Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Representation on the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy

Working in Partnership

This response relates to the proposed modification	
MM 4	**WS**
(Please add numeric reference e.g. MM22 or Wealden District Council/ South Downs National Park Authority modification WS e.g. WS 23)	

Declaration:	I consider the proposed modification will assist the submitted Core Strategy to be found sound ☐ /unsound ☒ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for the following reasons:

Reasons Given:	These comments are made in relation to proposed modifications MM4, MM5, MM6 and MM14 which are considered to affect the basis of the Core Strategy and ultimately result in the document being unsound. Modification MM4 relates to the demographic basis of the plan and states that there has not been demonstrated to be a demographic basis to support lower housing provision than that in the South East Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged that the basis of the modification is correct, the Core Strategy does not address this issue or seek to demonstrate why the housing development proposed does not accord with the demographic basis or the identified need It is therefore considered that the Core Strategy needs to address the higher housing figures within the South East Plan and to meet an identified housing need within the District. Whilst it is recognised that other policies and land designations may restrict the number of dwellings that can be built, it is not considered that the Core Strategy satisfactorily addresses the South East Plan figure and the proposed modification does not result in the plan being sound. The Core Strategy will only be sound on this basis if it is agreed that the terms of Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan allows a reduction in the number of dwellings due to the protection afforded to sites of international nature conservation importance (European Sites) and that all options for distribution and location have been assessed as unsuitable/unachievable without harming the Ashdown Forest. It is not considered that the council has satisfactorily demonstrated that this is the case and therefore this modification is not considered satisfactory or sufficient to making the Core Strategy a sound document. Modifications MM5 and MM6 relate to the deletion of the SDA at Heathfield (SD11) and are not considered appropriate or to result in the Core Strategy being sound. It is understood that the development strategy proposed for Heathfield has been well supported and that the development will meet housing and community needs. Whilst it is recognised that the site is located within the High Weald AONB, it is not considered that this should be used, or indeed is an appropriate basis for deleting the strategic allocation for Heathfield. Within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) there is recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment as well as the presumption in favour of sustainable development which runs through the document as a 'golden thread'. The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas including AONB's although it is considered that it is possible and acceptable to develop sites within the AONB if circumstances are right. It is therefore regarded that the proposed development for Heathfield is appropriate when assessed against the guidance within the NPPF and that it represents a positive approach to development for the settlement. It is considered that the development of the SDA has been fully assessed and given its scale needs to be part of the strategic allocations for the district within the Core Strategy and not part of a separate DPD as suggested. The allocation of this is part of the long term strategy for the district and therefore should remain as part of the Core Strategy document. MM14 relates to reviewing the strategy in 2015 or when a preferred solution to the North and South WWTW capacity issues has been identified, whichever is earlier. It is considered that there is no justification for this review and that the issue of WWTW capacity and an assessment of need and demand should have already been addressed in the preparation of the document. The Core Strategy needs to be a positive document that addresses housing need now and not at review that has already been anticipated. This may cause further

	uncertainty and possible delay which is unnecessary and potentially harmful to the sustainable development of the District. Evidence has been prepared and submitted in relation to the need and demand for housing which supports the proposed Core Strategy and on which the spatial strategy and distribution of development is based. An early review should therefore not be needed and therefore this modification is considered not to result in making the document sound. These modifications should also be viewed in light of the National Planning Policy Framework which was published on the 27th March 2012. Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'. Whilst it is agreed that plans need to be kept up to date and therefore may be subject to review throughout the plan period subject to changing circumstances, it is not considered that the issue of waste water capacity is a circumstance that cannot be addressed at the plan making stage and the fact that it has been identified as an issue now means that it needs to be addressed at this stage and not at a review that has already been anticipated. In addition, the inclusion of review in the Core Strategy doesn't contribute to 'predictability' if issues such as the impact of waste water capacity and housing need and demand could be changed in only 2/3 years. There is also the issue of the knock on effects on the plan and the manner in which the spatial distribution and development have been addressed within the document. If the review results in uncertainty and unpredictability the issues of addressing housing need may be more acute and therefore require a significant change in the Core Strategy and its approach. The guidance and intention of the NPPF is one of positivity towards development and growth that is sustainable and does not result in any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The aim of the Core Strategy should therefore be to allocate housing and development required to meet identified need and to find solutions to constraints that may result due to landscape designations and European Directives. These solutions should then form the basis of the long term strategy for the district. The proposed modification MM14 that requires potential changes to the strategy and a relatively short term review that does not accord with the guidance within the NPPF and does not result in a positive, fully evidenced based strategy as it identifies a deficiency in the evidence that supports the document as further information is required to address the strategic development in Hailsham. This is not an appropriate way in which to plan positively for the District and therefore it is considered that MM14 does not result in the document being sound.

Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Representation on the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy

Working in Partnership

This response relates to the proposed modification	
MM 5	**WS**
(Please add numeric reference e.g. MM22 or Wealden District Council/ South Downs National Park Authority modification WS e.g. WS 23)	

Declaration:	I consider the proposed modification will assist the submitted Core Strategy to be found sound ☐ /unsound ☒ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for the following reasons:

Reasons Given:	These comments are made in relation to proposed modifications MM4, MM5, MM6 and MM14 which are considered to affect the basis of the Core Strategy and ultimately result in the document being unsound. Modification MM4 relates to the demographic basis of the plan and states that there has not been demonstrated to be a demographic basis to support lower housing provision than that in the South East Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged that the basis of the modification is correct, the Core Strategy does not address this issue or seek to demonstrate why the housing development proposed does not accord with the demographic basis or the identified need It is therefore considered that the Core Strategy needs to address the higher housing figures within the South East Plan and to meet an identified housing need within the District. Whilst it is recognised that other policies and land designations may restrict the number of dwellings that can be built, it is not considered that the Core Strategy satisfactorily addresses the South East Plan figure and the proposed modification does not result in the plan being sound. The Core Strategy will only be sound on this basis if it is agreed that the terms of Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan allows a reduction in the number of dwellings due to the protection afforded to sites of international nature conservation importance (European Sites) and that all options for distribution and location have been assessed as unsuitable/unachievable without harming the Ashdown Forest. It is not considered that the council has satisfactorily demonstrated that this is the case and therefore this modification is not considered satisfactory or sufficient to making the Core Strategy a sound document. Modifications MM5 and MM6 relate to the deletion of the SDA at Heathfield (SD11) and are not considered appropriate or to result in the Core Strategy being sound. It is understood that the development strategy proposed for Heathfield has been well supported and that the development will meet housing and community needs. Whilst it is recognised that the site is located within the High Weald AONB, it is not considered that this should be used, or indeed is an appropriate basis for deleting the strategic allocation for Heathfield. Within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) there is recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment as well as the presumption in favour of sustainable development which runs through the document as a 'golden thread'. The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas including AONB's although it is considered that it is possible and acceptable to develop sites within the AONB if circumstances are right. It is therefore regarded that the proposed development for Heathfield is appropriate when assessed against the guidance within the NPPF and that it represents a positive approach to development for the settlement. It is considered that the development of the SDA has been fully assessed and given its scale needs to be part of the strategic allocations for the district within the Core Strategy and not part of a separate DPD as suggested. The allocation of this is part of the long term strategy for the district and therefore should remain as part of the Core Strategy document. MM14 relates to reviewing the strategy in 2015 or when a preferred solution to the North and South WWTW capacity issues has been identified, whichever is earlier. It is considered that there is no justification for this review and that the issue of WWTW capacity and an assessment of need and demand should have already been addressed in the preparation of the document. The Core Strategy needs to be a positive document that addresses housing need now and not at review that has already been anticipated. This may cause further

	uncertainty and possible delay which is unnecessary and potentially harmful to the sustainable development of the District. Evidence has been prepared and submitted in relation to the need and demand for housing which supports the proposed Core Strategy and on which the spatial strategy and distribution of development is based. An early review should therefore not be needed and therefore this modification is considered not to result in making the document sound. These modifications should also be viewed in light of the National Planning Policy Framework which was published on the 27th March 2012. Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'. Whilst it is agreed that plans need to be kept up to date and therefore may be subject to review throughout the plan period subject to changing circumstances, it is not considered that the issue of waste water capacity is a circumstance that cannot be addressed at the plan making stage and the fact that it has been identified as an issue now means that it needs to be addressed at this stage and not at a review that has already been anticipated. In addition, the inclusion of review in the Core Strategy doesn't contribute to 'predictability' if issues such as the impact of waste water capacity and housing need and demand could be changed in only 2/3 years. There is also the issue of the knock on effects on the plan and the manner in which the spatial distribution and development have been addressed within the document. If the review results in uncertainty and unpredictability the issues of addressing housing need may be more acute and therefore require a significant change in the Core Strategy and its approach. The guidance and intention of the NPPF is one of positivity towards development and growth that is sustainable and does not result in any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The aim of the Core Strategy should therefore be to allocate housing and development required to meet identified need and to find solutions to constraints that may result due to landscape designations and European Directives. These solutions should then form the basis of the long term strategy for the district. The proposed modification MM14 that requires potential changes to the strategy and a relatively short term review that does not accord with the guidance within the NPPF and does not result in a positive, fully evidenced based strategy as it identifies a deficiency in the evidence that supports the document as further information is required to address the strategic development in Hailsham. This is not an appropriate way in which to plan positively for the District and therefore it is considered that MM14 does not result in the document being sound.

Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Representation on the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy

Working in Partnership

This response relates to the proposed modification	
MM 6	**WS**
(Please add numeric reference e.g. MM22 or Wealden District Council/ South Downs National Park Authority modification WS e.g. WS 23)	

Declaration:	I consider the proposed modification will assist the submitted Core Strategy to be found sound ☐ /unsound ☒ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for the following reasons:

Reasons Given:	These comments are made in relation to proposed modifications MM4, MM5, MM6 and MM14 which are considered to affect the basis of the Core Strategy and ultimately result in the document being unsound. Modification MM4 relates to the demographic basis of the plan and states that there has not been demonstrated to be a demographic basis to support lower housing provision than that in the South East Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged that the basis of the modification is correct, the Core Strategy does not address this issue or seek to demonstrate why the housing development proposed does not accord with the demographic basis or the identified need It is therefore considered that the Core Strategy needs to address the higher housing figures within the South East Plan and to meet an identified housing need within the District. Whilst it is recognised that other policies and land designations may restrict the number of dwellings that can be built, it is not considered that the Core Strategy satisfactorily addresses the South East Plan figure and the proposed modification does not result in the plan being sound. The Core Strategy will only be sound on this basis if it is agreed that the terms of Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan allows a reduction in the number of dwellings due to the protection afforded to sites of international nature conservation importance (European Sites) and that all options for distribution and location have been assessed as unsuitable/unachievable without harming the Ashdown Forest. It is not considered that the council has satisfactorily demonstrated that this is the case and therefore this modification is not considered satisfactory or sufficient to making the Core Strategy a sound document. Modifications MM5 and MM6 relate to the deletion of the SDA at Heathfield (SD11) and are not considered appropriate or to result in the Core Strategy being sound. It is understood that the development strategy proposed for Heathfield has been well supported and that the development will meet housing and community needs. Whilst it is recognised that the site is located within the High Weald AONB, it is not considered that this should be used, or indeed is an appropriate basis for deleting the strategic allocation for Heathfield. Within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) there is recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment as well as the presumption in favour of sustainable development which runs through the document as a 'golden thread'. The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas including AONB's although it is considered that it is possible and acceptable to develop sites within the AONB if circumstances are right. It is therefore regarded that the proposed development for Heathfield is appropriate when assessed against the guidance within the NPPF and that it represents a positive approach to development for the settlement. It is considered that the development of the SDA has been fully assessed and given its scale needs to be part of the strategic allocations for the district within the Core Strategy and not part of a separate DPD as suggested. The allocation of this is part of the long term strategy for the district and therefore should remain as part of the Core Strategy document. MM14 relates to reviewing the strategy in 2015 or when a preferred solution to the North and South WWTW capacity issues has been identified, whichever is earlier. It is considered that there is no justification for this review and that the issue of WWTW capacity and an assessment of need and demand should have already been addressed in the preparation of the document. The Core Strategy needs to be a positive document that addresses housing need now and not at review that has already been anticipated. This may cause further

	uncertainty and possible delay which is unnecessary and potentially harmful to the sustainable development of the District. Evidence has been prepared and submitted in relation to the need and demand for housing which supports the proposed Core Strategy and on which the spatial strategy and distribution of development is based. An early review should therefore not be needed and therefore this modification is considered not to result in making the document sound. These modifications should also be viewed in light of the National Planning Policy Framework which was published on the 27th March 2012. Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'. Whilst it is agreed that plans need to be kept up to date and therefore may be subject to review throughout the plan period subject to changing circumstances, it is not considered that the issue of waste water capacity is a circumstance that cannot be addressed at the plan making stage and the fact that it has been identified as an issue now means that it needs to be addressed at this stage and not at a review that has already been anticipated. In addition, the inclusion of review in the Core Strategy doesn't contribute to 'predictability' if issues such as the impact of waste water capacity and housing need and demand could be changed in only 2/3 years. There is also the issue of the knock on effects on the plan and the manner in which the spatial distribution and development have been addressed within the document. If the review results in uncertainty and unpredictability the issues of addressing housing need may be more acute and therefore require a significant change in the Core Strategy and its approach. The guidance and intention of the NPPF is one of positivity towards development and growth that is sustainable and does not result in any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The aim of the Core Strategy should therefore be to allocate housing and development required to meet identified need and to find solutions to constraints that may result due to landscape designations and European Directives. These solutions should then form the basis of the long term strategy for the district. The proposed modification MM14 that requires potential changes to the strategy and a relatively short term review that does not accord with the guidance within the NPPF and does not result in a positive, fully evidenced based strategy as it identifies a deficiency in the evidence that supports the document as further information is required to address the strategic development in Hailsham. This is not an appropriate way in which to plan positively for the District and therefore it is considered that MM14 does not result in the document being sound.

Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Representation on the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy

Working in Partnership

This response relates to the proposed modification	
MM 14	**WS**
(Please add numeric reference e.g. MM22 or Wealden District Council/ South Downs National Park Authority modification WS e.g. WS 23)	

Declaration:	I consider the proposed modification will assist the submitted Core Strategy to be found sound ☐ /unsound ☒ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for the following reasons:

Reasons Given:	These comments are made in relation to proposed modifications MM4, MM5, MM6 and MM14 which are considered to affect the basis of the Core Strategy and ultimately result in the document being unsound. Modification MM4 relates to the demographic basis of the plan and states that there has not been demonstrated to be a demographic basis to support lower housing provision than that in the South East Plan. Whilst it is acknowledged that the basis of the modification is correct, the Core Strategy does not address this issue or seek to demonstrate why the housing development proposed does not accord with the demographic basis or the identified need It is therefore considered that the Core Strategy needs to address the higher housing figures within the South East Plan and to meet an identified housing need within the District. Whilst it is recognised that other policies and land designations may restrict the number of dwellings that can be built, it is not considered that the Core Strategy satisfactorily addresses the South East Plan figure and the proposed modification does not result in the plan being sound. The Core Strategy will only be sound on this basis if it is agreed that the terms of Policy NRM5 of the South East Plan allows a reduction in the number of dwellings due to the protection afforded to sites of international nature conservation importance (European Sites) and that all options for distribution and location have been assessed as unsuitable/unachievable without harming the Ashdown Forest. It is not considered that the council has satisfactorily demonstrated that this is the case and therefore this modification is not considered satisfactory or sufficient to making the Core Strategy a sound document. Modifications MM5 and MM6 relate to the deletion of the SDA at Heathfield (SD11) and are not considered appropriate or to result in the Core Strategy being sound. It is understood that the development strategy proposed for Heathfield has been well supported and that the development will meet housing and community needs. Whilst it is recognised that the site is located within the High Weald AONB, it is not considered that this should be used, or indeed is an appropriate basis for deleting the strategic allocation for Heathfield. Within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) there is recognition of the need to conserve and enhance the natural environment as well as the presumption in favour of sustainable development which runs through the document as a 'golden thread'. The NPPF states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in areas including AONB's although it is considered that it is possible and acceptable to develop sites within the AONB if circumstances are right. It is therefore regarded that the proposed development for Heathfield is appropriate when assessed against the guidance within the NPPF and that it represents a positive approach to development for the settlement. It is considered that the development of the SDA has been fully assessed and given its scale needs to be part of the strategic allocations for the district within the Core Strategy and not part of a separate DPD as suggested. The allocation of this is part of the long term strategy for the district and therefore should remain as part of the Core Strategy document. MM14 relates to reviewing the strategy in 2015 or when a preferred solution to the North and South WWTW capacity issues has been identified, whichever is earlier. It is considered that there is no justification for this review and that the issue of WWTW capacity and an assessment of need and demand should have already been addressed in the preparation of the document. The Core Strategy needs to be a positive document that addresses housing need now and not at review that has already been anticipated. This may cause further

	uncertainty and possible delay which is unnecessary and potentially harmful to the sustainable development of the District. Evidence has been prepared and submitted in relation to the need and demand for housing which supports the proposed Core Strategy and on which the spatial strategy and distribution of development is based. An early review should therefore not be needed and therefore this modification is considered not to result in making the document sound. These modifications should also be viewed in light of the National Planning Policy Framework which was published on the 27th March 2012. Paragraph 17 of the Framework states that 'Plans should be kept up-to-date, and be based on joint working and co-operation to address larger than local issues. They should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency'. Whilst it is agreed that plans need to be kept up to date and therefore may be subject to review throughout the plan period subject to changing circumstances, it is not considered that the issue of waste water capacity is a circumstance that cannot be addressed at the plan making stage and the fact that it has been identified as an issue now means that it needs to be addressed at this stage and not at a review that has already been anticipated. In addition, the inclusion of review in the Core Strategy doesn't contribute to 'predictability' if issues such as the impact of waste water capacity and housing need and demand could be changed in only 2/3 years. There is also the issue of the knock on effects on the plan and the manner in which the spatial distribution and development have been addressed within the document. If the review results in uncertainty and unpredictability the issues of addressing housing need may be more acute and therefore require a significant change in the Core Strategy and its approach. The guidance and intention of the NPPF is one of positivity towards development and growth that is sustainable and does not result in any adverse impacts that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits. The aim of the Core Strategy should therefore be to allocate housing and development required to meet identified need and to find solutions to constraints that may result due to landscape designations and European Directives. These solutions should then form the basis of the long term strategy for the district. The proposed modification MM14 that requires potential changes to the strategy and a relatively short term review that does not accord with the guidance within the NPPF and does not result in a positive, fully evidenced based strategy as it identifies a deficiency in the evidence that supports the document as further information is required to address the strategic development in Hailsham. This is not an appropriate way in which to plan positively for the District and therefore it is considered that MM14 does not result in the document being sound.

Wealden District (Incorporating part of the South Downs National Park) Representation on the Proposed Modifications to the Core Strategy

Working in Partnership

This response relates to the proposed modification	
MM 33	**WS**
(Please add numeric reference e.g. MM22 or Wealden District Council/ South Downs National Park Authority modification WS e.g. WS 23)	

Declaration:	I consider the proposed modification will assist the submitted Core Strategy to be found sound ☐ /unsound ☒ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for the following reasons:

Reasons Given:	These representations relate to the proposed modification (MM33) to the Core Strategy Policy WCS12 and will examine whether the policy as modified will allow the Core Strategy to be found sound and thus adopted in this amended form. Policy WCS12 in its original form simply stated that the council would seek to achieve a net gain in biodiversity and this would be achieved through a subsequent green network strategy. The policy also stated that there may be circumstances when compensatory measures are required where a net loss of biodiversity occurs. The modification seeks to introduce two new issues to policy WCS12 that specifically relate to preventing harm to the Ashdown Forest SAC/SPA; managing the effects of visitor disturbance and the effects of nitrogen deposition from development within the North of the District. However, rather than introduce a strategic tool within the Core Strategy with which to address these issues, the modifications simply state that it will be the Council's intention that these matters will be dealt with at a later date. For example the policy states that the nitrogen issue will simply be dealt with by way of a future review and the provision of Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) will be addressed through future DPD's. However, taking account of the legal importance of the Habitats Regulations and the basis of the strategy resting upon the South East Plan Policy NRM5, this is not acceptable and a more strategic approach is required to prevent harm to the SPA which must be reflected in the Core Strategy policies. The policies and the proposed modifications fail to propose such a strategic approach and fail to address the issue of potential harm to the Ashdown Forest in a positive and proactive way and thus on this matter alone, the Core Strategy will remain unsound. Suitable Alternative Natural Green Space (SANGS) The provision of SANGS is essential to the delivery of development in the North of the District. It is our view that where essential infrastructure is required for the delivery of growth in the District, then its provision should form part of the strategic approach. For example matters such as highway improvements are already acknowledged in the strategy and form part of the strategy for the different SDAs. The same approach should be extended to require SANGS as part of the strategy within the 7km zone around Ashdown Forest to ensure deliverability of the development over the plan period. The proposed modification for addressing the SANGS provision in subsequent DPD's rather than provide a strategic tool for managing impact on the SPA is fundamentally flawed and will lead to a situation, as is the case currently, whereby development and growth will stall. This would replicate the issues relating to the Thames Heath Basin SPA whereby Surrey Heath Borough Council had no dwellings built for over three years whilst the situation was resolved. As we have stated in previous consultation responses, SANGS provision should have formed part of the initial background work as part of the SHLAA exercise which would have then identified a strategic green network which is in appropriate strategic locations to the SDA. Otherwise, there will be uncertainty in deliverability as if SANGS cannot be identified to the right scale or location, then the delivery of the overall strategy will remain equally uncertain. Therefore this modification does not ensure deliverability and the plan in this form will remain unsound.

	Nitrogen Deposition The modifications suggested to policy WCS12 in relation to nitrogen disposition will be equally ineffective in delivering growth in areas affected by the SPA. The only additional policy tool the modification introduces is that further research will be carried out on Nitrogen Deposition in a future review. As such the modification will fail to provide certainty that the effects of nitrogen deposition can be effectively managed or mitigated as per the Habitat Regulations, particularly in relation to development in addition to that proposed by the Strategic Development Areas (SDA). This stems from the manner in which the Council undertook the Appropriate Assessment in relation to the Core Strategy which effectively means the strategic objectives and aims of the Core Strategy will be impossible to meet as a result of nitrogen deposition restrictions. At present the council are either refusing planning permission or requesting applicants withdraw planning applications for any development, however minor, that has the potential to increase vehicles movements (the main cause of nitrogen deposition). The reason for this is that they consider any additional development would be harmful to the SPA in combination with that proposed by the Core Strategy by way of Nitrogen Deposition. This is as a result of the Appropriate Assessment that was undertaken in relation to Core Strategy which only concentrated on the level of development proposed by the Core Strategy and did not apply any headroom to take account of windfalls or other more minor development that would likely come forward during the plan period. These more minor developments, including tourism, small scale commercial and residential are those which have historically maintained the vitality of the District and which account for a large proportion of development that occurs within the District. The modification does not provide any mechanism to address this and simply seeks to undertake more research on this matter in a future review without any clear vision of how development can be managed within the 7km zone. This will have disastrous effects on the District and even in this modified form the Core Strategy will be unable to the meet the aspirational vision or the strategic objectives. It will therefore remain unsound. The Council allocated their largest housing and employment area to be located within Uckfield (within the 7km zone) even though they were aware nitrogen deposition had exceeded the critical load, potentially causing deleterious effects, within parts of the Forest. The flawed approach of the strategy in relation to the Habitat Directive stems from the fact the early stages in the preparation of the strategy, the Issues and Options stage, paid little regard to the SPA or the impact of the Habitat Regulations. This is compounded by the limited scope of the Appropriate Assessment stage. As such, this flawed adoption process in relation to the Habitat Regulations means the CS policy WCS12 cannot be modified to be found sound. Instead the council should have undertaken an assessment on other locations and levels of growth that could have delivered development without harm to the SPA including sufficient headroom for minor development over the plan period. This would have allowed an Appropriate Assessment that could have demonstrated certainty that development could be delivered in terms of nitrogen deposition including any mitigation that could be possible.

	As outlined above, the modifications to WCS12 do not secure the policy aims required both in terms of the SPA protection or the certainty of the deliverability of the development and thus in this modified form the plan will remain unsound. The Core Strategy should instead include a policy solely relating to the Ashdown Forest SPA which should set out how the effects of development can be managed and mitigated. This should include the level of SANGS that will be required, the standard of such areas and a strategic plan showing the broad areas that will be considered for SANGS and a basis for an avoidance strategy that will follow. This is seen within the Core Strategy DPD's of the authorities affected by the Thames Basin Heath SPA whereby the authorities have a specific policy relating to the SPA and details how matters such as visitor disturbance can be mitigated. However, this specific policy cannot be introduced as a modification and thus the Core Strategy should be revised to take account of this fundamental issue that affects the North of the district.

If this is a new matter that you have raised please complete the following

I wish ☒ / do not wish ☐ (*place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen) for this matter to be heard in front of the Inspector

Signed:	ASP
Name and Address:	ASP
E-Mail Address:	
If on behalf of a company, please state:	
Date:	12/06/2012

Please place a cross in the box to show which option you have chosen	
I would wish to be notified of the publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Core Strategy	Yes ☒ No ☐
I would wish to be notified of the adoption of the Core Strategy	Yes ☒ No ☐

Note: If completing this in hardcopy form, please use additional sheets if necessary.

Please return this form by **5pm on Wednesday 13th June 2012**:

By post to: Head of Planning and Environmental Policy, Wealden District Council, Freepost SEA 10959, Crowborough, East Sussex, TN6 1BR

By email to: ldf@wealden.gov.uk

Data Protection Act 1998 and Freedom of Information Act 2000
Representations cannot be treated in confidence. Regulation 30 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as amended, requires copies of all representations to be made publicly available. The Council will also provide names and associated representations on its website but will not publish personal information such as telephone numbers, e-mails or private addresses. By submitting a representation on the Proposed Modifications you confirm that you agree to this and accept responsibility for your comments.

Please telephone 01892 602007 or e-mail ldf@wealden.gov.uk if you require assistance in submitting your representation or if further information is required. If you, or somebody you know, would like the information (guidance notes, forms etc) in large print, braille, audio tape/CD or in another language please let us know.