitigated in consultation with Highways.</p>

			Amend policy HO6 to say a net gain of 6 or more dwellings ... (this now aligns with PPG)
		Infrastructure policies: The views of the relevant agencies will be important. Policy IN7 noted.	Noted
Highways England	email	In relation to Policy EC6 point 3 on page 28, please note that Highways England will be concerned with developments that result in intensification of use of an existing access on to the A21. Any such proposals would need careful consideration in relation to the type of access already provided and whether or not it would still be suitable for use following re-development of the site. The creation of a new access to the A21 is likely to be resisted by Highways England unless there is significant economic benefit in doing so and that the new access would not be detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of our network.	This will be dealt with as part of the planning application process. The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges document TD 41/95 'Vehicular Access to all Purpose Trunk Roads' gives guidance on the appropriate type of access for smaller development sites.
		Policy HO3 point 3 on page 38, Highways England would seek to resist the creation of new direct access to the A21 unless there is significant economic benefit in doing so and that the new access would not be detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of our network.	We were not seeking any new accesses off the A 21 for any of our preferred sites. This will be dealt with at planning application stage in any event.
		We note that a Traffic Management Plan is proposed on page 56. As such, we recommend that early consultation is undertaken with Highways England in development of this plan	Some of the developers have started the early consultation with Highways.
		On page 7 of Annex 2: Site Assessment Document, we note that access to/from the A21 may be required for the Slides Farm and Grove Farm Phase 2 sites. Please note that Highways England would seek to resist creation of new direct access to the A21 unless there is significant economic benefit in doing so and that the new access would not be detrimental to the safe and efficient operation of our network.	The cumulative traffic effects of development will need careful consideration in relation to the efficient operation of the A21 specifically the roundabout junction with Northbridge Street and Church Lane as well as the priority junction with George Hill. Detrimental effects on the operation of these junctions may necessitate highway improvements which will need to be funded by development. This will be dealt with at planning application stage. Neither of the two sites referred to by HE are preferred sites.

		The cumulative traffic effects of all development being brought forward as a result of the Neighbourhood Plan will need careful consideration in relation to the efficient operation of the A21 specifically the roundabout junction with Northbridge Street and Church Lane as well as the priority junction with George Hill. Detrimental effects on the operation of these junctions may necessitate highway improvements which will need to be funded by development.	This will be dealt with at planning application stage.
High Weald joint advisory committee	email	<p>In section 1.4 Parish Information it is noted that paragraphs 1.4.11-12 on the Environment relate to Rother District as a whole rather than specifically to the parish. Given the high quality environment in the parish this is surprising, and it is suggested that this section is also made specific to Robertsbridge. This could include reference to the High Weald AONB and how the landscape character components are reflected in the parish.</p> <p>Policy EN3: Countryside Protection says that 'All development will be considered with regard to the need to protect the landscape character of the countryside including views into and out of the AONB and elsewhere.' Given that the parish is wholly within the AONB and some miles from its perimeter, it is considered unlikely that there will be views into or out of the AONB.</p> <p>I would suggest that a policy approach which is more specific about the local characteristics of the AONB that you wish to protect would add more to the national and local plan policies on AONBs. Some suggested wording is appended to this letter.</p>	<p>Include the suggestion of the policy.</p> <p>Include the characteristics of the area as supporting text in paras 1.4.11 and 12</p>
Ramblers (East Sussex countryside officer)	email	The designation of 18 local green spaces is to be commended. These should be made as easily accessible as possible for both residents and visitors.	Noted

		It appears that sites 1, 9, 10 and 11 are wholly or partly outside the proposed new development area. This is to be welcomed as otherwise development would be stretching too far into the countryside.	Noted
		Where public footpaths run through or alongside proposed development areas, they should be kept on dedicated lines and not on where there will be vehicular use	Noted but covered in Policy IN5.
Sedlescombe Parish Council	email	Thank you for inviting Sedlescombe Parish Council to comment on the Salehurst and Robertsbridge Development Plan. I can confirm that following a discussion at the Full Council Meeting on 11th October 2016, Parish Council is in support of the plan.	Noted
Croudace (under control of Grove Farm 1 and Grove farm 2)	email	The first phase of Grove farm is allocated within the Local Plan Policy VL7, which was saved through the adoption of the Core Strategy. Rother District Council, at the time of adoption of the Core strategy considered the site at Grove Farm to be suitable, available and deliverable within the plan period. This position has not changed and an application has been submitted to RDC for the provision of 34 new dwellings and conversion of the listed barn to a residential dwelling (REF 2016/1722/P)	Noted, however whilst Croudace always claim the RDC Policy VL7 from the 2006 Local Plan support the continued allocation of their site, we do not believe that is the case, for two reasons. First that policy is clearly stated to be subject to another RDC policy, DS 6 which states in para (iv) in relation to VL 7, that the site will only be released (granted permission) 'if found necessary to meet housing requirements up to 2011' i.e. after that date it falls. Second para 22 of NPPF requires land allocations (Policy VL: 7 is just such) 'to be regularly reviewed'. VL 7 has not been reviewed since 2006 i.e. 10 years ago despite the fact that RDC had the chance to review it in the Core Strategy of 2014.
		Recommendations 1. an explanation should be provided as to how the traffic light system has been utilised to draw the conclusions which have been reached in order to make the evidence base more transparent for members of the public and relevant stakeholders.	1. The preferred options have been selected based on the criteria scoring and previous evidence base documents such as the residents' survey and the SHLAA. These are presented as a range of options and residents were consulted (February 2016) and asked to

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Justification as to why the recommendations of the SHLAA are being ignored in relation to proposed site densities and why they consider these to be deliverable. 3. Sites should be reassessed to take into account what appropriate community facilities could be made available and provide weight to these as necessary. 4. Alongside the justification of why sites have been chosen, confirmation as to why sites have not been carried forward to allocations should also be given. This should include an explanation as to why the allocated Grove Farm site has been concluded as 'unsuitable' 5. Reasoning should be provided as to why residents feedback has been ignored in relation to the Vicarage Land. 	<p>express a preference. The results were presented as a range of options so that the community were able to express a preference and that they understood why the preferred options were being proposed. The steering group then reviewed the comments and the site assessment and selected the sites to be included in the Plan. Final selection also took account of the full evidence base; the overall objectives set out within the Plan and the points that had been identified for ensuring the village remained sustainable for all its residents into the future.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. The SHLAA is a useful evidence base document to use as a baseline but neighbourhood development plans will review these and also look at other sites which locally become available and build upon this prior to assessing all the reasonable alternatives as part of the site allocation. The SHLAA was the starting point for the site assessment process, however as part of the call for sites process the land owners proposed more land than what is considered in the SHLAA hence why more capacity was proposed. The Mill Site owner has since begun pre application discussions with RDC and are therefore committed to delivering the site. They have also started various detailed studies to support their proposed allocation of 100. 3. Unsure why Croudace suggest that they would be willing to provide some substantial community benefits, when their actual current
--	--	---	--

			<p>application before Rother has argued consistently that the benefits that were being required of them in Policy VL 7 and suggested should be given in the Rother SHLAA cannot be afforded. There is no set list of criteria required and those used cover a wide range of issues that are proportionate for an NDP.</p> <p>4. There are no hard and fast ways of choosing specific site allocations once you have determined that they are necessary, but the site selection process will have to be carried out in an open and transparent way, including consultation with the community and the production of a full evidence base to support and justify the conclusions reached. Inevitably, not all the short-listed sites could be chosen so the sites had to be selected by identifying the most appropriate sites which could be taken forward to the next formal stage of the process following consultation with the community and other stakeholders. The NDP brings to bear new criteria for site selection which were not available to Rother officers when conducting their SHLAA site selection process. The old appeal decision is not relevant because the NDP set out new rules in the light of current thinking set against the requirements of the NPPF.</p> <p>5. This is a partial view of feedback and ignores the results of the widest feedback of all – the Questionnaire.</p>
Rapleys (Agent for Mill site)	email	The site's allocation is supported. It is the only site capable of accommodating a significant scale of residential development	Noted

		<p>Employment delivery</p> <p>The draft Plan should provide further context in regard to how Salehurst and Robertsbridge. A potential approach could be to prepare a map showing existing commercial and employment generating sites within Robertsbridge.</p>	<p>Noted but there is insufficient evidence to do this at present and can be done as part of a Plan review.</p>
		<p>Appropriate mix of housing/employment</p> <p>It is proposed that our client's site will deliver approximately 100 residential dwellings and elements of employment generating floorspace</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Courtley (Devine)	email	<p>A single representation was received on this document from Courtley Planning Consultants Ltd on behalf of Devine Homes. The various paragraphs are outlined below</p>	<p>Noted</p>
		<p>Paragraph 1.2</p> <p>Use of the same evidence base and timing</p>	<p>The evidence base of the document was constituted of the various evidence documents that informed and supported the Rother Local Plan, information from the data.gov website; East Sussex County Council; information that supported applications of relevance and information provided to the Salehurst and Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Steering Group, from site promoters.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 1.2</p> <p>Consultation with stakeholders on the scope of the document</p>	<p>A scoping document was sent to Rother District Council and the required agencies for comment in August. Comments received regarded an additional topic, which was incorporated into the document.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 1.3; 1.5 and 2.1.1</p> <p>Quotes paragraph 170 of the NPPF regarding landscape and historic character assessment</p>	<p>Crucially this paragraph mentions 'where appropriate'. As the evidence documents included information on the wider landscape, as well as at a local level, plus relating to the historic environment down to a specific Salehurst and Robertsbridge Character Appraisal, a separate exercise was not required. These all informed the content of the document.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 1.4</p>	<p>The document was done by a consultant independent of the Parish and information was relayed as</p>

		Believes that the document was done by the Parish Council, not started early in the process and not done independently	requested. This instruction began in July, while topics were still being discussed.
		Paragraph 2.1.3 Talks of the East Sussex Landscape assessment being too crude to make robust assessment of the landscape impacts of individual sites submitted in the SHLAA process	As mentioned above for para 1.3, 1.5 and 2.2.1, the evidence included the specific Salehurst and Robertsbridge Character Assessment
		Paragraph 2.1.5 This talks of the only landscape evidence listed in Appendix II being the ESCC landscape character assessment and this not being appropriate or proportionate	Appendix II as its name states lists the plans and programmes that exist which need to be considered in the SEA. This is not however a list of the evidence that has informed the content of the report
		Paragraph 2.2.3 This talks of the Mill Site being in the floodplain and that the measures suggested would not be appropriate	The flood issues at the Mill Site are mentioned but it shows that there are design solutions that would reduce or prevent the residual risk.
		Paragraph 2.2.6-2.2.8 This talks of the fact that there are other more preferable sites that could meet the Parish housing needs. It goes on to talk about what a site specific assessment would require. It finishes by talking about the fact that as a result it would not consider the site would be safe in flood events.	The SEA document does not ignore the flood risk on any sites but the sequential test at this stage is not site level, it simply needs to take account of the vulnerabilities and potential solutions that reduce the residual risk.
		Paragraph 2.3.5 This talks of not understanding why with landscape and historic environment the conclusion is only neutral for the Mill site	The overall scoring is set out in section 4 of the SEA document. Account is also taken of the advice contained within the government guidance on the SEA Directive
		Paragraph 3.4.1 Consider that due to being in the AONB and conservation area the score should be neutral	The overall scoring is set out in section 4 of the SEA document. Account is also taken of the advice contained within the government guidance on the SEA Directive.
		Paragraph 3.5.2-3.5.4 This mentions that it is not believed the supplementary landscape assessment has been considered and that objectives 4 and 5 should be recategorized from neutral to positive for the Bishops Lane site	The overall scoring is set out in section 4 of the SEA document. Account is also taken of the advice contained within the government guidance on the SEA Directive.

		<p>Paragraph 3.6.1 Believes that the assessment for the Mill site is unbalanced and skewed. Considers there should be a reclassification of a number of elements and should be rejected.</p>	<p>The scoring is clearly set out. Though there may be different proportions of the questions and indicators between the sites, the scoring reflects that for both.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 4.1 The SEA was published in September 2016. The NPPF state that the SEA is an integral part of any plan and this assessment must be carried out early within the plan-making process. Clearly, this has not occurred given the NP was also published at the same time (Sept 2016)</p>	<p>The SEA was developed as part of the process and therefore aligned with the Plan throughout. This therefore including updating it as part of the Reg.14 submission hence the date. The SEA process also includes the scoping so it is evident that this exercise commenced in accordance with the requirements of the NPPF.</p>
		<p>Paragraph 4.2 The report appears to have been undertaken by the Parish Council and its assessment therefore has led to an unbalanced and skewed assessment of the individual sites as illustrated in our submission. The report fails to obtain appropriate and proportionate evidence in its assessments of issues such as Landscape and Visual Assessments within a settlement “washed over “as AONB. It also failed to undertake a Sequential or Exception Test on flood risk on the sites assessments.</p>	<p>The NDP has undertaken various evidence base studies including a character appraisal which also look at the landscape and fabric of the area. The SEA document does not ignore the flood risk on any sites but the sequential test at this stage is not site level, it simply needs to take account of the vulnerabilities and potential solutions that reduce the residual risk. NDPs need to be proportionate in evidence base and are not mini local plans.</p>
Southern Water	Email	<p>We look to Salehurst and Roberstbridge Parish Council, and Rother District Council to ensure, through planning policies and conditions, that development is coordinated with the provision of infrastructure and not permitted to proceed unless it connects to the sewerage system at the nearest points of adequate capacity, as advised by the service provider.</p>	<p>Noted, this is a planning application requirement.</p>
		<p>Capacity of the sewerage system Our assessment reveals that the local sewerage system currently has limited capacity to accommodate additional development at this scale. This is not a constraint to development however, provided planning policy for this site</p>	<p>Noted, this is a planning application requirement.</p>

		ensures that proposed development makes a connection to the sewerage network at the nearest point of adequate capacity.	
		<p>Proposed amendments</p> <p>To ensure consistency with the NPPF and Planning Practice Guidance, we propose the following text (underlined) be added to Policy HO3:</p> <p>Policy HO3 Site Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Development will need to provide a connection at the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider.</u> • <u>An odour assessment should be undertaken to inform the masterplanning of the site and to minimise land use conflict</u> 	<p>Amended as suggested</p> <p>Policy HO3 Site Allocation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Development will need to provide a connection at the nearest point of adequate capacity in the sewerage network, as advised by the service provider.</u> • <u>An odour assessment should be undertaken to inform the masterplanning of the site and to minimise land use conflict</u>
		<p>Additional policy on the provision of water and wastewater infrastructure</p> <p>Although the Parish Council is not the planning authority in relation to wastewater development proposals, support for essential infrastructure is required at all levels of the planning system.</p> <p>Proposed amendment</p> <p>On this basis, we propose the following additional policy:</p> <p><u>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</u></p>	<p>Amended as suggested</p> <p>On this basis, we propose the following additional policy:</p> <p><u>New and improved utility infrastructure will be encouraged and supported in order to meet the identified needs of the community.</u></p>
Evison (client is Chichester Diocese)	Email	The Diocese welcomes and supports the proposed allocation of the “Vicarage Land” for approximately 10 dwellings under Policy HO3 and will be pleased to assist the Steering Group at any time with further information or discussion if required	Noted
		The Diocese has some concerns about Policy HO6 (non-market housing). Neighbourhood plan policies must be consistent with higher tier plans and national policy. Notwithstanding the proviso in the draft policy, the underlying concern is to avoid a policy that impacts on the viability and thus the deliverability of housing on this site.	Amend policy HO6 to say a net gain of 6 or more dwellings ... (aligns with PPG)

Matt Higgins (HFG East)	Email	We have two access points from George Hill and Heathfield Gardens and in discussions with the Highways Authority and positive about them both.	Post consultation the land owner has employed Savills so that preliminary work can commence which is a clear indication of commitment to delivery of the Heathfield Gardens site.
		Supports the allocation	Noted
Strutt and Parker (clients own the Mountfield estate)	Email	The plan followed a rigorous and transparent process of site selection to identify and allocate available, deliverable and developable housing sites which can meet the minimum target of 155 units required by RDC. This means the plan is in conformity with the housing policies contained in the NPPF, particularly paragraph 47 which seeks to significantly boost the supply of housing.	Noted
		<p>Policy HO3 of the SRNDP allocates both the Western and Eastern parcels of land (now known as Heathfield Gardens) for 40 units, some 31% of the total new allocations for Robertsbridge. The Mountfield Estate is in full support of this allocation.</p> <p>An indicative site layout has been provided to the Neighbourhood Plan process and is included here in Appendix A.</p> <p>The Mountfield Estate is now in the process of working with the neighbouring landowner to bring forward both sites for development. The allocation is therefore considered available, deliverable and developable within the Neighbourhood Plan period.</p>	Noted
		<p>HO1 – Spatial Plan</p> <p>The extension to the boundary would help to facilitate sustainable development in Robertsbridge and is therefore supported.</p>	Noted
		<p>HO2 – Housing Requirement</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure appropriate to development sites in Robertsbridge will be secured through CIL and any appropriate Section 106 agreement (which meets the tests set</p>	<p>Amended as suggested</p> <p>We recommend deleting the last sentence of Policy HO2 to avoid confusion on this issue.</p>

		out in Paragraph 204 of the NPPF) made with RDC. It is also noted that Policy IN7 of the SRNDP requires the development of appropriate infrastructure through CIL and other measures. We recommend deleting the last sentence of Policy HO2 to avoid confusion on this issue.	
		HO5 – Housing Mix Policy HO5 is supported. Heathfield Gardens will be brought forward with a mix of house types which will accord with the needs of the local area.	Noted
		Policy HO6 – Lower cost, shared or social (Non-market) housing We would recommend that references to ‘non-market housing should be removed and replaced with ‘affordable housing’. This is a defined term in the NPPF and will remove any ambiguity.	Noted but have kept
		Policy IN6 – Communication Infrastructure It is important to ensure that new development is able to provide future residents with high speed fibre optic broadband and other communication infrastructure and therefore the principle is supported. It is, however, considered beyond the scope of the Neighbourhood Plan to require details of connectivity as part of the planning application process as this is something that will be determined at a later date. Any statement submitted as part of an application would be liable to change and would be unlikely to serve the intended purpose. This information is better required through a planning condition when further details of the form of the development are available.	This is an important impact on viability of sites so it is felt the policy is needed.
		Policy IN8 – Reducing Flood Risk The policy as written, however, extends the scope to the whole parish and therefore sites which are not within flood risk areas	Amended as suggested We recommend amending the opening sentence of the policy to read “Development proposals within

		<p>may be required to address issues outside the scope of the development. This is considered unreasonable.</p> <p>We recommend amending the opening sentence of the policy to read “Development proposals within areas at risk of flooding will only be supported where they can demonstrate that they ensure the implementation of measures to mitigate flood risk that are effective, viable, attractive and enhance the public realm and ensure that any residual risk can be safely managed.”</p> <p>We also recommend clarifying points 1 to 3 in the policy which are currently confusing.</p>	<p>areas at risk of flooding will only be supported where they can demonstrate that they ensure the implementation of measures to mitigate flood risk that are effective, viable, attractive and enhance the public realm and ensure that any residual risk can be safely managed.”</p>
Historic England	Email	As a minor point objectives 4b) and 4c) should apply to all forms of development rather than just Housing and might better be included under heading3 – Environment.	Noted although this is just a case of preference.
		Policy EC1. We support the direct reference to the need to provide sensitive shopfronts within the conservation area. as this has been a commercial area in the past we would also suggest including a requirement to maintain and restore elements of historic shopfronts that make a positive contribution to the area’s character.	Noted
		Policy EC2 We support the requirement to ensure that radio telecommunication masts are sited to minimise impacts on the conservation area in particular. It might be helpful to consider whether ‘masts’ is too specific and whether ‘radio and television infrastructure would cover a wider range of equipment that could affect the area’s character	Policy amended as suggested It might be helpful to consider whether ‘masts’ is too specific and whether ‘radio and television infrastructure would cover a wider range of equipment that could affect the area’s character
		Policy EC6 We would suggest adding a third bullet point to state: “c) Change of use, conversion or extension of historic buildings to provide economic use will be supported where this will contribute to achieving the optimum viable use of the building	Policy amended as suggested Policy EC6 We would suggest adding a third bullet point to state: “c) Change of use, conversion or extension of historic buildings to provide economic use will be supported

		<p>and the design has sought to conserve the building's significance"</p>	<p>where this will contribute to achieving the optimum viable use of the building and the design has sought to conserve the building's significance"</p>
		<p>Policy EN6. We support the intention of the policy but would suggest the wording is simplified to make it easier to understand: "Any Designated historic heritage assets in the Parish and their settings, including listed buildings, historic public realm, sites of archaeological significance and any scheduled monuments that may be scheduled or conservation areas that may be created will be preserved conserved, and or enhanced where necessary, for their historic significance, including the contribution made by their settings and their importance to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place. Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic heritage assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage assets. Applicants should clearly demonstrate that any harm is both unavoidable and justified on the basis of public benefits it deliver." Policy EN8. Scheduled monuments are designated heritage assets and would best be included under the requirements of policy EN7. To make the policy clearer we suggest the following amendment: "As well as nationally listed buildings, Locally listed buildings listed in Schedule 3 or otherwise identified by RDC and scheduled ancient monuments, other key buildings or structures which are of significant local architectural and historic interest and contribute to the Parish's distinctiveness are to will be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance protected. The Plan designates the buildings and other structures as listed in Schedule 3 as locally listed. Development proposals will be expected to retain and enhance</p>	<p>Part of this Policy amended as suggested. We are not sure why HE have suggested a revision which takes out certain categories, in particular in view of what ESCC have commented, that we should include sites of archaeological significance.</p>

		the local distinctiveness of the identified locally listed buildings and structures and their setting. The Salehurst and Robertsbridge Character Assessment and historic environment study (see evidence base) will be used as a reference to assess the impact of the proposals.”	
		Policy EN9. We support the identification of other elements of the historic landscape as worthy of protection but would suggest that trees and hedgerows do not meet the definition of a heritage asset set out in the NPPF. We recommend using an alternative term to local listing to make it clear that these are ‘local character features’ rather than confusing them with the buildings or structures on the local list.	There is a separate policy list and policy.
		Policy HO3. We recommend identifying the need to protect the listed oast house and its setting in the supporting information to Policy HO3, as well as possibly identifying the opportunity that development provides to secure the long term viable use of the building and of providing greater public access to it. In bullet point 5 we recommend the wording is changed to ‘archaeological investigation’, which is better understood as a programme of work to understand the area’s archaeological potential and interest.	Amended as suggested In bullet point 5 we recommend the wording is changed to ‘archaeological investigation’, which is better understood as a programme of work to understand the area’s archaeological potential and interest.
General comments by steering group			Evidence base document para.3.8.2 no.5 economy (evidence base document altered to reflect most recent information)
General Comments received from the community	Hard copy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Before any development commences we need a solution to parking problems, otherwise the character of the area will be degraded 2. We need to provide houses in the £250 k to £375 k 3. Real need for affordable housing provision 4. Ensure that all cul de sacs have linking foot/cycle paths 	Noted

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Parking problems and the state of Station Road need to be tackled by developer contributions from whichever sites are developed 6. Policy IN 1 encourages more cars: there would be 'used car lot' appearance to the villages. 7. The Plan fails to address the current gridlock at school times. With development it will only get worse 8. Strict allocation of affordable housing to those local people who are the most needy and deserving 	
Specific topic Comments from the community	Hard copy	<p>Drainage and sewerage Drainage and sewage disposal at present inadequate. Sewers already back up. Overload due to new developments tapping in to the Victorian sewers. Concern that new development would increase water run off and put additional pressure on drainage. Has ability of water, sewerage, electrics and it services to cope been taken into account for all sites? Drainage / flood prevention - courses down George Hill after 10 minutes of steady rain. Concern regarding hard standing for parking as won't allow water absorption. Improve drains, porous surfaces in new-builds</p> <p>Traffic Traffic concerns - congestion already, effect on road surface (damage visible by war memorial), safe access to divert traffic away from George Hill, roundabout at A21, 20mph limit through village.</p>	Noted and amended where necessary

		<p>Station Road is inadequate for school traffic. Consider one-way traffic through the village. Ensure safe access for children and transport to the two schools. Concern about traffic.</p> <p>Parking All development should have sufficient space for car parking. Parking provision arrangements essential as a prime issue in the village. Key issue is increase in parking. Concern about increased traffic and pressure on parking. More parking required for expanding the village. Ensure there's no loss of existing parking provision. Like the parking allowance in Willow Bank. Support restrictions of parking on the main roads. Parking issues related to commuters. Is there land alongside Gray Nicols for extra parking? I worry about the amount of additional traffic and parking requirement. Affordable parking needed at the station. Commuter cars should not be allowed to clog up the roads because they don't want to pay car parking charges. Provision of extra car parking in the Club and New Spice car park. Agree general need for more housing, but near strangulation point re traffic unless a major parking area precedes further development and existing roads</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>prohibit parking by non-residents. Without upgraded infrastructure all new building will destroy character for area and hinder much needed housing. This village has bad access and parking problems.</p> <p>Footpaths, walking and cycling Connections between footpaths and public transport is crucial. Pleased to note your support for preserving and extending footpath access. Supportive of opportunities for walking and cycling. Utility walking and cycling needed; make places connect together by shared paths. Avoid car park on routes where cyclists will go; avoid cul-de-sac but provide shared use paths. New rights of way should NOT be on footways (pavements?).</p> <p>Pedestrian safety Welcome any measure which might reduce congestion and enhance safety such as a one-way system. Lack of safe pavements down Brightling Road to the village. A continuous pavement wide enough to walk on with children needed. Station Rd near the bridge particularly dangerous at night due to pavement parking and no footpath. Concern for pedestrian safety in the High St and Station Rd.</p> <p>Roundabout top of George Hill Roundabout needed at top of George Hill.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Railway Concern for the future of the mainline station.</p> <p>Assets list All proposed assets of community value are essential to village life. Should Bishops Meadow be added to the list of assets? Generally fully support the protection of assets of community value. The old stone bridge should be classed as a structure of character to be protected and maintained. Assets should include: car park, public loos, green spaces and Robertsbridge railway.</p> <p>Employment Need to facilitate home working. Employment important. Support for retail in the village. Would like to understand how the village would be promoted to local businesses.</p> <p>Tourism Tourism will help the village to thrive and bring in jobs. Tourism could be a real growth area, but should be in keeping.</p> <p>Energy efficiency/climate change Renewable technology needed, eg ground source heat pumps – not mentioned in the Plan.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Support renewable energy and energy efficiency to adapt to climate change. Any development should mitigate against climate change and use renewable energy. All housing should be built with sympathetic aesthetic and environmental efficiency as paramount. Generally supportive, but concerned about sustainability and environment.</p> <p>Leisure Important to include the needs of young residents, eg BMX/Skate Board or bike area. Are there enough facilities for teens? Suggest some form of informal facilities for young people. A swimming pool would be amazing The Secondary school should provide a gym. Suggest school facilities should be open to local clubs. Joined up thinking needed to make joint applications for grants for leisure facilities. Provide versatile outside recreation place as in Hastings - tennis, soccer, hand ball.</p> <p>Green spaces Leave as many greenfield sites as possible intact. Green spaces are vital. Don't close in the green spaces around the village. Would strongly welcome preservation and enhancement of green space in village: natural swimming pool, encouragement of natural meadows</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>and diversity and wildlife habitat, walking paths and public footpaths, outdoor classroom using green space for Salehurst School and RCS.</p> <p>Greenfield sites should be considered last.</p> <p>Green field sites should never be considered.</p> <p>Agree we need to protect and enhance local open spaces and access to the countryside.</p> <p>Important to fight to retain green spaces.</p> <p>Object to building on any greenfield site.</p> <p>Please don't build on Bishops Lane fields.</p> <p>The protection of local green spaces and landscape character of the village of paramount importance.</p> <p>Broadband Superfast broadband is critical.</p> <p>Seven Stars public house & URC What's going to happen to the 7 Stars? Use Seven Stars as library and ?? Closure of 7 Stars pub and URC is worrying.</p> <p>Hedges and Trees Breaks my heart that we should lose any trees. Preserve hedges as a home to wild life. Safeguard trees Preserve trees / hedges wherever possible</p> <p>Natural beauty and the Conservation area You must preserve the status of Robertsbridge as an area of outstanding natural beauty.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Ensure the preservation of the character of the Conservation Area. Any housing development should be sympathetic with its surroundings. Support design in keeping with the village. We should remain within the current development boundary; precedent will be set for the future. Need to preserve the historic heart of the village whilst enabling residents to engage with the world in a modern fashion. Historic buildings should be used and improved to save them, but historic nature to be preserved. Close attention to listed and heritage buildings, appropriate design of new homes</p> <p>Affordable housing Need affordable housing - young people struggle to get on housing ladder - more affordable 2 or 3 beds for young growing families. Real gap between £250 2 beds and £375 4 beds. Expect and hope that any development of affordable housing should be allocated to local people who are the most needy. Affordable rented and starter homes for local people needed. Support for social housing. Support for lower cost housing. Are there plans for enough starter and affordable homes.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Housing for the elderly What about flat/warden control for elderly people. Do we need another survey of what the elderly need?</p> <p>School capacity Concern that nursery/primary and secondary are already at capacity. Provide school places in relation to new children from any new housing development. Concern that there are sufficient school places. Primary school concern about capacity.</p> <p>Developer contributions Ensure there is a framework to ensure developers are accountable to provide the extra requirements the community needs. Developer contributions must be included. Developers must contribute to the infrastructure of the village. All developers need to submit a drainage plan. Repair Station Road before any building starts - cost borne by developers. What say will the village have on the spend of CIL and Section 106 moneys? How will Projects p 56 be delivered?</p>	
Comments from the community on the sites	Hard copy	<p>Site 1 Slides POSITIVE Makes sense for smaller development if access is improved. Takes traffic out of village.</p>	Noted

		<p>NEGATIVE Question suitability as on high ground and highly visible, difficult to adequately screen by trees. Residents would use car for shopping in village so need adequate parking in village.</p> <p>Site 3 Mill Site</p> <p>POSITIVE Best proposal. Easy access. Old building should be kept turned into flats. Mature trees and water features should be retained. Develop this first. This is a definite. Lots of land. Would be good to see leisure centre here. Support preferred sites - brownfield first. Support preferred sites. Obvious first-site for development. Delighted at the proposal to sue the Mill Site. This site is preferred. We must preserve the view lines from the Pocket Park. Must not lose sight of the view of Mill Ste from the Pocket Park. Strong support for Mill Site as a brownfield site. Building on the Mill Site is a no brainer!</p> <p>NEGATIVE Don't want large commuter housing along Mill Race - this is valuable green space and important place of</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>local history and beauty and should be preserved in current form for future generations.</p> <p>Site 4 Vicarage</p> <p>POSITIVE</p> <p>In favour if access improved - steep and narrow. An alley or narrow passage exists to High Street - could be improved. Mature trees should be saved Support preferred sites - brownfield first. Support preferred sites. Need preservation orders on trees in vicarage garden. Nonplussed why perfectly good house should be pulled down - build on Glebe land. Ideal for the elderly since it's a central location. Could house more than the 10 planned if they're smaller sheltered homes.</p> <p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>This site was favoured by less than 50% of respondents. Concern about access, parking, sympathy for the Conservation Area. Concerns about the viability of Fair Lane to accommodate a development of up to 10 houses. Not sure and Fair Lane already crazy busy. Support plan but concerns about access to this site - traffic already nightmare - wing mirrors get smashed. Will road be widened? How will large trucks etc get to the building site? What about parking for residents during building.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>2 main concerns re this site: amount of congestion in Fair Lane will endanger residents if emergency vehicles need to access. And surface water run-off could impinge on whole of middle of village.</p> <p>Undesirable due to high position rear of iconic listed buildings, plus destruction of church hall. Access really difficult with lots of parked cars - more cars really bad.</p> <p>Flood risk for High Street houses backing onto land - really steep slopes and already have water problems after heavy rain - worse if concreted over.</p> <p>Large collection of beautiful trees.</p> <p>There are a number of mature trees on the site. Small wildlife refuge.</p> <p>Current vicarage towers over High Street and Fair Lane - 10 houses would destroy beautiful heart of village.</p> <p>More suited to badly needed allotments.</p> <p>Traffic to be considered!</p> <p>Concern about parking while drivers using the shops.</p> <p>Objection. Concerns about access, parking and impact on Conservation Area.</p> <p>Development would result in loss of privacy, overshadowing and overlooking properties in the High Street as well as noise and disturbance to High St and Fair Lane.</p> <p>Exacerbate parking issues.</p> <p>Increase the risk of repeat flooding because of the higher gradient of vicarage land.</p> <p>The Plan does not give due consideration to the impact on the historic setting.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>To accommodate access, there would be an impact on the historic setting.</p> <p>Major excavation would be required given the difference in ground levels on the site and Fair Lane. Difficult for articulated vehicles. Concern about the effect of heavy traffic.</p> <p>No detailed plans to view.</p> <p>Suggest alternative parking for existing residents to allow site access.</p> <p>Site 5 Grove Farm 1</p> <p>Not in favour. Access problems. Water run-off. Drains can't cope. After BREXIT may need all growing land can get!</p> <p>Should be a working farm.</p> <p>Still poor design. Too many big houses. Lack of parking and dangerous access onto George Hill.</p> <p>Include Grove Farm in Policy EN2 due to historic significance</p> <p>This site has local historical significance. Evidence for this was not available to the Steering Group in the process of decision-making. It must be included in EN2 if all green areas are to be judged on an equal basis.</p> <p>This site is not only seen as an historic farmstead, but still has the medieval field structures. We must be seen to protect the history of our historic village.</p> <p>Fear that the village will completely lose its village feel if we build on Grove Farm as it is a buffer between the A21 and the village.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Fear if we build on this site driving into the village it will look like a huge housing estate. Concern about additional traffic and parking requirements.</p> <p>Site 6 Grove Farm 2</p> <p>Not in favour. Access problems. Water run-off. Drains can't cope. After BREXIT may need all growing land can get! Should be a working farm.</p> <p>Site 9 Bishops Lane</p> <p>POSITIVE If used, open old access road (Bishops Lane) to take traffic from HFG. Lights/zebra crossing across George Hill. Possible foot bridge across HFG because of extra traffic?</p> <p>NEGATIVE This whole green zone, WITH Ostrich fields and village hall fields, is key to maintain and save - key in a rural village. Building here would compound fear that we are about to become a commuter TOWN.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Question suitability as on high ground and highly visible, difficult to adequately screen by trees. Residents would use car for shopping in village so need adequate parking in village. Access too restricted and yet more traffic being pushed onto George Hill - would require revised access onto A21 and improved junction / roundabout.</p> <p>Sites 10 and 11 Heathfield Gardens</p> <p>POSITIVE Approve of this development. Blends well with nearby estate. Smaller houses needed, not big - out of reach of local people. Good use of land won't affect look too much. Support preferred sites - brownfield first - leave greenfield sites alone. Desperately need affordable housing association accommodation. Access road for site 10 would be ok especially if a roundabout was built at A21 junction. Use existing gate at site 11 Support especially if the anti-ground water planting at the perimeter is as indicated on the plan. The old stream at the edge of the wood might even be useful for drainage. The proposed access is sensible. Unclear about access to this site.</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Shame to build on lovely open fields but prefer this to Grove Farm.</p> <p>NEGATIVE</p> <p>Question suitability as on high ground and highly visible, difficult to adequately screen by trees.</p> <p>Residents would use car for shopping in village so need adequate parking in village.</p> <p>Access too restricted and yet more traffic being pushed onto George Hill - would require revised access onto A21 and improved junction / roundabout - although better than Bishops Lane.</p> <p>Loss of valuable, well used, open green space - use brownfield first - and avoid 'sprawl' leading to loss of intimate village feel. HFG busy already - detrimental to families.</p> <p>Currently a mature wonderland - contains habitat for adders, grass snakes, lizards, glow worms, field mice, spotted ? Moth and whole variety of other species of fauna and flora.</p> <p>Specific objection to these sites on environmental grounds. Against building on green field sites - especially beautiful meadowland like this. Need to preserve natural environment around the village. Build on brown field only.</p>	
<p>Comments from the community General</p>	<p>Hard copy</p>	<p>I hope house building will begin soon.</p> <p>I fully agree with the proposals.</p> <p>Fully support the Plan.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>support – overwhelming support and the following are examples</p>		<p>We agree with all that is planned. Complete approval. The Plan supports the objectives in the forefront of the document. Support the adoption of this NP. Support for the proposed housing sites. Support for the Plan because it reflects why the village is popular, sustainable and green. Support for the housing sites. I welcome the Plan Support preferred sites. Wholehearted agreement with the Vision.</p> <p>Against</p> <p>We do not want any more building in Robertsbridge.</p> <p>Positive comments re NP process</p> <p>General support. (2) Vitaly important work – keep going. Support and commend the site allocation list as it reflects local wishes. Thank you all for your hard work. Hope there is a good outcome. Extraordinarily good and interesting exhibition; show the hard work put into this Plan. Excellent comprehensive Plan. Thank you for your hard work. Excellent exhibition. Helpful advice and information. Full of admiration for the immense amount of work gone into this. It's hard to see how the process and results could be improved.</p>	
---	--	---	--

		<p>Thank the people who have worked on this Plan and produced so many facts and ideas about this requirement.</p> <p>What an amazing piece of work.</p> <p>The thoroughness and rigour with which all aspects have been researched and responded to.</p> <p>A testament to the dedication and expertise that has been brought to the development of the draft.</p> <p>Thank you to everyone involved in the NP. Very impressed with how through and serious they are.</p> <p>Keep up the brilliant work to retain and save our village.</p> <p>This has become an impressive and informative document.</p>	
--	--	--	--

04 Conclusion

- 4.0.1 Throughout the process, the intention of the Steering Group has been to get as many members of our community as possible involved, using a variety of consultation techniques to ensure that we get a true picture of what the issues are for our community. The various consultation events have all been widely attended and public participation has been very positive.
- 4.0.2 The summary of the key stages of the SRNDP process so far include:
- Call for sites process: March / April 2015
 - Area Designation: 13th April 2015
 - Sites information open day: 4th July 2015
 - Parish wide questionnaire: September 2015
 - Parish wide consultation open day: 27th February 2016
 - Draft pre-submission plan: September 2016
 - Reg.14 pre-submission: Consultation 26 Sept. to 7 Nov. including two public consultation days, 7 and 8 Oct. each of six hours' duration
 - Building of the evidence base is continuous throughout the process
- 4.0.3 The public has been very vocal throughout the production of the Plan through various consultation events and these have impacted directly on the production of the plan.

05 Appendices

The appendices contain additional information that would be helpful to the flow of the main text of the statement. Due to the size of these documents these are a separate electronic Appendix labelled as **SRNDP Consultation Statement Appendix** on the website.

This can be found online at: <http://www.robertsbridgeneighbourhoodplan.org.uk>

Appendix 1: Communication engagement strategy

Appendix 2: Questionnaires

Appendix 3: Photographs of consultation events

Appendix 4: Resources/literature from key consultation community events (links to section 2 consultation timeline)

Appendix 5: Response to working draft comments from Rother District Council