Wealden Consultation Statement

Representation Summaries:

Site Representations

These are broken down by:

A. Employment Sites
B. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople Sites
C. Housing Sites
D. Housing Option Sites
E. Omission Sites

A. Employment Sites

This section presents both Proposed Employment Site Allocations and Employment Site Options (as presented in the Focused Local Plan (2026).

SITE Ref: OEMP4 (FWLP), MA EMP1 MA (Reg 19) – Ashdown Business Park / Oakwood Park

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 705	**Support:** 6	**Neutral:** 652	**Object:** 47

Question 9 - Ashdown Business Park, Maresfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • The field would be very sensitive to development and not well connected to the existing business park. • The area being considered is of a much larger scale than the existing well contained business park which is closely related to the roads on either side. • Out of scale with the village settlement of Maresfield	• Comments noted	• Include policy wording to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are in place
Network Rail • A means of better connecting the site with Uckfield Railway would encourage greater active travel and support sustainable transport options.	• Comment noted	• Include policy wording to ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are in place
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council		

• Not supportive of the Ashdown Business Park Extension • Concerns over the impacts on the natural environment • Concerns over the impacts on the road network • Development of this scale would be more suitable in the southern part of the district	• Comments noted • Development of this scale will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms.	• No action required
Danehill Parish Council • Impacts on the environment, loss of protected landscape, lack of adequate infrastructure • Area prone to flooding	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
East Hoathly with Halland Parish Council • Scale of development is unacceptable • Impacts on the environment and infrastructure	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No action required
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • May be a suitable site subject to further testing	• Comment noted	• No action required
Horam Parish Council • Not easily accessible for residents	• Comment noted	• No action required
Isfield Parish Council		

• Opposed to any extension of this site. • The site is heavily constrained	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
Laughton Parish Council • Environmentally sensitive area • Impact on transport network and additional traffic across the Ashdown Forest	• Development of this scale will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms.	• No action required
Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council • Valuable opportunity to provide employment space subject to further testing	• Comment noted	• No action required
Rotherfield Parish Council • No comment	• Noted	• No action required
Uckfield Town Council • Flood risk issues • Alternative sites should be considered	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options	• No action required
Willingdon and Jevington Parish Council		

• Ideal location	• Welcome support	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
AM Workspace Limited • Additional employment space should be allocated in the plan • Suitable location for the provision of employment floorspace • Well related to the proposed housing growth which would help minimise commuting distances • A different level of information is required for the purpose of plan making compared to the application stage • No impediment to the delivery of the development in principle • Support the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Concerns over impacts on the Ashdown Forest • Likely to compromise connectivity of the Forest with the wider landscape and wildlife corridors	• An updated Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No action required
CPRE Sussex **The Working Group Against Over Development** • No evidence of need • Site is heavily constrained	• Evidence shows a need for substantial employment floorspace allocation over the plan period. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy	• No action required

	requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	
Crowborough and District Chamber of Commerce • Site worthy of further investigation • Concerns over the lack of economic allocation in and around Crowborough although understands the challenges. • The site has potential to provide business development and employment opportunities for Crowborough	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options with limited alternative for employment provision in Crowborough	• No action required
Newick Village Society • Concerns over the increased traffic through Newick • Impact on rural character of the village • Likely to provide further employment opportunities in proximity to Newick and therefore may result in further homes being needed in the village. • Such strategic provision requires joint decision-making to achieve sustainable balance	• Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms.	• No action required
Piltdown Friends and Residents Association • The existing park has struggled to find business enterprises it was intended for • No unemployment issue in Uckfield, with Wealden having the lowest in East Sussex • If there is need for employment space, it should be provided in the south of the district • Impact on the Ashdown Forest	• The Employment and Economic Study (2026) sets out the level of employment need to support growth across the plan period as well as preferred location across the district. Need for employment development in the northern part of the district is	• No action required

	identified to support expansion of businesses in the towns. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	
Uckfield Chamber of Commerce • Support the expansion of the Ashdown Business park • Successful existing facilities with business moving in from Uckfield to grow or attracted from neighbouring area • The site benefits from good access	• Welcome support	• No action required
Village Concerns • No comment on sites in the Plan outside our parish.	• Comment noted	• No action required
Willingdon Residents' Association • Ideal location with easy access from nearby A22	• Comment noted	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No evidence of need or demand for additional employment land/business units. • Sufficient employment land already allocated within the Local Plan. • Existing permissions and vacant business units should be occupied before allocating more land. • Proposal exceeds identified employment needs. • Not needed to provide jobs for the future Wealden population.	• The Employment and Economic Study (2026) sets out the level of employment need to support growth across the plan period as well as preferred location across the district. Need for employment development in the northern part of the district is identified to support expansion of businesses in the towns.	• No action required

• Uncertainty about future occupiers and economic justification. • Unsuitable location for a strategic employment site. • Development would be better located in the south of the district, nearer Eastbourne and the Strategic Road Network (SRN). • Poor connection to major roads, population centres and employment needs. • Rural/countryside location is inappropriate for development of this scale. • Wrong site for high-impact or strategic-scale development. • Local road network (including A272/A22) lacks capacity. • Increased traffic congestion and vehicle movements. • Impacts on surrounding villages and settlements. • Poor connectivity to the Strategic Road Network. • Reliance on private car travel. • Insufficient or poor public transport provision. • Concerns about heavy goods vehicle traffic. • Road safety concerns. • Existing infrastructure cannot accommodate development. • Lack of supporting infrastructure and services. • Pressure on utilities and community facilities. • Concerns regarding housing provision for future workers. • Adverse impacts on the natural environment and biodiversity. • Impacts on Ashdown Forest.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) provides ecological evidence. Other polices in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these	

• Site borders ancient woodland. • Loss of countryside, greenfield land, green space and farmland/agricultural land. • Impacts on rural character and landscape. • Potential effects on habitats, wildlife and ecological networks. • Concerns regarding climate change and biodiversity objectives. • Increased pollution. • Impact on dark skies. • Flood risk concerns, including Flood Zone 3. • Potential impacts on watercourses. • Contrary to national planning policy. • Contrary to the Vision of the Local Plan. • Contrary to Local Plan objectives and policies (including references to SS4). • Inconsistent with sustainable development principles. • Sequential test concerns for employment/retail uses. • Proposal is disproportionate or excessively large. • Overdevelopment of the site. • Scale is inappropriate for the location and infrastructure available. • Moderate or smaller-scale development would be more appropriate. • Impact on community wellbeing and quality of life. • Proposal not supported by the local community. • Lack of consultation and engagement.	policies when submitting planning applications.	

• Loss of separation/buffer zones between settlements. • Urban sprawl concerns. • Potential adverse impact on existing businesses. • Potential adverse impact on Uckfield town centre. • Concern that employment land is being provided in the wrong location. • Proposal may not effectively meet regional employment needs. • Original business park increasingly functioning as retail space. • Locate employment development in the south of the district near the SRN. • Consider alternative sites already identified in the Plan. • Consider mixed-use development instead. • Consider regenerative farming or other uses. • Phase development. • Further testing, assessment and evidence gathering required. • Use brownfield land in preference to greenfield sites. • Lack of suitable access. • Oakwood Park should be allocated instead/first. • Existing business park not fully utilised. • Lack of employee parking. • Erosion of settlement gaps and buffers. • Site is an ideal/well-located employment location. • There is a need for additional employment land and business space.		

• Development could provide employment opportunities. • Public transport improvements could enhance accessibility. • Moderate development of the site is supported. • Proposal could benefit the local area.		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 531	**Support:** 9	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 521

SITE Ref: OEMP4 (FWLP), MA EMP1 MA (Reg 19) – Ashdown Business Park / Oakwood Park		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Fletching Parish Council • Object to the option • Evidence base is incoherent, inconsistent and self-contradictory • It is unclear what site is being within the SA which appears to replicate the application on the site. • The Plan fails to identify all outstanding issues for the site such as PFAS, suitability of location and transport infrastructure • Evidence demonstrates that there is neither demand nor need for the quantum proposed at this location	• The Employment and Economic Study (2026) sets out the level of employment need to support growth across the plan period as well as preferred location across the district. Need for employment development in the northern part of the district is identified to support expansion of businesses in the towns. • Comment noted in relation to Sustainability Appraisal – the matter has been clarified in the iteration	• No action required

• Significant environmental impacts	published alongside the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. • The updated Site Assessment in the SA also takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation. • It is accepted that this site is at a scale which will lead to significant change. Policies in the Plan sets out requirements that will need to be met in this respect. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these policies when submitting planning applications.	
Isfield Parish Council • Object to the proposal • Unjustified, environmentally harmful, unsupported by evidence • Unsuitable location and constraint by local road network • Impacts on landscape and biodiversity	• Evidence is set out in a suite of documents published alongside the Plan	• No action required
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Object to the proposal • Unjustified, environmentally harmful, unsupported by evidence • Site presents like an aspiration	• Comments noted • Evidence is set out in a suite of documents published alongside the Plan	• No action requires

Maresfield Parish Council • Maintain comments submitted previously • Support the submission by Fletching Parish Council	• Comments noted	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
AM Work Space Limited • Supportive of the proposal • No sustainability reason to omit the site from the Local Plan • Allocation appears to be on hold due to technical reasons	• Welcome support	• No action required
Jessops Construction and Zunikh • Supportive of the proposal • Assessment included in the Sustainability Appraisal should be updated to reflect evidence provided • Some areas of the wider SHELAA site 980/3120 have not been included within the proposal map and should be added	• Welcome support	• The Sustainability Appraisal has been reviewed and amended where relevant
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Object to the proposal • Negative impacts on the Ashdown Forest SAC and SPA and surrounding environment, landscape and heritage • Proposal is unsound, unjustified and inconsistent with planning policy • Issues with the evidence base • PFAS contamination risk	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only	• No action required

• Transport constrained in capacity as well as availability of alternative of the private care • No demonstrated need for further employment provision and flawed assumptions in the modelling resulting in an inflated figure • Location suggested does not align with the finding of the economy study • Unsuitable water infrastructure	preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. • The Employment and Economic Study (2026) sets out the level of employment need to support growth across the plan period as well as preferred location across the district. Need for employment development in the northern part of the district is identified to support expansion of businesses in the towns. • The updated Site Assessment in the SA takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation.	
Cornerstone Church Uckfield • Object to the proposal due to scale, local and cumulative impacts contrary to sustainable development • Issue to PFAS	• Comment noted • The updated Site Assessment in the SA takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation.	• No action required
Crowborough and District Chamber of Commerce	• Welcome support	• No action required

• Supportive of the proposal which could provide for the Crowborough need and meet the employment need shortfall		
Newick Village Society • Object to the proposal • Combined impact of all development • Risk of coalescence with neighbouring village • Lack of road capacity to accommodate such scale of development • Unsustainable car dependent location • Lack of evidence of availability of water infrastructure • Loss of farmland • Harm to the Ashdown Forest, neighbouring ancient woodland and Low Weald landscape • PFAS contamination risk	• Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal • Whilst this site would extend into the countryside as currently defined, it would not lead to coalescence. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan • The updated Site Assessment in the SA takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation.	• No action required
Piltdown Golf Club Ltd • Object to the proposal • The Sustainability Appraisal demonstrates that the site is not essential to any growth strategy	• Comments noted - The Sustainability Appraisal has been reviewed and amended where necessary to provide	• No action required

and that its role was limited to high level modelling • Unresolved strategic and district scale constraint relevant to location such as landscape sensitivity, proximity to ancient woodland and priority habitat, water sensitivity, flood risk, risk of PFAS contamination, car-dependency • Inclusion in the plan conflicts with the Sustainability Appraisal findings	clarification on the testing carried out and approach selected by the Council. • The updated Site Assessment in the SA takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation.	
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Object to the proposal • Impact of the proposal on the district's natural capital • Need for robust policy to protect the water courses surrounding the site • Impacts on the Ashdown Forest SPA and SAC	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No action required
The Woodland Trust • Site is adjacent to areas of ancient woodland	• Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong majority objection to the proposal on the basis that the scale, location and cumulative impacts	• The Council recognises the level of local concern regarding the scale of development, infrastructure capacity, traffic, public transport, water and	• No action required

• Site is considered unsound, undeliverable and contrary to sustainable development in particular due to its out-of-town location • Repeated concerns that the A22, A26 and A272 already experience congestion and that additional employment traffic, including HGVs, would worsen, alongside residential development, road safety, journey times, rat-running, road condition and air quality. • Site is car-dependent, with limited public transport, walking and cycling options, and would conflict with climate and sustainable travel objectives. • Concerns that water supply, sewage treatment, drainage and flood risk constraints are unresolved and that extensive hard surfacing would increase surface water runoff downstream. • Objections to the permanent loss of productive farmland, countryside greenfield and the rural character of the Low Weald. • Concerns that development would contribute to settlement coalescence and urban sprawl between Uckfield, Maresfield, Piltdown and nearby villages. • Concerns about harm to Ashdown Forest, ancient woodland, priority habitats, biodiversity, dark skies, watercourses and landscape character. • Frequent reference to potential PFAS contamination associated with historic fire training activity, with requests for proper	sewerage capacity, landscape, and biodiversity. These issues have been considered through further evidence, masterplanning and policy refinement. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. • The Employment and Economic Study (2026) sets out the level of employment need to support growth across the plan period as well as preferred location across the district. Need for employment development in the northern part of the district is identified to support expansion of businesses in the towns. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The updated Site Assessment in the SA takes account of updated evidence, including revisions to the scale and quantum of development, mitigation measures proposed in site	

contamination, groundwater and watercourse investigations. • Questions over whether additional employment land is needed in this location, whether the site is commercially attractive, and whether further out-of-centre activity could harm Uckfield town centre. • Existing Ashdown Business Park is underoccupied • Lack of services and facilities to accommodate further development at this location • Many respondents requested that site is removed from the Draft Local Plan or not taken forward as an allocation or option. • Supportive due to central location of the site	layout/design, and desktop study on PFAS and potential mitigation. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) provides ecological evidence. Other polices in the plan set out requirements for biodiversity net gain, nature recovery, and protection of habitats. Developers/site promoters must submit ecological surveys to demonstrate compliance with these	

	policies when submitting planning applications.	

SITE Ref: EMP2 (FWLP), HA EMP2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Knights Farm West, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: EMP2 (FWLP), HA EMP2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Knights Farm West, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Environment Agency • Commented that several strategic employment allocations, including EMP2, may have higher potential for historic or residual contamination. They advised that site-specific policies should signpost the need for land-quality assessment and, where necessary, remediation to ensure risks to controlled waters are understood and managed.	Noted. Policy NE14 of the Plan seeks to ensure that development on sites with known or suspected land contamination undertake site-specific proportionate land contamination assessment and remediation where risks are identified, including measures to protect human health, controlled waters and the wider water environment. This policy will apply to any development/site, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Objects to the proposed allocation of Knights Farm West (EMP2) for 40,000 sqm of employment floorspace. They consider the site inappropriate because it is in a rural location at Lower Dicker and would introduce intrusive development into the Low Weald landscape. • They argue that development at EMP2 would be inconsistent with local neighbourhood plan policies and would place additional pressure on the A22 and the Boship roundabout. • They also propose that Knights Farm West should be considered as a relocation site for Hailsham livestock market and a rural business centre, arguing that failure to provide an alternative site could harm the rural economy and farming community.	• Objection noted. • The Council considers that the allocation is suitably located to help meet employment floorspace needs and benefits from access to key transport corridors. The Council has considered issues of landscape sensitivity, sustainability and transport issues through detailed parts of the evidence base such as the Landscape Sensitivity Context: Hailsham West (North of A22) Assessment Unit and assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal process. The site has been selected for the reasons set out in these assessments. • The Council acknowledges that the site boundary along the A22 may be impacted by the Village Area policy within the Hellingly	No change necessary.

	Neighbourhood Plan, however the majority of the site is not. • Future uses and identified end users of the site will be considered in detail during any planning application process.	

SITE Ref: EMP3 (FWLP), HA EMP3 (A) (Reg 19) – Woodside Park, Land East of A22, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: EMP3 (FWLP), HA EMP3 (A) (Reg 19) – Woodside Park, Land East of A22, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Environment Agency • Notes that several proposed strategic employment allocations, including EMP3, may have a higher likelihood of historic or residual contamination from former uses. • Requests that site-specific policies signpost the potential need for land-quality assessment and, where necessary, remediation to manage risks to controlled waters. • Encourages early pre-application engagement with the Council and, where appropriate, the Environment Agency, particularly where contamination risks could affect sensitive hydrological catchments.	• Noted. Policy NE14 of the Plan seeks to ensure that development on sites with known or suspected land contamination undertake proportionate land contamination assessment and remediation where risks are identified, including measures to protect human health, controlled waters and the wider water environment. This policy will apply to any development/site, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change necessary.

East Sussex County Council • EMP3 is supported in principle as a strategic employment allocation, with the site identified as Woodside Park, Land East of A22, Hailsham, providing approximately 16,750 sqm of employment floorspace. • The site is already partly in employment-related use and includes safeguarded waste management functions, so future policy wording should recognise existing lawful operations and avoid prejudicing continued waste and employment activity. • Representations highlight the need for the EMP3 policy and supporting text to address waste consultation areas, the agent of change principle and safeguarding requirements under the Waste and Minerals planning framework.	Comments noted. The Council supports the principle of EMP3 as a strategic employment allocation and recognises the importance of safeguarding existing employment and waste management operations. The East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Sites Plan, February 2017 (Sites Plan) and Waste and Minerals Local Plan, 2013 form part of the development plan for the area, thus have been considered in assessing suitability of this site, with policies also being applicable in assessment of any planning application. That development plan should be read as a whole.	No change necessary.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Hailsham Roadway Construction Co Ltd • Supports the allocation of EMP3 for employment use and notes that the company owns the southern half of the site. • Explains that the site is already in employment-related use and functions as a	Comments noted. The Council welcomes support for the principle of employment allocation at EMP3. The Council also recognises the existing employment and safeguarded waste management functions on part of the site	The quantum of development proposed for mixed use employment floorspace has been reduced from 16, 750sqm to 10, 000sqm noting the representation received, and likely

safeguarded waste management facility, including highways maintenance, storage, distribution, workshops, industrial buildings, asphalt and concrete production and associated activities. • Confirms there may be capacity to diversify land use, potentially as part of a coordinated masterplan, but states that mixed use would need to be retained to reflect operational requirements. • Requests that site-specific requirements consider operational needs and an agreed access solution to support the wider EMP3 site. • Notes that the total amount of additional employment floorspace deliverable across EMP3 may need to be reviewed.	and the need to consider operational continuity, land ownership, access and realistic deliverability of additional employment floorspace. In that regard, it is noted that the quantum and scale of development may need to be reduced to take account of operational continuity and an element of mixed use development only.	delivery of employment floorspace on a smaller part of the site.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **No Response**	No Response Required	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Supports EMP3. • Considers EMP3 to be better related to the major road network and links to Lewes, Hastings and Eastbourne by road and rail. • Raises no site-specific objection to EMP3.	Comments noted. The Council welcomes the support for EMP3 and notes the respondent's view that the site is comparatively better located than some alternative employment options.	No change necessary.

SITE Ref: EMP4 (FWLP), HA EMP4 LM (Reg 19) – Natewood Farm, Polegate Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation- Not applicable, site presented at FWLP Stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: EMP4 (FWLP), HA EMP4 LM (Reg 19) – Natewood Farm, Polegate Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Environment Agency • Notes that several strategic employment allocations, including EMP4, may have a higher likelihood of historic or residual contamination associated with former uses. • Requests that relevant site-specific policies signpost the potential need for land-quality assessment and, where necessary, remediation to manage risks to controlled waters. • Advises that contamination scoping should also be considered for any future promotion of employment sites not currently allocated, including where there may be potential PFAS residues.	Noted. Policy NE14 of the Plan seeks to ensure that development on sites with known or suspected land contamination undertake Site-specific policy wording should identify the need for proportionate land contamination assessment and remediation where risks are identified, including measures to protect human health, controlled waters and the wider water environment. This policy will apply to any development/site, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change necessary.

• Encourages early pre-application engagement with the Council and, where appropriate, the Environment Agency.		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Supports EMP4 as an appropriate employment site due to its central location, transport connections and proximity to local services.	Comments noted. Support for EMP4 is welcomed.	No change necessary

SITE Ref: EMP1 (FWLP), POL EMP5 POL (Reg 19) - Land at North Polegate, A22

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 4	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: EMP1 (FWLP), POL EMP5 POL (Reg 19) - Land at North Polegate, A22		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Environment Agency • Commented on contaminated land matters, noting that several proposed strategic employment allocations, including EMP1, may be located in areas with a higher likelihood of historic or residual contamination. • Requested that relevant site-specific policies signpost the potential need for land-quality assessment and remediation where necessary, particularly to protect controlled waters and sensitive hydrological catchments.	Noted. Policy NE14 of the Plan seeks to ensure that development on sites with known or suspected land contamination undertake proportionate land contamination assessment and remediation where risks are identified, including measures to protect human health, controlled waters and the wider water environment. This policy will apply to any development/site, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change necessary.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Formula Land (Polegate) Limited • Supported the allocation of EMP1, stating that the site is strategically well located on the A22/A27 corridor, has good road and rail connections, and could accommodate over 63,000 sqm of commercial floorspace. • They noted that an outline planning application is under consideration and that the Local Highway Authority and National Highways have raised no objections subject to conditions. • The promoter also referred to the Employment and Economic Study and argued that EMP1 could make a significant contribution towards meeting Wealden's employment floorspace requirement.	Support noted. The allocation of EMP1 is intended to contribute towards meeting identified employment needs in a location with access to the strategic road network. Consideration has been given to matters including transport impacts, landscape sensitivity, accessibility, mitigation, and the delivery of supporting infrastructure in the site assessment process, with further detailed assessment to take place through the development management processes.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objected to the inclusion of land north of Polegate, arguing that the proposal is inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy and would result in creeping urbanisation of an	Objection noted. The Council has considered issues of landscape sensitivity, settlement separation, sustainability, transport accessibility and the relationship of the site to the wider Spatial Strategy,	No change necessary.

historic green landscape between Polegate and Hailsham. • Concerns were raised regarding sustainability, reliance on car travel, limited public transport, loss of the strategic green gap, landscape impact, previous local opposition to development in this location; and changes to the evidence base (SHELAA) to state this land is now suitable.	through detailed parts of the evidence base such as the Landscape Sensitivity Context: Polegate West and North Assessment Unit and assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal process. The SA also considers issues of cumulative development and coalescence. The site has been selected for the reasons set out in these assessments.	

SITE Ref: OEMP1 (FWLP) - Land to the south of the Woodland Centre, A22 Whitesmith

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, option presented in Focused WLP only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: OEMP1 (FWLP) - Land to the south of the Woodland Centre, A22 Whitesmith		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Objects to ancient woodland being included within development option sites and asks that site boundaries are reviewed to exclude ancient woodland and provide appropriate buffers. • Highlights that OEMP1 contains Kiln Wood ancient woodland and is adjacent to Shelf Wood. • Requests protection from pollution, encroachment, fragmentation and construction impacts, including a precautionary minimum 50 metre buffer unless robust evidence supports a smaller buffer. • Requests specialist surveys where ancient or veteran trees may be present, with root	• Comments noted. Any future consideration of OEMP1 would need to avoid harm or loss to ancient woodland, provide appropriate buffers and protect connectivity between wildlife habitats.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.

protection areas maintained through design, construction and occupation.		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response.		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response.		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No responses		

SITE Ref: OEMP2 – Land at Laughton Park Farm, East Hoathly with Halland / Laughton

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused WLP only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 77	**Support:** 5	**Neutral:** 4	**Object:** 68

SITE Ref: OEMP2 – Land at Laughton Park Farm, East Hoathly with Halland / Laughton		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No statutory consultee responses	No response required	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Lewes District Council: Noted cross-boundary concerns if strategic growth options including Laughton Park Farm were pursued, particularly the potential impacts on nearby communities and the local and strategic highway network. Requested early notification before Regulation 19 if Option 4 / the new settlement approach is taken forward.	Comments noted. Cross-boundary impacts, including highway and infrastructure matters, are considered through ongoing Duty to Cooperate engagement and further evidence work if OEMP2 is progressed. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Hoathly with Halland Parish Council: Objected to the principle of large-scale development in and around the parish, stating that it would	Comments noted. The matters raised regarding rural character, transport dependency and infrastructure capacity	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed

urbanise a rural community, increase dependence on the A22 and private car use, and place pressure on roads, public transport, water, drainage, sewerage, energy, healthcare, education and digital infrastructure.	are considered through the site assessment and sustainability appraisal process. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council: Objected to OEMP2, stating that up to 30,000 sqm of employment floorspace appears excessive, insufficiently justified, poorly related to local infrastructure and sustainable transport, and likely to cause landscape, environmental and infrastructure impacts unless substantially reduced or reconsidered.	Comments noted. The scale of employment floorspace, infrastructure capacity, landscape impacts and evidence of need have been assessed further, as set out in the evidence base. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Horam Parish Council: concerned with the proposed site, poorly related to the spatial strategy and would contribute to the erosion of the rural character of the Low Wealden, away from the towns	Comments noted. The scale of employment floorspace, infrastructure capacity, landscape impacts and evidence of need have been assessed further, as set out in the evidence base	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Grass Roots Planning / South West Strategic Developments: Supported continued positive consideration of Oakleigh Garden Community, including OEMP2, as part of a larger mixed-use strategic opportunity capable of delivering housing, employment land, services, schools, green and blue infrastructure and longer-term supply. The promoter argued that Wealden's employment evidence identifies a need for additional modern employment floorspace, including in the northern/A22 market area, and that OEMP2 could help address	Support noted. The Council has considered the submitted evidence alongside the wider evidence base, as set out, and found the site unsuitable.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.

employment need, reduce out-commuting and provide jobs alongside homes. The promoter considered that landscape, transport, biodiversity, heritage, lighting, health and infrastructure matters require further technical work but are capable of being addressed through masterplanning, mitigation, phasing and a Planning Performance Agreement.		
Parker Dann / Hesmonds Stud: Suggested a longer-term opportunity to integrate land north of East Hoathly with Laughton Park Farm / OEMP2 to support mutual service provision and stronger sustainable transport links.	Comments noted. Any potential relationship with nearby strategic sites would need to be considered through further spatial strategy, infrastructure and transport assessment. The site noted has also been assessed independently at this stage and found to be unsuitable for the reasons set out.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Sussex Butterfly Conservation: Raised concern about potential negative impacts on Rowland Wood / Park Corner Heath nature reserve from OEH1/OEMP2, including recreational pressure, hydrology, noise, light pollution, litter, traffic emissions and domestic pets. It requested detailed environmental assessment, consultation and safeguards to protect butterflies, moths and other species.	Comments noted. Potential impacts on Rowland Wood / Park Corner Heath, priority habitats, protected species, hydrology, lighting, noise and recreational pressure would require detailed ecological assessment and mitigation if the site were progressed.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.
Woodland Trust: Raised concerns that OEMP2 could affect ancient woodland, priority habitats and biodiversity interests, and requested that any consideration of the site be supported by robust ecological evidence and appropriate buffers, mitigation and safeguards.	Comments noted. Potential impacts on ancient woodland, priority habitats and biodiversity would require further ecological assessment and evidence testing if the site is progressed.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.

National Trust: Raised concerns regarding the potential effects of OEMP2 on landscape character, heritage assets, rural setting and wider environmental quality, including the need for robust assessment before any site option is progressed.	Comments noted. Further evidence has been considered and the site concluded to be unsuitable, including for the reasons set out.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objected to the scale of OEMP2 as disproportionate and inappropriate for a rural Low Weald location. • Raised concern that the A22, B2192 and rural lanes could not accommodate staff, HGV, servicing and delivery traffic. • Highlighted limited sustainable transport, including no rail access, poor bus provision and unsafe walking/cycling routes. • Stated that transport assessment, cumulative modelling and deliverable mitigation are lacking. • Raised infrastructure concerns, including water, wastewater, drainage, flooding, utilities, healthcare, education and local services. • Objected to loss of farmland and harm to landscape, ancient woodland, SSSI/nature reserve interests, protected species and biodiversity.	Comments noted. The concerns raised on scale, highways, sustainable transport, infrastructure, flood risk, landscape, biodiversity, heritage, settlement character and employment are noted. The site was assessed further, as set out in the evidence base, and found to be unsuitable for a number of reasons.	The site was proposed as an option in the FWLP, but for reasons set out in the evidence base, the site is not proposed to proceed to draft allocation at Regulation 19 stage.

• Raised heritage and character impacts, including listed buildings, scheduled monuments, historic farm landscapes, village identity and the setting of the South Downs National Park. • Questioned the evidence for employment need, market demand and independent deliverability.		

B. Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople (GTTS) Sites

This section presents both Proposed GGTS Allocations and GTTS Options (as presented in the Focused Local Plan (2026).

SITE Ref: OGT5 (FWLP), BYG GT2 FR (Reg 19) – The Stables, Hawkenbury Road, Bells Yew Green

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 23	**Support: 0**	**Neutral: 0**	**Object: 23**

SITE Ref: OGT5 (FWLP), BYG GT2 FR (Reg 19) – The Stables, Hawkenbury Road, Bells Yew Green		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Object to proposed site. • Site should not be regarded as an extension to, or adjacent to, an existing permanent Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Showpeople site, as there is no evidence that the existing use is a registered permanent site. • Site is unsuitable because it is isolated, poorly connected to local services, located in the High Weald National Landscape and	• Comments noted. • The suitability of the site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including through a detailed Site Assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal process which considers each issue raised. The location of the site has been considered, noting that the need for accommodation primarily arises for family extension needs in Wealden	• Site allocation reduced (from 3 pitches to 2) to ensure proportionate development in relation to the existing settlement, and that on site mitigation can be adequately secured.

accessed via rural roads with limited vehicular and pedestrian access. • Site proposal is inconsistent with the settlement hierarchy. • Concerns about local road safety, including Dundale Road, Hawkenbury Road and a nearby junction, the lack of safe pedestrian access, and the cumulative effects on neighbouring properties and the wider rural community as mentioned in adjacent SHELAA site assessment.	and that this is an existing site that has been proposed for extension. • The scale and impact of the site and any development has been reduced to consider on site constraints, and take account of the location away from a sustainable settlement, whilst still meeting needs of the local GTTSP community in a proportionate manner. The site has been selected for the reasons set out in the site assessment and selection process, having regard to the PPTS, including paragraphs 13 and 14, and emerging Local Plan evidence base. • The site is currently authorised for 1 pitch for Gypsy and Traveller under planning permission WD/2012/1809/FA. • While the site lies within the High Weald National Landscape and open countryside, these factors have been fully considered as part of the assessment process, including through a detailed Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026).	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No Response		

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• A substantial number of residents objected to the site. • Concern regarding highway safety, poor accessibility to services, increase in traffic and the sites' rural location. • Impact on the residential amenity of neighbouring dwellings. • Objections raised potential impacts on High Weald National Landscape, rural character, wildlife and ancient woodland. • Impacts on infrastructure such as drainage, flooding and water, electricity, and gas supply. • Residents questioned the current status of the existing site and whether more suitable alternative sites should be considered.	• Comments are noted. • The suitability of the site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment work. There is a substantial need for GTTSP accommodation in the district, and weighting of that against other assessment criteria is set out in the detailed Site Assessment SA process. • While the site lies within the High Weald National Landscape and open countryside, these factors have been fully considered as part of the assessment process, including through a detailed Landscape and Visual Assessment (2026).	• Site allocation reduced (from 3 pitches to 2) to ensure proportionate development in relation to the existing settlement, and that on site mitigation can be adequately secured.

SITE Ref: OGT4 (FWLP), HD GT5 (HD) (Reg 19)- Five Badgers and Little Robins, Stonehurst Lane, Mayfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: OGT4 (FWLP), HD GT5 (HD) (Reg 19)- Five Badgers and Little Robins, Stonehurst Lane, Mayfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Hadlow Down Parish Council • Objects to the inclusion of the site. • Impact on the countryside character and rural setting. • Conflict with the spatial strategy due to the site's relationship to an unsustainable settlement and limited access to services and facilities.	• Objection is noted. • The suitability of the site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Sustainability Appraisal and site assessment work. There is a substantial need for GTTSP accommodation in the district, and weighting of that against other	• No change required.

• Impact on the High Weald National Landscape. • Temporary planning permission and the existing requirement for the site to be restored to countryside use.	assessment criteria is set out in the detailed Site Assessment SA process. • While the site lies within the High Weald National Landscape and open countryside, these factors have been fully considered as part of the assessment process, including through a detailed Land and Visual Appraisal (2026). Only part of the site is allocated based on that assessment, and policies in the Plan will continue to secure detailed assessment and mitigation. • Notwithstanding the temporary nature of any site, the site has been submitted for assessment through the SHELAA process and is proposed solely for GTTSP accommodation. It has therefore been assessed on that basis, as set out in the GTTSP LAA.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

SITE Ref: OGT6 (FWLP), CIH GT8 MFA (Reg 19) – Little Rose, Meres Lane, Cross in Hand, Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support: 0**	**Neutral: 1**	**Object: 0**

SITE Ref: OGT6 (FWLP), CIH GT8 MFA (Reg 19) – Little Rose, Meres Lane, Cross in Hand, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Concern raised that site allocation is in close proximity to ancient woodland at Hornslodge Gill.	Other policies in the Plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan,	No changes required

• Requests site boundary is reviewed to exclude areas of ancient woodland and appropriate buffers be provided to protect adjacent ancient woodland – as a precautionary principle, a minimum of 50 metre buffer should be maintained between development and ancient woodland, unless it can be demonstrated that a smaller buffer would suffice	including the need to provide a suitable buffer to the ancient woodland noted	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

SITE Ref: OGT3 (FWLP), HEA GT9 HEAW (Reg 19) – Monkhurst Field, Sandy Cross Lane, Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 31	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 30

SITE Ref: OGT3 (FWLP), HEA GT9 HEAW (Reg 19) – Monkhurst Field, Sandy Cross Lane, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to the inclusion of OGT3, noting that the site would fail to comply with Policy HO9 on provision of GTTSP accommodation. • Concerns raised about location of the site within the High Weald National Landscape, poor access to services and sustainable transport, unsafe access from Sandy Cross Lane, flood and drainage risks, impact on nearby heritage assets, ancient woodland, biodiversity and harm to the rural character.	• Comments are noted. • The Council recognises the concerns raised regarding landscape sensitivity, access, sustainability, heritage, drainage and ecology. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process, including through a detailed Site Assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal process which considers each issue raised. The location of the site has	• No changes proposed. Site already reduced in area between submission and allocation to account for on site constraints and issues raised.

• Raised concerns about the infrastructure constraints and the likely visual and environmental effect of hardstanding, lighting, vehicles and associated activity on the rural character of the area.	been considered in terms of proximity to a sustainable settlement, proximity to services and education, and with the scale and impact of the site and any development reduced to consider on site constraints, including the site specific assessment in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026). • The site has been selected for the reasons set out in the site assessment and selection process and accompanying evidence base, including the GTTSP LAA and SA Ste Assessments. Regard has been had to national policy, including paragraph 13 of the PPTS, and emerging Local Plan evidence base.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Woodland Trust • Object to the inclusion of sites that affect ancient woodland. • Noted that the site is adjacent to, and may contain, ancient woodland at Ham Wood.	• Other policies in the Plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan, including the need to provide a suitable buffer to the ancient woodland noted.	• No change required.

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• All residents objected to the site allocation. • Raised concerns that Sandy Cross Lane is narrow, rural, unlit and without footways, making it unsuitable for caravans, towing vehicles and increased traffic, and an unsustainable location • Referred to previous refusals for housing or other development, including recent appeals dismissed on the site, and questioned why the site is being considered. • Raised concerns about the site's location within the High Weald National Landscape. • Highlighted proximity to ancient woodland, a Grade II listed building and sensitive wildlife habitats, including references to Great Crested Newt impact zones. • Raised concerns about drainage and surface water flooding, including potential impacts on the headwaters of the River Cuckmere. • Raised concerns about light and noise pollution, pressure on local services, impact on residential amenity, potential management and enforcement issues, and the effect of development on the rural character of the area. • Raised concerns about its proximity to existing housing and impact on these properties.	• Comments are noted. • The Council acknowledges the level of objection from local residents and the range of planning matters raised. • The Council recognises the concerns raised regarding landscape sensitivity, access, sustainability, heritage, drainage and ecology. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process, including through a detailed Site Assessment in the Sustainability Appraisal process which considers each issue raised. The location of the site has been considered in terms of proximity to a sustainable settlement, proximity to services and education, and with the scale and impact of the site and any development reduced to consider on site constraints, including the site specific assessment in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026). • The site has been selected for the reasons set out in the site assessment and selection process	• No change required. Site already reduced in area between submission and allocation to account for on site constraints, and issues raised.

	and accompanying evidence base, including the GTTSP LAA and SA Ste Assessments. Regard has been had to national policy, including paragraph 13 of the PPTS, and emerging Local Plan evidence base. • The Council will has considered previous planning decisions and appeal findings, noting that in the previoulsy dismissed appeal the Inspector raised concern at depth and projection of the site and impacts from two storey detached dwellings in the recently dismissed appeal. The site now proposed for allocation does not project to the same degree, forming only a part of the previous site. GTTSP development also proposes single storey development only. Overall development is of a differing nature/scale for consideration and has been assessed and selected for the reasons set out. • Detailed matters are subject to assessment at planning application stage and can be appropriately controlled as required.	

SITE Ref: OGT2 (FWLP), Site HA GT14 HA (Reg 19) - Development Land at Station Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: OGT2 (FWLP), Site HA GT14 HA (Reg 19) - Development Land at Station Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • The site falls within a Waste Consultation Area and there is potential for future waste development to take place which could have an impact of future occupants living in area within the WCA. • If site were to come forward, the policy and/or supporting text should refer to the requirements regarding safeguarding waste sites.	Comments noted. The Council acknowledges the location of the site within a Waste Consultation Area. The safeguarding of existing and potential future waste management facilities is addressed through the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Plan and will be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. In addition, the draft Wealden Local Plan contains policies relating to infrastructure, amenity and environmental impacts which require development to avoid prejudicing existing uses and ensure an acceptable living environment for future occupants.	• Site yield reduced to account for on site constraints

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

SITE Ref (FWLP): OGT1 – Land at Polly Arch, Lynholm Road, Polegate

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref (FWLP): OGT1 – Land at Polly Arch, Lynholm Road, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses received		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Two local residents object to the policy OGT1.	• Comments noted • The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the	No changes as a result of comments made. However, draft allocation omitted for other reasons, namely due to flood

• Polly Arch is an established family site and express concerns about additional pitches nearby being occupied by households outside of that family unit, potentially causing conflict in the area. • Concerns raised regarding suitability of the access road for increased traffic and potential impact on the rural character of the area. • Respondents highlighted the positive relationship between existing residents and wider community and suggested that changes to site occupation could affect existing community dynamics.	proposed additional pitches near to an existing established site, including the family nature of the existing site and concerns about the compatibility of any future occupants. The GTAA (2026) makes it clear that accommodation needs can arise from growing family needs. The proposed site could therefore be used as an extension to existing nearby family accommodation, if ownership and delivery mechanisms allow, or as a site to meet wider needs in the area. Any occupiers will need to comply with site licence if applicable. Concerns of traffic impacts, access, and character of the area have been considered alongside the wider evidence base and relevant planning considerations when determining the suitability of the site for allocation. Other parts of that evidence base result in the site being omitted for allocation for other reasons.	risk along access routes making the site unsuitable.

C. Housing Sites

This presents the proposed housing allocations that are moving forward, along with two sites where representations were made but they have been removed as are too small to be included as potential site allocations (FR5 and FR10). Where sites now have planning permission, and are therefore a commitment, these have been removed. Also, sites are only included where representations were made on them.

The sites removed as they are now commitments include:

BU2	Land behind the Croft, Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross
BU8	Land at Mockbeggar Farm, London Road, Uckfield
EH1	Land off South Street, East Hoathly
FF1	Cysleys Farm, Eastbourne Road, Uckfield
HA2	Land south of A271 and north of Harebeating Lane, Hailsham
HA7	150 and 152 Battle Road, Hailsham
HEL2	Land at Park Farm, New Road, Hellingly
HOR2	Land at Cauldavon, Horebeech Lane, Marle Green, Horam(224)
POL1	Paddock to front of Dittons Park Industrial Estate, Dittons Road, Polegate
POL3	Land at Shepham Lane, Polegate
UCK2	Land at Horstedpond Farm, Lewes Road, Uckfield
UCK5	Land at Springfield, Lewes Road, Ridgewood, Uckfield

SITE Ref: FF4 (FWLP), BB1 (FF) (Reg 19) – Land adjoining Old Mill House, Framfield Road, Blackboys

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: FF4 (FWLP), BB1 (FF) (Reg 19) – Land adjoining Old Mill House, Framfield Road, Blackboys		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, but adequate space exists on site to address the constraint and still deliver development identified. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No response	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to site allocation due to the overdevelopment of Blackboys.	• Comment noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base, including site assessment work. The assessment concluded that the site is suitable for allocation and capable of accommodating development, subject to compliance with the Local Plan's development.	• No change proposed.

SITE Ref: FF3 (FWLP), BB2 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Blackboys Inn and Adjoining Land, Lewes Road, Blackboys

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:**

SITE Ref: FF3 (FWLP), BB2 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Blackboys Inn and Adjoining Land, Lewes Road, Blackboys		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No responses		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Raise no objection to the site allocation. • Request a site specific policy that includes criteria for sites within the HWNL to demonstrate landscape led design and layout that avoids or minimises adverse impacts on the setting of the HWNL,	• Comment noted. • The council acknowledge the site's proximity to the HWNL and the importance of protecting its setting. The allocation is considered appropriate for residential development and has been informed by landscape evidence.	• No change proposed.

safeguards its dark skies and follows the guidance in the High Weald AONB Design Guide.	Any development of the site will avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the setting of the HWNL.	
Harvey & Sons (Lewes) Ltd) • Support site allocation.	• Support noted.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:**	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: FF3 (FWLP), BB2 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Blackboys Inn and Adjoining Land, Lewes Road, Blackboys		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
• No response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
DJA Planning • Support site allocation.	• Comment noted. Whilst the wider site submitted to the SHELAA was considered through the site assessment process, only the eastern portion has been identified	• No change proposed.

• Boundary of site could be extended to include the additional land to the west and increase dwelling capacity.	as suitable for allocation. The western area was assessed as being unsuitable for allocation due to site-specific constraints identified during the Council's evidence-based assessment. As a result, the proposed allocation boundary has been drawn to include only the developable and suitable part of the site.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to site allocation. • Concerns include highway safety and traffic, lack of services, overdevelopment of blackboys.	• Comment noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base, including detailed strategic site assessment work. This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper. Assessment included a review of the village and services in the updated Sustainable Settlement Strategy; and detailed strategic site review of the site and constraints in the Sustainability	• No change proposed.

	Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raised. • The assessment concluded that the site is suitable for allocation and capable of accommodating development, subject to compliance with the Local Plan's development · No proposed change.	

SITE Ref: BE1 (FWLP), BE1 (Reg 19) – Land north of Recreation Ground, Station Road, Berwick Station

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: BE1 (FWLP), BE1 (Reg 19) – Land north of Recreation Ground, Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Existing infrastructure crosses the site which will need to be considered. • Planning policy should therefore require development layouts to safeguard access to the sewer network for ongoing maintenance and future capacity upgrades.	• Comment noted. • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change proposed.
Natural England • Notes that the site is adjacent to priority habitat woodland.	• The plan should be read as a whole. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including Priority Habitats and wider ecological networks, is addressed through draft Policy NE1.	• No change proposed.
Network Rail • Development needs to consider potential impacts on nearby level crossing, including	• Detailed considerations relating to access, movement and safety will be assessed through the planning	• No change proposed.

increased usage and proximity of development. • Wish to work with council to help minimise associated safety risks.	application process in consultation with Network Rail.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to proposed site allocation. • Main issues raised include the overdevelopment of Berwick, development on greenfield land and environmental impacts such as flood risk.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• No proposed change.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 14	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: BE1 (FWLP), BE1 (Reg 19) – Land north of Recreation Ground, Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Network Rail • Site allocation should assess cumulative impacts on Berwick Station. • Station may require upgrades and contributions and additional use of the level crossing raises safety considerations.	• Comments noted. The Council have considered infrastructure needs as a result of all growth, with infrastructure required to meet growth being set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There are no site specific needs arising from this specific allocation.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response.		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Arlington Parish Council • Site allocation could create dormitory housing rather than sustainable communities. • Other concerns include poor access to services, traffic pressures, potential of major development being visible to the South Downs National Park.	• Comments noted. • The Council have considered these issues as part of the evidence base work. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The	• No change proposed.

	process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, and landscape impact. • The Council notes the comment regarding potential visibility of the allocation from, and towards, the South Downs National Park. The site has been considered in the context of the Wealden Landscape Character Assessment (2022), which provides the strategic framework for assessing landscape character and sensitivity across the district. The existence of intervisibility does not in itself indicate unacceptable harm. Any future development proposal would be required to respond sensitively to its landscape setting and demonstrate that potential effects on the character, appearance and setting of the South Downs National Park are appropriately mitigated.	
Berwick Parish Council:	• Comments noted. • The concerns regarding surface water flooding, settlement scale,	• No proposed change.

• Objects to site allocation due to existing surface water flooding. • There is a disproportionate increase in housing relative to settlement size and will change the linear character of the village. • Other concerns are a lack of services and public transport resulting in car dependency, traffic and congestion.	linear character, transport accessibility, local services and congestion have been reviewed through the site assessment, infrastructure and transport evidence base. This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raised.	
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Concerns include site is in a unsustainable location, harmful impact on rural character of Berwick, inadequate infrastructure and environmental impacts.	• Comments noted. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to	• No change proposed.

	services, landscape and environmental impact	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Firle Estate • Strongly supports site allocation. • Site is well screened, accessible from Station Road, close to the railway station/bus stops and has no insurmountable constraints. • Further masterplanning has identified the developable area is capable of around 60 dwellings, with open space, links to the recreation ground/village hall/play area and frontage to Station Road.	• Support noted. • The request to increase the site allocation to approximately 60 dwellings has been assessed against the site's developable area, access, landscape and settlement character and deliverability considerations. Detailed assessment has been undertaken through the Sustainability Appraisal process, using the evidence base available and including assessment of cumulative impact and scale of growth across the village. This is necessary noting material change to proposals, the characteristic of the settlement, and objections and issues raised on the draft allocation for 30 units here alongside other allocations in the village.	• Amend the allocation capacity to a higher yield of 45 dwellings.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Majority of local residents responses have objected to the site allocation. • Concerns include excessive cumulative growth, including concerns that committed	• Comments noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base, including detailed strategic site	• No proposed change.

and proposed development could more than double Berwick Station and conflict with the village's rural scale and linear form. • Other key issues include waterlogged land, surface water flooding, shared drainage constraints, potential downstream impacts on the Cuckmere/Alfriston, proximity to woodland, Arlington Reservoir SSSI/Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, dark skies and wildlife impacts. • Residents also raise transport and infrastructure concerns, including speeding on Station Road, level crossing congestion, limited buses/hourly trains, poor access to shops, schools and healthcare, car dependency, lack of safe pedestrian/cycle links and unresolved SHELAA/evidence-base issues.(duplication of mapping for BE1 & BE2 as well as constraints such as access, topography, drainage and infrastructure capacity).	assessment work. This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper. Assessment include a review of the village and services in the Updated Sustainable Settlement Strategy; and detailed strategic site review of the site and constraints in the Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raised. • The assessment concluded that the site is suitable for allocation and capable of accommodating development, subject to compliance with the Local Plan's development management policies and any site-specific requirements. • The surface water flooding has been assessed and as a result the net developable area of the site has been reduced so that no development will take place to the north of the site.	

SITE Ref: BE2 (FWLP), BE2 (Reg 19) – Land West of Station Road, Berwick Station

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:**	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: BE2 (FWLP), BE2 (Reg 19) – Land West of Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change proposed
Natural England • Note that the site is adjacent to priority habitat woodland.	• The plan should be read as a whole. The protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets, including priority habitats and wider ecological networks is addressed through draft policy NE1.	• No change proposed.

Network Rail • Development needs to consider potential impacts on nearby level crossing, including increased usage and proximity of development. • Wish to work with council to help minimise associated safety risks.	• Detailed considerations relating to access, movement and safety will be assessed through the planning application process in consultation with Network Rail.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to proposed site allocation. • Main issues raised include the overdevelopment of Berwick, development on greenfield land and environmental impacts such as flood risk and on Arlington Reservoir.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and	• No change proposed.

	Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 15	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 11

SITE Ref: BE2 (FWLP), BE2 (Reg 19) – Land West of Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Existing infrastructure crosses the site which will need to be considered. • Planning policy should therefore require development layouts to safeguard access to the sewer network for ongoing maintenance and future capacity upgrades.	• Comment noted. • Design and layout of a site will be considered at planning application stage. • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Berwick Parish Council	• Comments noted.	• Correction to the site boundary within the SHELAA assessment.

• Object to site allocation. • Consider number of dwellings proposed would be overdevelopment of a small area. • Raise concerns that existing properties already experience sewage flooding, more development would worsen the problem. • Concern that allocations in Berwick would virtually double dwellings at Berwick Station, change the established linear character, increase car dependency, worsen traffic and railway crossing congestion, and place further pressure on overstretched medical services and limited public transport. • SHELAA assessment for site shows incorrect boundary and should be corrected.	• This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raisedThe Council notes the request to correct the SHELAA boundary information and have reviewed and rectified the error.	
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Object to site allocation. • Concerns include unsustainable location, harmful to the rural character of Berwick, inadequately supported by infrastructure and environmentally constrained. • The cumulative allocation is disproportionate to the settlement's role, would intensify traffic and infrastructure pressure, increase reliance on private car use for schools, healthcare, shops and services, erode the rural setting, and has not been adequately assessed for cumulative impacts, including flood risk, drainage, biodiversity and water supply.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to	• No change proposed

	services, landscape and environmental impact	
Arlington Parish Council • Site allocation could create dormitory housing rather than sustainable communities. • Other concerns include poor access to services, traffic pressures, potential major development being visible to the South Downs National Park.	• Comments noted. • The Council have considered these issues as part of the evidence base work. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, and landscape impact. • The Council notes the comment regarding potential visibility of the allocation from, and towards, the South Downs National Park. The site has been considered in the context of the Wealden Landscape Character Assessment (2022), which provides the strategic framework for assessing landscape character and sensitivity across the district. The existence of intervisibility does not in itself indicate unacceptable harm. Any	• No change proposed

	future development proposal would be required to respond sensitively to its landscape setting and demonstrate that potential effects on the character, appearance and setting of the South Downs National Park are appropriately mitigated. •	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Firle Estate</u> • Strongly support site allocation for 27 dwellings. • Considers the site to be well screened by boundary trees and hedgerows. • Site is well related to the existing settlement and capable of access from Station Road. • SHELAA assessment for site shows incorrect boundary and should be corrected. .	• Support noted. • The Council notes the request to correct the SHELAA boundary information and have reviewed and rectified the error.	• Correction to the site boundary within the SHELAA assessment.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents objected to site allocation. • Concern that site allocations in Berwick will more than double the number of dwellings at Berwick and change the character of a small rural settlement. • Concerned raised about land levels and topography of site and risk of overlooking,	• Comments noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base, including detailed strategic site assessment work. This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need,	• Correction to the site boundary within the SHELAA assessment.

loss of privacy, visual dominance, overbearing impact, artificial lighting and loss of rural/dark skies. • Other concerns include flood risk and cumulative downstream impact, sewage and wastewater concerns, inadequate infrastructure. • Highway and pedestrian safety concerns were also raised including vehicular access, poor visibility splays, speeding, on street parking, narrow single file footways, lack of formal crossing and limited scope to improve pedestrian access. • SHELAA assessment for site shows incorrect boundary and should be corrected The unresolved constraints including access, topography, drainage and infrastructure capacity show an unresolved SHELAA/evidence-base issues duplication of mapping for BE1 & BE2 as well as constraints such as access, topography, drainage and infrastructure capacity). • Other concerns include pressure on local health services, limited access to essential services, mismatch between affordable housing needs and a car-dependent location, biodiversity/landscape impacts, and cumulative infrastructure effects with other Berwick allocations and larger nearby option sites.	including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper. Assessment include a review of the village and services in the Updated Sustainable Settlement Strategy; and detailed strategic site review of the site and constraints in the Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raised. • . • The Council notes the request to correct the SHELAA boundary information and have reviewed and rectified the error.	

SITE Ref: BE3 (FWLP), BE3 (Reg 19) – Land to north east of Berwick Station, Station Road, Berwick Station

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 15	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 10

SITE Ref: BE3 (FWLP), BE3 (Reg 19) – Land to north east of Berwick Station, Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change proposed.

Network Rail • Site allocations within Berwick need to consider the cumulative impacts on Berwick Station, including potential station facility upgrades, increased patronage and level crossing safety. A reasonable contribution towards station improvements may be required.	• Comments noted. • The Council have considered infrastructure needs as a result of all growth, with infrastructure required to meet growth being set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There are no site specific needs arising from this specific allocation.	• No change proposed
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Object to site allocation. • Concerns include unsustainable location, harmful to the rural character of Berwick, inadequately supported by infrastructure, and environmentally constrained. • The cumulative allocation is disproportionate to the settlement's role, would intensify traffic and infrastructure pressure, increase reliance on private car use for schools, healthcare, shops and services, erode the rural setting, and has not been adequately assessed for cumulative impacts, including flood risk, drainage, biodiversity and water supply.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, landscape and environmental impact	• No change proposed.
Arlington Parish Council • Site allocation could create dormitory housing rather than sustainable communities.	• Comments noted. • The Council have considered these issues as part of the evidence base work.	• No change proposed

• Other concerns include poor access to services, traffic pressures, potential of major development being visible from the South Downs National Park.	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, and landscape impact. • The Council notes the comment regarding potential visibility of the allocation from, and towards, the South Downs National Park. The site has been considered in the context of the Wealden Landscape Character Assessment (2022), which provides the strategic framework for assessing landscape character and sensitivity across the district. The existence of intervisibility does not in itself indicate unacceptable harm. Any future development proposal would be required to respond sensitively to its landscape setting and demonstrate that potential effects on the character, appearance and	

	setting of the South Downs National Park are appropriately mitigated. •	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Firle Estate • Strongly support the site allocation for residential development • Site would reflect the pattern of development along Station Road as well as the northern extent of the settlement. • This land could form part of a wider site allocation on the land east of Station Road.	• Support noted. • The Council notes that a larger site extent was previously submitted and assessed through the SHELAA process. The assessment concluded that the land to the east, together with the wider site area, would result in greater harm to landscape character and the local setting and was therefore not taken forward. The proposed allocation reflects the findings of the SHELAA and associated landscape evidence, which identified a reduced site area as the more appropriate developable extent. On this basis, no amendments to the allocation boundary are proposed.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents objected to site allocation on the grounds that 10 dwellings accessing Station	• Comments noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base,	• No change proposed.

Road would be unsafe because vehicles regularly exceed the speed limit. • Concern that site allocations in Berwick will more than double the number of dwellings at Berwick and change the character of a small rural settlement. • Other concerns include infrequent and limited train and bus services and reliance on private cars for shops, schools, healthcare and other services. • Other objections include impacts on rural character, the existing linear settlement pattern, the setting of the South Downs National Park and the openness/countryside around Berwick Station. • Flooding and drainage concerns were raised, including waterlogged land, surface water drainage into the same ditch system as other allocations and the risk of downstream impacts. • Residents raised biodiversity concerns, including impacts on wooded areas, Arlington Reservoir SSSI, priority habitats, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas and species including bats, woodpeckers, cuckoos, sparrowhawks, kites and buzzards. • Further concerns included increased traffic at the level crossing, lack of local infrastructure, uncertainty over delivery of shops and employment space on committed sites, and potential cumulative impacts with larger nearby sites.	including detailed strategic site assessment work. This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper. Assessment include a review of the village and services in the Updated Sustainable Settlement Strategy; and detailed strategic site review of the site and constraints in the Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raised. • The assessment concluded that the site is suitable for allocation and capable of accommodating development, subject to compliance with the Local Plan's development management policies and any site-specific requirements.	

SITE Ref: BE4 (FWLP), BE4 (Reg 19) – Land at Brookfield Nursery, Station Road, Berwick Station

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, allocation proposed in FWLP

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: BE4 (FWLP), BE4 (Reg 19) – Land at Brookfield Nursery, Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted. • The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW as other sites do in the area, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	• No change proposed.
Network Rail	• Comments noted. • The Council have considered infrastructure needs as a result of	• No change proposed.

• Site allocation along with others in Berwick should consider cumulative impacts on Berwick station. Increased patronage may require station facility upgrades and reasonable developer contributions. • Also highlight the need to consider impacts on the nearby level crossing due to increased use and associated safety concerns.	all growth, with infrastructure required to meet growth being set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. There are no site specific needs arising from this specific allocation	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Berwick Parish Council</u> • Objects to site allocation. • Concerns regarding the access/egress would add danger at the Station Road, Common Lane and Chilver Bridge Road crossroads, where recent accidents are reported. • Also concerned that visibility would be difficult, traffic approaches quickly from the south, and the access is only just within the 30mph speed limit after a 60mph approach. • Concern that allocations in Berwick would virtually double dwellings at Berwick Station, change the established linear character, increase car dependency, worsen traffic and railway crossing congestion, and place further pressure on overstretched medical services and limited public transport.	• Comments noted. • This assessment work was undertaken to identify land to address housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such those raisedAssessment of access and suitability of the site has included liaison with ESCC Highways on all sites. The site will be required to provide safe and suitable access in accordance with national and local planning policies.	• No change proposed

Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Object to site allocation. • Concerns include unsustainable location, harmful to the rural character of Berwick, inadequately supported by infrastructure, and environmentally constrained. • The cumulative allocation is disproportionate to the settlement's role, would intensify traffic and infrastructure pressure, increase reliance on private car use for schools, healthcare, shops and services, erode the rural setting, and has not been adequately assessed for cumulative impacts, including flood risk, drainage, biodiversity and water supply.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, landscape and environmental impact	• No change proposed.
Arlington Parish Council • Site allocation could create dormitory housing rather than sustainable communities. • Other concerns include poor access to services, traffic pressures, potential of major development being visible to the South Downs National Park.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper, Sustainable Settlement Strategy, and Sustainability Appraisal; the latter including the site specific assessment undertaken that considers issues such as access to services, and landscape impact.	• No change proposed.

	• The Council notes the comment regarding potential visibility of the allocation from, and towards, the South Downs National Park. The site has been considered in the context of the Wealden Landscape Character Assessment (2022), which provides the strategic framework for assessing landscape character and sensitivity across the district. The existence of intervisibility does not in itself indicate unacceptable harm. Any future development proposal would be required to respond sensitively to its landscape setting and demonstrate that potential effects on the character, appearance and setting of the South Downs National Park are appropriately mitigated. •	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• The site promoter supports the inclusion of the site allocation. • Considers the site capable of accommodating up to 7 dwellings. • Response states the site is in a sustainable location within walking distance of Berwick railway station, bus stops and village facilities, is visually contained by existing residential development, hedgerows and a wooded	• Support noted. The promoted benefits and capacity of the site have been considered alongside landscape sensitivity, settlement form, access, odour, infrastructure and environmental constraints. The Council consider the capacity of the site to be constrained by these constraints and characteristics, and limited site size. The allocation is therefore to remain for the quantum	• No change proposed.

shaw, and could form a logical, integrated continuation of the village. • The promoter acknowledges that development would introduce built form east of the existing frontage but argues this can be sensitively positioned and that allocation is important given housing land supply shortfalls.	of development set out, but will be subject to further assessment at planning application stage. Should more dwellings be possible to accommodate whilst ensuring compliance with all policies I the Plan, that will be considered at that time.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents have objected to the site allocation due to highway safety concerns over a new access onto Station Road. • Residents also argue the site would extend beyond the existing building line, harm the rural character of Berwick and contribute to overdevelopment alongside other allocated sites. • Concerns are raised that cumulative development could significantly increase the settlement size without adequate infrastructure, services or assessment of impacts. • Residents consider the location car dependent due to limited public transport and poor access to key services. • Flood risk, drainage and sewage capacity issues are also raised, including downstream impacts.	• Comments noted. • The site has been assessed against the Council's evidence base, including site assessment work. The assessment concluded that the site is suitable for allocation and capable of accommodating development, subject to compliance with the Local Plan's development management policies and any site-specific requirements. • Assessment of access and suitability of the site has included liaison with ESCC Highways on all sites. The site will be required to provide safe and suitable access in accordance with national and local planning policies.	• No change proposed

• Environmental concerns include effects on trees, hedgerows, biodiversity, protected species, nearby designated landscapes and dark skies. • Some responses note the refusal o a second access at neighbouring Shabbards as evidence of existing access safety concerns.		

SITE Ref: BU7 (FWLP), BU1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Holly Farm, Station Road, Buxted

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: BU7 (FWLP), BU1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Holly Farm, Station Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water notes the site is within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works. Sensitive development should be sufficiently separated to protect future amenity, with site-specific policy wording and an odour assessment required to agree the 1.5 OdU contour.	Comments noted. The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change required.
Natural England advises that the site is close to Buxted Park SSSI and all impact pathways must be avoided. The site also lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to	No change required

	comply with all relevant policies in the plan. An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the proposed submission version of the Local Plan	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **Buxted Parish Council** considers BU7 unsuitable due to visibility from Buxted Park, including the higher ground within the site. • The representation notes that heritage assets and their setting will be assessed using Historic England GPA3 methodology. • The Council seeks clarity and flexibility in the policy wording, including retaining explanatory text or adding wording such as "around" or "approximately" so that provision of 22 homes would not conflict with the policy.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Holly Farm Buxted Limited • Welcomes the draft allocation.	Support noted.	No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 7

SITE Ref: BU7 (FWLP), BU1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Holly Farm, Station Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council Objected to BU7 and maintained that land at Holly Farm, Station Road is unsuitable for development due to its visibility from Buxted Park. The Parish Council noted that part of the site is higher than Buxted Park and that the areas would be intervisible. It also queried why the site is considered suitable when other nearby countryside sites have been regarded as too far into the countryside.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water Southern Water requested that BU7, as one of the	Comments noted.	No change required.

sites within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works, should include wording requiring the layout of development to be informed by an odour assessment undertaken in consultation with the statutory wastewater undertaker. Southern Water also noted that previous April 2024 comments had not been fully incorporated into the Draft Focused Local Plan.	The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Resident objections raised concerns that BU7 would harm the rural character and village setting of Buxted, including the green approach into the village and the relationship with adjoining fields. • Concerns were raised about harm to Buxted Park SSSI, increased recreational pressure, impacts on wildlife corridors, dark skies, ancient woodland and wider ecological connectivity. • Highway and pedestrian safety objections referred to access onto the A272, poor visibility, the downhill road section, limited pedestrian provision, crossing movements to the recreation ground and proximity to the railway embankment. • Further objections related to water supply, sewage capacity, flooding and runoff, limited public transport, car dependence, lack of school capacity, pressure on local health	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1), Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including surface drainage, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is	No specific proposed changes at this stage.

services and the availability of brownfield alternatives. • One response on the wider spatial strategy also objected to BU7 and sought to retain separation between Uckfield, Buxted and Maresfield, protect the countryside gap and prioritise brownfield sites.	inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation. Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. A review has been undertaken as to whether additional policy safeguards are needed for landscape and ecological impacts, access and pedestrian safety, flood risk and drainage, wastewater infrastructure, sustainable transport, local character and infrastructure capacity.	

SITE Ref: BU6 (FWLP), BU2 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land East of Great Totease Farm, Church Road, Buxted

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: BU6 (FWLP), BU2 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land East of Great Totease Farm, Church Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water The site is within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works. Southern Water advise that new sensitive development should be adequately separated from wastewater treatment works to protect residential amenity, in line with paragraph 180(e) of the NPPF. They recommend site-specific policy wording and subsequent planning conditions, including an odour assessment undertaken in consultation with Southern Water to agree the 1.5 OdU contour, within which no sensitive development should be located.	Comments noted. The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW as other sites do in the area, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No changes required
Natural England The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Buxted Parish Council The Parish Council consider that BU6 could be extended further north if land is available. They agree that the site must only be accessed via Iron Plat Lane and not Church Road, which they identify as being in poor condition and often congested with parked cars.	Comments noted. The potential for any extension to the north would depend on land availability, suitability and assessment through the site selection process. The access concerns regarding Church Road are noted and would need to be reflected in any site-specific requirements.	Access arrangements for the site will be reviewed and confirmed within the site allocation policy wording.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
B Yond Homes Limited @ DMH Stallard Support the allocation of 20 dwellings at BU6, describing the site as available, deliverable and a sustainable extension to the existing built form of Buxted. The representation states that the site can provide landscape buffering to the Grade II Listed Totease Farmhouse to the east, alongside existing mature tree screening. They also broadly support the settlement hierarchy approach and identification of Buxted as a Secondary Village.	Support noted. The comments regarding availability, deliverability, settlement hierarchy and landscape buffering are noted. The site's relationship with the Grade II Listed Totease Farmhouse would need to be addressed through appropriate layout, design and landscaping. A Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken on the site, and the Council the proposed quantum of development is appropriate and can be delivered.	No changes required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: BU6 (FWLP), BU2 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land East of Great Totease Farm, Church Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water Southern Water requested that BU6, as a site within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works, should include wording requiring the layout of development to be informed by an odour assessment undertaken in consultation with the statutory wastewater undertaker. Southern Water also noted that previous April 2024 comments had not been fully incorporated into the Draft Focused Local Plan.	Comments noted. This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with. The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW as other sites do in the area, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Buxted Parish Council Objected to BU6 and reiterated previous concerns about the suitability of land east of Great Totease Farm. The Parish Council stated that the site should only be accessed via Iron Plat Lane and not via Church Road, which it described as being in poor condition and often congested with parked cars. The Parish Council also suggested that the site could be extended further north if land is available.	Comments noted. The potential for any extension to the north would depend on land availability, suitability and assessment through the site selection process. The access concerns regarding Church Road are noted and would need to be reflected in any site-specific requirements.	Access arrangements for the site will be reviewed and confirmed within the site allocation policy wording.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
B.Yond Homes Limited B.Yond Homes Limited, as landowner, supported the continued allocation of BU6 for 20 dwellings. The consultee welcomed the allocation and stated that a detailed questionnaire had been completed in relation to the site.	Support noted.	No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Resident objections raised concerns that BU6 would fragment wildlife corridors, harm land adjoining areas managed for wildlife, and set a precedent for further development west of Church Road. • Comments also objected on highway and safety grounds, referring to the narrowness of Church Road, poor visibility onto the A272, parked cars near the village shop, and potential impacts on the nearby zebra crossing.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be	No change required

• Further concerns included pressure on Buxted Medical Centre, lack of school capacity, car dependence, increased congestion and pollution, and the effect of additional development on the rural character of Buxted.	required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	

SITE Ref: BU4 (FWLP), BU3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Lower Totease Farm, Framfield Road, Buxted

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: BU4 (FWLP), BU3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Lower Totease Farm, Framfield Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water Southern Water advises that existing sewerage infrastructure crosses the site and this will need to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. An easement of 6 metres or more may be required depending on pipe size and depth, which should remain clear of buildings and substantial tree planting and may affect the layout or require diversion. Southern Water requests policy wording to ensure future access to sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	Comments noted. This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation.	No changes required

Natural England Natural England notes that BU4 lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council Buxted Parish Council raises concerns regarding the suitability of BU4 due to the potential loss of employment opportunities and unsuitable access onto Framfield Road, including restricted visibility. If BU4 is considered suitable for development, the Parish Council suggests that development should be extended to include Land South of Lower Totease Farm (SHELAA ref. 042/1840), noting that this land uses the same access as BU4 but has been assessed differently. The Parish Council also notes the proximity of ancient woodland and suggests that land closest to it could be retained as a nature reserve or used as a green burial site. The Parish Council owns half of the access track and would be open to dialogue with WDC about widening it to serve both new development and the existing recreation ground.	Comments noted. The concerns regarding employment land, access arrangements, visibility onto Framfield Road and the relationship with adjoining land will be considered through the site assessment and site selection process. Any decision to widen the allocation or include adjoining land would need to be justified through the evidence base, including access, landscape, ancient woodland, biodiversity and deliverability considerations.	No changes required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No Response		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: BU4 (FWLP), BU3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Lower Totease Farm, Framfield Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council • Objected to BU4 and reiterated previous concerns about the suitability of Lower Totease Farm for development. • The Parish Council raised concerns about the loss of employment opportunities, restricted visibility at the Framfield Road access, increased traffic and the number of homes proposed. • It also noted that the related Land South of Lower Totease Farm site appears to share the same access issue and suggested that, if development proceeds, land could be set aside near the ancient woodland for a nature reserve or green burial site.	• Comments noted. • The Council should consider the concerns raised regarding access visibility, highway safety, loss of employment use, traffic impacts, relationship with nearby ancient woodland and the potential role of adjoining land. • Any development would need to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved and that impacts on landscape, biodiversity, neighbouring uses and local infrastructure can be appropriately addressed.	As part of the review of policy wording, consideration was given to whether additional wording was required to address access arrangements, highway safety, employment land considerations, ancient woodland buffers, biodiversity mitigation, the relationship with adjoining land.

• The Parish Council stated it owns half of the access track and would be open to discussion with WDC about widening the track for both new development and the existing recreation ground.	• The Council would also be open to explore options with the Parish Council in relation to the part Parish-owned access track.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objection to the proposed scale of development in Buxted and Maresfield, including BU4, citing overdevelopment, loss of rural character, increased traffic, harm to biodiversity, pressure on GP services and reduced quality of life for existing residents. • The comments also raised wider concerns that additional housing in Buxted would add to the existing burden on Buxted Medical Centre and other local GP practices.	• Comments noted. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	No changes required

SITE Ref: OBU2 (FWLP), BU4 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Limes Lane, Buxted

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable. Site proposed as Option in FWLP.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:**	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: OBU2 (FWLP), BU4 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Limes Lane, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	No response required	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	No response required	No changes required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council • The Parish Council objects to the potential allocation of OBU2. • Concerns include substantial and irreversible landscape change, erosion of the semi-rural character of Limes Lane, loss of openness, habitat loss, increased lighting and noise, ecological fragmentation, increased surface water run-off/flooding risk, and highway safety concerns arising from the narrow lane, limited passing places, lack of pedestrian provision,	• Objection and concerns noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertake which considers	• No change required.

national speed limit, and constrained junction visibility. • The Parish Council also raises wider parish concerns about the scale and distribution of growth, infrastructure capacity, inaccuracies in settlement facilities information, and the suitability of other Buxted/Five Ash Down sites.	accessibility and connectivity, landscape and townscape impact, flood risk, habitat and highway issues. • Following submission of further evidence, access has been shown to be achievable in one of two potential locations and would include off site highway improvement works to Limes Lane, with passing places, if utilised. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OBU2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation, subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • Parts of the evidence base consider cumulative impacts of development, including in the Sustainability Appraisal.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Esquire Developments</u> • Supports the identification of OBU2 for 25 dwellings. • Considers the site suitable, available and achievable, noting its relationship to the Buxted settlement boundary, access to local services, location within Flood Zone 1, absence of heritage assets within the site,	• Support noted. • Additional information on suitable access arrangements are welcomed, to enable further assessment of the site, as set out in the evidence base.	• No change required

and position outside the High Weald National Landscape. • States that pedestrian/cycle access to the High Street can be achieved within the same ownership, that vehicular access from Limes Lane can be made safe with appropriate mitigation, and that layout, biodiversity and character matters can be addressed through careful design, landscaping, biodiversity net gain and planning application details. • Argues that these additional housing allocations are required to address the overall housing shortfall and reduce reliance on windfall development.		
<u>Catesby Strategic Land Limited</u> • Supports the principle of growth at Buxted / Coopers Green. • Claims the site is sustainable and deliverable • Uses the existence of OBU1 and OBU2 as evidence that the Council already accepts Five Ash Down as a suitable location for housing growth – promoting an additional site at Coopers Green for up to 75 dwellings.	• Support noted. • A number of alternative and nearby sites have been assessed as set out in the evidence base, and concluded as suitable or unsuitable for the site specific reasons noted.	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	No response required	No changes required

SITE Ref: FR4 (FWLP), BYG1 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land between Court Lodge and Bells Yew Green Industrial Estate

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: FR4 (FWLP), BYG1 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land between Court Lodge and Bells Yew Green Industrial Estate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Site is within the High Weald National Landscape. • The allocation is located directly adjacent to irreplaceable ancient woodland.	• Landscape impact of the site is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Object to the proposed 20 dwellings, considering this would represent overdevelopment given the site's constrained location between the village and railway line. • Concern regarding poor pedestrian connectivity and the ability of future residents to integrate with the village. • Raise concerns regarding surface water drainage and runoff, particularly potential worsening of existing drainage and highway safety issues around the railway bridge. • Concern about potential adverse impacts on the adjacent ancient woodland and the character of the surrounding landscape. • Consider that the site's location within the High Weald National Landscape requires particular protection of its landscape and ecological characteristics.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding pedestrian connectivity, surface water drainage, adjacent ancient woodland and the site's location within the High Weald National Landscape. The site has been assessed through the Council's landscape evidence base, which has informed the proposed allocation and its indicative capacity. These constraints are also addressed through the site-specific requirements and other relevant policies of the Plan. The Council considers that the indicative capacity of 20 dwellings remains appropriate, subject to detailed design and appropriate drainage, landscape and ecological considerations at planning application stage.	• Site specific policy to set out constraints and direct development to suitable parts of the site.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges the need to protect adjacent ancient woodland, existing trees and hedgerows,	• Site specific policy as requested, to set out constraints and direct development to suitable parts of the site.

• No objection in principle to the allocation of FR4, but requests stronger site-specific policy requirements. • Development should avoid impacts on adjacent ancient woodland, retain the existing tree and protect boundary hedgerows. • The design, scale and built form should reflect the existing settlement character and streetscape. • The proposed 20 dwelling yield should be reviewed, as the identified landscape and ecological constraints may justify a lower capacity.	and to ensure that development responds appropriately to the character and settlement pattern of the area. These matters are addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Having regard to the site's characteristics and identified constraints, the Council considers that the indicative capacity of 20 dwellings remains appropriate and no reduction in yield is proposed.	
The Woodland Trust • The site adjoins Rushlye Wood Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland along parts of its eastern and southern boundaries. • An appropriate buffer zone is requested between the ancient woodland and any	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a	• Site specific policy as requested, to set out constraints and direct development to suitable parts of the site.

future development to protect it from potential impacts.	whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Local Residents	• **WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 10	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object: 7**

SITE Ref: FR4 (FWLP), BYG1 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land between Court Lodge and Bells Yew Green Industrial Estate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Boyer Planning on behalf of Elivia Homes • Strongly supports the allocation. • Seeks clarification that Ancient Woodland buffers follow Natural England guidance and site-specific evidence.	• Support welcomed. • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and	• No action required

	proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Knight Frank • Supports growth south of Tunbridge Wells, including FR4, as a sustainable location linked to services, public transport and active travel, and argues further land should be considered to address the housing shortfall.	• Support welcomed	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Green Weald Alliance • Objects to FR4 as part of the wider Frant allocations, citing soundness concerns, National Landscape impacts, incomplete evidence, lack of cumulative assessment, unresolved infrastructure issues and insufficient consideration of alternatives.	• Objections noted - The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the SA and landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• Site specific allocation policy to set out landscape and other constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• Residents object to FR4 as part of the wider Frant allocations, citing excessive growth, National Landscape harm, traffic, infrastructure and water supply pressures, loss of rural character, biodiversity impacts and cumulative effects from nearby allocations.	• Objections noted - The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the SA and landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as Policy NE2 (Biodiversity Net Gain) for which ecological survey will contribute to demonstrate compliance with the policy.	• Site specific allocation policy to set out landscape and other constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

SITE Ref: HEA1 (FWLP), CIH1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the east of Burnetts Farm, Firgrove Road, Cross-in Hand

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 17	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 14

SITE Ref: HEA1 (FWLP), CIH1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the east of Burnetts Farm, Firgrove Road, Cross-in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be considered when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. • We will therefore need appropriate planning policy wording to be associated with these site allocations in future versions of the Local Plan, for example - Layout of the	• Existing utility infrastructure and associated easements are important considerations in the design and layout of development proposals. The detailed configuration of development, including the safeguarding of sewerage infrastructure and maintenance access requirements, will be addressed through the planning application process in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers. The Council considers that existing planning, infrastructure and design policies provide an	• Comments noted. No changes required.

development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	appropriate framework for ensuring that development takes account of utility infrastructure constraints and requirements.	
Natural England • Site lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design.	• The allocation will be subject to the relevant landscape, design and environmental policies of the Local Plan, which require development to be sensitively designed and to respond appropriately to its landscape setting. The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides appropriate safeguards to ensure that potential impacts on the High Weald National Landscape are avoided or appropriately mitigated.	• Comments noted. No changes required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Although HEA1 has road frontage, the site allocation numbers imply that backland development is also envisaged, which would also conflict with HWNL policies and objectives. • Landscape concerns with prominent long views over the local landscape, with potential impacts on the landscape through lighting, residential activity, predation, etc.,	• Comment noted • These issues have been considered in the site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address issues of landscape character (NE6 and NE7) and design (DE1) and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development	• Comments noted. No changes required.

including substantial landscaping buffering for HEA1.	will need to comply with all relevant policies.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

High Weald National Landscape
 	
• Do not object to this allocation in principle, however a site-specific policy should address matters of:
  ○ The appropriate extent of site coverage with built development, to ensure the retention of the site boundary woodland and hedgerows to the north (road adjacent) and within the site.
  ○ The nature of built development to support settlement pattern and character.
	• Comments noted.
	• These issues have been considered in the site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage.
	• Other policies within the Local Plan address issues of woodland and hedgerows (NE3), landscape (NE6 and NE7) and design (DE1) and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies.
		• Comments noted. No changes required.

Local Residents		
• Majority of respondents object to the allocation of HEA1. • Site is in an unsustainable location in the 2018 settlement hierarchy and circumstances have not materially changed. • Existing infrastructure is insufficient to support development, including schools, GP surgeries, dentists, sewage and wastewater networks, drainage systems and utilities • Significant concerns regarding increased traffic generation, highway safety and	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the sustainability of the location, infrastructure capacity, highways impacts, accessibility and the potential effects on the High Weald National Landscape. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process, Sustainability Appraisal and supporting evidence base,	• Comments noted. No changes required.

congestion, particularly on Fir Grove Road and at the B2102/A267 junction • Uncertainty over how a suitable access would be achieved • Poor pedestrian and cycling connections to Heathfield • Concerns that landscaping, screening and buffering would not adequately mitigate harm to the High Weald National Landscape • Lack of assessment of green and blue infrastructure and concern over broader environmental impacts. • Some representations did not object in principle to development but suggested it should be restricted to frontage development and accompanied by improvements to pedestrian and cycling links and supporting infrastructure.	including assessments of landscape, infrastructure and environmental constraints. • The Council notes concerns regarding access arrangements, pedestrian and cycle connectivity, green and blue infrastructure, and the capacity of local services and utilities. Any future planning application will be required to demonstrate that impacts can be appropriately mitigated and that necessary infrastructure can be provided.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 25	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 21

SITE Ref: HEA1 (FWLP), CIH1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the east of Burnetts Farm, Firgrove Road, Cross-in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • The Council recognised that, within the context of Cross in Hand, site HEA1 could be regarded as a more logical infill or rounding-off opportunity on the southern side of the settlement than site HEA12. • However, the Council considered that any development on site HEA1 should be confined to a linear frontage form, in order to minimise adverse effects on the High Weald National Landscape and prevent an intrusive extension of built development into the wider rural hinterland	• Comments noted. • The site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process. • The scale of development proposed and the potential cumulative effects arising from other allocations in the area have been considered through the site assessment process, SA and landscape evidence base.	• Comment noted. No changes required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Broad objection to the allocation of HEA1, either alone or cumulatively with HEA6, HEA9 and HEA12, on the basis that it would harm the High Weald National Landscape/AONB, rural setting and landscape character of Cross in Hand. • Residents raise concerns that development would urbanise or suburbanise a rural ridge-top/linear settlement, erode separation from	• Objections and comments noted. • The site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process.	• No change required

Heathfield, and damage long-distance views, tranquillity, dark skies and the distinctive village character. • Highway concerns are a recurring issue, particularly the narrowness of Firgrove Road and Cross in Hand High Street, parked cars reducing roads to single-track conditions, the blind/dangerous junctions, and existing congestion and accident risk at the A267/B2102 junction. • Several responses state that HEA1 would worsen traffic, car dependency, air pollution and road safety, with limited safe walking/cycling routes, narrow pavements and weak public transport provision. • Infrastructure objections focus on existing pressure on schools, GP/dental services, utilities, water supply, electricity, drainage and sewerage, including references to flooding, sewage overflows, power cuts and inadequate capacity to support additional dwellings. • Environmental and biodiversity concerns include loss of greenfield land, woodland, hedgerows, mature trees and wildlife habitat, with references to deer, owls, birds of prey, bats, badgers and wider ecological connectivity. • Some residents question whether effective landscape and ecological mitigation can be secured, citing past loss of woodland/hedgerows on nearby development and concern that safeguards may not be enforceable.	• Site has been proposed for allocation on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites. • The scale of development proposed and the potential cumulative effects arising from other allocations in the area have been considered through the site assessment process, SA and landscape evidence base.	

• One resident takes a more qualified position, noting that the reduced allocation of 10 dwellings fronting Firgrove Road may be less harmful than the 40 dwellings promoted through SHELAA, provided development is limited, sensitively designed, retains trees and avoids a self-contained estate form.		

SITE Ref: HEA6 (FWLP), CIH2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Breton House, Cross in Hand

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 23	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 20

SITE Ref: HEA6 (FWLP), CIH2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Breton House, Cross in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. • SW request appropriate planning policy wording to be associated with these site allocations in future versions of the Local Plan, for example - Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage	• Comment noted. Existing utility infrastructure and associated easements are important considerations in the design and layout of development proposals. Detailed matters relating to the safeguarding of sewerage infrastructure, maintenance access, easement requirements and any necessary diversion works will be addressed through the planning application process in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers. The Council considers that existing site requirements, together with the wider infrastructure and design policies of the Local Plan, provide an appropriate framework	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint

infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes	to ensure that development takes account of utility infrastructure constraints and operational requirements.	
Natural England • Notes that the site lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design.	• Comment noted. • The Council acknowledges that the site lies within the High Weald National Landscape and agrees that any development must be carefully designed to conserve and enhance its natural beauty. Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process and supporting evidence, and any future development proposal will be required to demonstrate a high standard of design and compliance with policies NE6 and NE7 of the Local Plan.	• No change required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • The Parish Council does not specifically oppose HEA6, but raises significant concerns about its suitability, landscape impact, access arrangements, and compliance with High Weald National Landscape policies. • Landscape concerns with prominent long views over the local landscape, with	• Concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The	• No action required.

potential impacts on the landscape through lighting, residential activity, predation • The location of HEA6, with no road frontage, will bring development of the site into conflict with the HWNL policies and objectives, the locality having a historic routeway built form. • Access to HEA6 could not comply with the Manual for Streets without at least a significant reduction in street parking	process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Issues of access and parking will be dealt with at planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. Issues will be dealt with at planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan (NE6 and NE7).	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA6 due to significant harm to the HWNL. • Argue that HEA6 should not be allocated for development because it forms a distinctive and highly tangible part of the pasture slopes on the southern side of the village; an important part of the landscape setting of the settlement in the AONB	• Objections noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in	• No change required.

• Consider development of the site would erode the distinctive landscape setting of the settlement, by the encroachment of built development into presently undeveloped fieldscape and would significantly erode the aesthetic and perceptual qualities of the site. • The development of the site would be contrary to a number of the objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan • They do not consider that the harms identified to the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB of development of the site could be mitigated, relating as those harms do to the principle of development of this site.	accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. Issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan (NE6 and NE7).	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to the allocation • Development would conflict with the High Weald National Landscape designation, the High Weald National Landscape Management Plan, and draft Policy NE7. • Development would fail to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the area. • Development would harm the landscape, including important views and the rural setting • Concerns regarding impacts on the character, heritage, history and cultural identity of Cross in Hand.	• Objections and concerns noted. • The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which will be addressed via other policies within the Plan. • The cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield / Cross in Hand site allocations is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA	• No change required.

• Loss of historic farmland • Significant landscape mitigation and visual buffering would be required. • Argue that the site was previously identified as an unsustainable location in the 2018 Settlement Hierarchy and consider circumstances have not changed. • Development will increase car dependency, increase traffic generation and associated congestion. • Limited and infrequent public transport services, poor pedestrian and cycle connectivity between the site, Cross in Hand and Heathfield, existing footways are inadequate • Concerns that existing infrastructure lacks capacity to accommodate growth, including wastewater, sewage, drainage, water supply, gas and utility networks • Concerns that development would place further strain on • healthcare services, schools, dentists, shops and other local facilities • Potential adverse impacts on wildlife, biodiversity and ecology. • Concerns regarding light, noise, air and water pollution. • Concerns that conclusions regarding the site's suitability rely on mitigation being addressed at the planning application stage.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 36	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 35

SITE Ref: HEA6 (FWLP), CIH2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Breton House, Cross in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council
 	
• The Parish Council does not specifically oppose HEA6, but raises significant concerns about its suitability, landscape impact, access arrangements, and compliance with High Weald National Landscape policies.
• Their concerns focus on:
  ○ Impact on the High Weald National Landscape.
  ○ Conflict with landscape character and policy objectives.
  ○ Lack of road frontage.
  ○ Difficult access arrangements.
  ○ Parking impacts.
  ○ Protection of trees and hedgerows.
• Any future development would require significant mitigation, careful design, and
	• Concerns noted.
	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options
	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.
	• Issues of access and parking will be dealt with at the planning
		• No action required.

robust highway and landscape solutions before it could be considered acceptable	application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. Issues will be dealt with at the planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA6, in conjunction with HEA12, due to significant harm to the HWNL. • Argue that HEA6 and HEA12 should not be allocated for development because of their prominent landscape role, sensitivity to development, adverse effects on views and rural character, conflict with the purposes of the High Weald National Landscape, and the inability of mitigation measures to address these fundamental harms.	• Objections noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. Such	• No change required.

	issues will be dealt with at planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan (NE6 and NE7).	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Object to HEA6 and adjoining or related Cross in Hand sites including HEA1, HEA9 and HEA12. • Consider HEA6 unsuitable due to its location within the High Weald National Landscape, harm to rural character, loss of open fieldscape, impacts on long views, dark skies and the historic ridgetop/linear settlement pattern of Cross in Hand. • Raise biodiversity concerns including habitat loss, fragmentation and impacts on wildlife corridors, with species and habitats referenced including barn owls, bats, slow worms, great crested newts, deer, foxes, badgers, hedgehogs, birds of prey, ponds, hedgerows and naturally rewilding land. • Raise highway and pedestrian safety concerns, including congestion at the A267/B2102 junction, narrow pavements, parked vehicles, poor visibility, unsafe access to the High Street/Firgrove Road/Back Lane, accident risk, emergency vehicle access and construction traffic impacts.	• Objections and concerns noted. • The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which will be addressed via other policies within the Plan. Matters relating to landscape impact, habitat protection, highways, drainage, utilities, residential amenity and the detailed form of development will be assessed through the planning application process and against the relevant policies of the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the Heathfield / Cross in Hand sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to	• No change required.

• Raise concerns that local infrastructure and services are inadequate, including limited public transport, reliance on private cars, limited local shops and employment, pressure on GP surgeries, schools, dentists, utilities, electricity supply and community services. • Raise water, drainage and sewage concerns, including existing sewage overflows, surface water run-off, flooding, pressure on Victorian sewer infrastructure and uncertainty over water supply capacity. • Consider the proposed development boundary extension to be inappropriate, arbitrary or harmful, and suggest that it will undermine the High Weald Management Plan and set a precedent for further development in the National Landscape. • Suggest that brownfield land, empty homes, urban locations, better-connected settlements or less sensitive sites should be prioritised instead.	identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	

SITE Ref: HEA12 (FWLP), CIH3 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – 5 Farthing Cottage, Back Lane, Cross in Hand

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

No comments received at this stage of consultation.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 25	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 25

SITE Ref: HEA12 (FWLP), CIH3 (HEAW) (Reg 19) - 5 Farthing Cottage, Back Lane, Cross in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • Object to HEA12 • Seek clarification on whether it would expand the development boundary. • Raise concerns about the proposed new allocations at HEA10, HEA11 and HEA12, including their relationship to housing provision and development boundary changes.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in	• No changes needed

	accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA12, considered alongside HEA6 due to its immediate adjoining location. • Raise concerns that development will harm the natural beauty, landscape character and ridge-top setting of Cross in Hand within the High Weald National Landscape. • Consider that development will erode the distinctive pasture slopes south of the village and affect long-distance views across the National Landscape. • State that the identified landscape harm cannot be mitigated as it relates to the principle of development in this location. • Object to extending the Cross in Hand development boundary southwards where this would encourage development harmful to the National Landscape.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The allocation and proposed development boundary have been assessed through the Local Plan site selection process, informed by landscape, visual, environmental and sustainability evidence. The Council acknowledges the sensitivity of the site and its location within the	• No changes needed.

	High Weald National Landscape. However, it considers that the proposed allocation is capable of being developed in a manner that responds appropriately to landscape character, views and the special qualities of the National Landscape through sensitive design, layout, landscaping and mitigation measures.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to HEA12, alongside HEA1, HEA6 and HEA9, and consider the site unsuitable for allocation. • Raise concerns about harm to the High Weald National Landscape, rural character, treasured views, dark skies, biodiversity and ecological connectivity. • Raise highway safety concerns, including access onto Back Lane close to the High Street/A267 junction, narrow lanes, poor visibility, congestion, accidents, pedestrian safety and emergency vehicle access. • Raise infrastructure concerns, including limited services, poor public transport, car dependency, school and healthcare capacity, water supply, sewage overflows, drainage, surface water run-off and power supply resilience.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within	• No changes needed

• Consider the site would extend development beyond the existing linear/rural settlement form of Cross in Hand and would not be well related to services or employment opportunities. • Suggest that brownfield land, empty homes, urban intensification or better-connected locations should be prioritised instead.	the Local Plan and accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	

SITE Ref: HEA9 (FWLP), CIH4 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at Sunnyside, A267, Cross in Hand

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: HEA9 (FWLP), CIH4 (HEAW) – Land at Sunnyside, A267, Cross in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting.	• Comment noted. Existing utility infrastructure and associated easements are important considerations in the design and layout of development proposals. Detailed matters relating to the safeguarding of sewerage infrastructure, maintenance access, easement requirements and any necessary diversion works will be addressed through the planning application process in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers. The Council considers that existing site requirements, together with the wider infrastructure and design policies of the Local Plan, provide an appropriate framework	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint

	to ensure that development takes account of utility infrastructure constraints and operational requirements.	
Natural England • Site lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design. • Site is directly adjacent to nationally important priority habitat woodland. • Ancient woodland is afforded robust protection in the NPPF from direct loss and degradation through indirect effect	• Comments noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Any development proposal will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts on the High Weald National Landscape, ancient woodland and priority habitats are avoided or appropriately mitigated through sensitive design, layout and buffering measures where necessary.	• No change required

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • The Parish Council does not specifically oppose HEA9, but raises significant concerns about its suitability, landscape impact, access arrangements, and compliance with High Weald National Landscape policies. • Argue that although HEA 9 has road frontage, the site allocation number implies that backland development is also envisaged, which would conflict with HWNL policies and objectives. • HEA9 potentially represents somewhat of an infill, but satisfactory access and highway screening will be paramount	• Concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The impacts can be dealt with at the planning application stage in line with relevant policies in the Local Plan.	• No action required.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to	• No change required

• Object to HEA9 on the basis that development would conflict with the existing settlement pattern of Cross in Hand. • Consider the A267 to provide a strong boundary to the north-east of Cross in Hand and do not consider the site to form part of the built settlement morphology, contrary to the LUC assessment in the evidence base. • Identify the site's open character, including its role on the approach from the east, as an important part of the landscape setting of the village. • Note that the site forms part of a medieval field system with a historic field boundary to the eastern edge. • Consider that the harm to landscape character and natural beauty cannot be mitigated because it relates to the principle of development. • Refer to previous refusals and dismissed appeals for development on this site, where harm to the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape was identified. • Object to extending the Cross in Hand development boundary north of the A267, as this would encourage development in a location considered harmful to the National Landscape.	identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA process. Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process and supporting evidence, and any future development proposal will be required to demonstrate a high standard of design and compliance with policies NE6 and NE7 of the Local Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to HEA9. • HWNL Management Plan policies will be breached if site is developed as allocated	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to	• No change required.

• Site should only be developed along the road frontage. • Concern that Cross in Hand is too small for further development. • Limited infrastructure • The increased traffic from the site will make the congestion at the junction of B2102 with the A267 worse • Further strain on services such as schools, doctor and dentist surgeries • Will require improvements to for pedestrian and cycling connectivity between Cross in Hand and Heathfield • Conclusion has been drawn based on designing out problems at planning stage. • Concern over drainage capacity.	identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). • Other policies within the Plan deal with issues of landscape character (NE6) and impacts on the High Weald National Landscape (NE7). Any development will need to comply with all relevant policies, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 16	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 16

SITE Ref: HEA9 (FWLP), CIH4 (HEAW) – Land at Sunnyside, A267, Cross in Hand		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • The Parish Council does not specifically oppose HEA9, but raises significant concerns about its suitability, landscape impact, access arrangements, and compliance with High Weald National Landscape policies. • Argue that although HEA 9 has road frontage, the site allocation number implies that backland development is also envisaged, which would conflict with HWNL policies and objectives. • HEA9 potentially represents somewhat of an infill, but satisfactory access and highway screening will be paramount • Comments focused primarily on HEA10, HEA11, HEA12 and HEA2; no detailed site-specific comments on HEA9 were identified.	• Concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence, Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Landscape impacts have been assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The impacts can be dealt with at the planning application stage in line	• No action required.

	with relevant policies in the Local Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA9 on the basis that development would conflict with the existing settlement pattern of Cross in Hand. • Consider the A267 to provide a strong boundary to the north-east of Cross in Hand and do not consider the site to form part of the built settlement morphology, contrary to the LUC assessment in the evidence base. • Identify the site's open character, including its role on the approach from the east, as an important part of the landscape setting of the village. • Note that the site forms part of a medieval field system with a historic field boundary to the eastern edge. • Consider that the harm to landscape character and natural beauty cannot be mitigated because it relates to the principle of development. • Refer to previous refusals and dismissed appeals for development on this site, where harm to the character and appearance of the High Weald National Landscape was identified. • Object to extending the Cross in Hand development boundary north of the A267,	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA process. Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process and supporting evidence, and any future development proposal will be required to demonstrate a high standard of design and	• No change required

as this would encourage development in a location considered harmful to the National Landscape.	compliance with policies NE6 and NE7 of the Local Plan.	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Object to HEA9 and, where referenced, related Cross in Hand sites including HEA1, HEA6 and HEA12. • Raise concerns that further development will harm the protected countryside, the High Weald National Landscape, rural character, long views, dark skies and the historic linear/ridgetop settlement pattern of Cross in Hand. • Raise biodiversity and environmental concerns, including loss of wildlife habitat, habitat disturbance and increased light, noise and air pollution. • Raise highway safety and traffic concerns, particularly relating to the A267, the A267/B2102 junction, nearby petrol station access, accident risk, congestion, road condition, parked vehicles and emergency vehicle access. • Consider access from HEA9 onto the A267 to be unsafe, particularly due to traffic flow, turning movements and the nearby junctions. • Raise concerns about inadequate infrastructure and services, including limited local facilities, public transport, school	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). • Other policies within the Plan deal with issues of landscape character (NE6) and impacts on the High Weald National	• No change required.

places, GP and dental provision, utilities, electricity supply and reliance on private vehicles. • Raise water, drainage and sewage concerns, including limited water supply capacity, existing sewage problems, surface water run-off and pressure on older drainage infrastructure. • Suggest that brownfield sites, previously developed land, existing settlement boundaries or less sensitive locations should be prioritised instead.	Landscape (NE7). Any development will need to comply with all relevant policies, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	

SITE Ref: CR2 (FWLP), CR1 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to the London Road and Pilmer Road Junction, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: CR2 (FWLP), CR1 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to the London Road and Pilmer Road Junction, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • This site lies directly adjacent to the High Weald National Landscape and indirect implications to this national landscape must be avoided. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA	• Comments noted. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on the HWNL (Policy NE7). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Crowborough Town Council	• Concern noted. • Development will inevitably generate an increase in highways	

• The council is concerned that CR2 would have significant effects on the A26 intersection.	movements; however, this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Outside of, but potentially affecting setting of, the HWNL.	• Comments noted.	• No change required

• Taking into account the context of the site, we do not consider this allocation would affect the setting of the HW AONB		
Local Residents		
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

No comments were received for this site.

SITE Ref: CR5 (FWLP), CR2 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Millbrook Road, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: CR5 (FWLP), CR2 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Millbrook Road, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be considered when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. • We will therefore need appropriate planning policy wording to be associated with these site allocations in future versions of the Local Plan, for example - Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes	• Comment noted • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint • For any development that comes forward, ensure an adequate layout that provides necessary easement to Southern Water's infrastructure which crosses the site

Natural England • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA	• Comment noted • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	• No change required •
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Crowborough Town Council • The council would like to express concern that CR5, which is listed as Millbrook, currently has no discernible access without the need to cross a stream and bulldoze existing properties.	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: CR5 (FWLP), CR2 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Millbrook Road, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Batcheller Monkhouse • Support the continued allocation of CR5 and the identification of SHELAA site 507/1110 as suitable, available and achievable for residential development. • Confirmed continued commitment to promoting the allocation and working proactively with other landowners to provide further supporting information. • Explained that the previously assumed access through the adjacent Burnside site is no longer available because the permitted dwellings are now largely complete, but alternative access options are being reviewed.	• Support noted.	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

SITE Ref: CR8 (FWLP), CR3 (CR) (Reg 19) – Police Station, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: CR8 (FWLP), CR3 (CR) (Reg 19) – Police Station, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No statutory consultee comments were identified for CR8 in the Focused Local Plan Consultation responses spreadsheet.	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No neighbouring or other local authority comments were identified for CR8 in the Focused Local Plan Consultation responses spreadsheet.	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Town or Parish Council comments were identified for CR8 in the Focused Local Plan Consultation responses spreadsheet.	No response required.	No change proposed.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No site promoter comments were identified for CR8 in the Focused Local Plan Consultation responses spreadsheet.	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No other consultee body comments were identified for CR8 in the Focused Local Plan Consultation responses spreadsheet.	No response required.	No change proposed.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
A resident commented that the former police station is a well-loved and historic building and should be maintained. The respondent also referred to a recent application which they said was refused but supported subject to a request that the chalet be reduced in size. No resident names have been included.	Comments noted. The importance of the building's local character and historic interest is acknowledged. Any redevelopment or reuse of the site should be considered alongside heritage, design and townscape evidence, including the need to conserve or enhance features of local value where appropriate.	The CR8 allocation wording has been reviewed to ensure heritage, design and townscape considerations are appropriately reflected, including the retention, sensitive conversion or sympathetic redevelopment of the former police station building. Reduced yield to 5 dwellings for the proposed site allocation.

SITE Ref: CR1 (FWLP), CR4 (CR) (Reg 19) – Kingswood, Luxford Lane

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: CR1 (FWLP), CR4 (CR) (Reg 19) – Kingswood, Luxford Lane		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • The area is surrounded by priority habitats which are of national importance. Impacts must be avoided and fully mitigated. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA	• Comments noted. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Local Residents		
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: CR1 (FWLP), CR4 (CR) (Reg 19) – Kingswood, Luxford Lane		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• One resident objected to CR1, raising concerns that Luxford Lane is narrow with poor connectivity. • The response also stated that the Grade II listed building should be respected within its context and noted concern that new build development is gradually surrounding it.	• Objection noted. • The site allocation process has been informed by evidence base including heritage impact assessment and transport modelling. • Policy HE2 addresses impact on development on heritage assets. The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required

SITE Ref: WIT2 (FWLP), CR5 (WIT) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Cooks Corner Farm and to the north of London Road, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 8

SITE Ref: WIT2 (FWLP), CR5 (WIT) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Cooks Corner Farm and to the north of London Road, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Objected to WIT2, noting it lies within the Ashdown Forest SPA Zone of Influence and within the High Weald National Landscape. • Raised concerns about cumulative impacts from nearby sites, including air, light and noise pollution, increased access pressure, increased traffic on roads crossing Ashdown Forest, and reduced ecological connectivity. • Considered the Focused Local Plan unsound due to the absence of an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment and associated mitigation/SANG provision.	• Comments noted. The site's relationship with Ashdown Forest, the Zone of Influence, ecological connectivity, cumulative effects, traffic, recreational pressure, HRA requirements and appropriate mitigation has been considered through the evidence base, site assessment and any subsequent planning application process.	Supporting evidence reviewed to ensure Ashdown Forest, HRA, ecological connectivity, cumulative impacts and mitigation requirements are clearly addressed. No change proposed.

• Stated that greater attention should be given to connectivity, wildlife corridors and stepping stones between protected biodiversity sites.		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Objected to WIT2 and considered that the site should not be allocated for development. • Highlighted that WIT2 was recently refused planning permission and dismissed at appeal for a residential scheme, with the Inspector identifying harm to the character and appearance of the area and to the landscape character of the AONB. • Raised concern that development would extend beyond the perceived settlement edge, result in the loss of open land that contributes positively to wider landscape character, and appear prominent and visually intrusive. • Considered that the reduced proposed yield does not overcome concerns about the principle of development in this location. • Also raised broader concerns through comments on the Sustainability Appraisal, stating that objections relating to High	Comments noted. The recent planning history, appeal decision, National Landscape designation, landscape character, settlement edge, visual prominence, biodiversity, dark skies and statutory duty matters have been considered through the site assessment and plan-making process.	Updated the WIT2 site assessment to ensure the appeal decision, National Landscape impacts, settlement edge, visual prominence and statutory duty considerations are clearly addressed. No change proposed.

Weald sites had not been adequately addressed and that the Council must demonstrate due regard to conserving and enhancing the National Landscape.		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objected to WIT2 alongside other allocations within the High Weald National Landscape. • Raised concerns that the Council should follow advice from the High Weald National Landscape/Management Board and treat the Management Plan as a material consideration. • Requested more detailed assessment of landscape, historic and biodiversity impacts for sites within the National Landscape. • Raised concerns about dark skies, rural character, remoteness, wildlife, historic settlement character, infrastructure, road junctions, and increased light, noise and air pollution. • Considered that the Sustainability Appraisal had not demonstrated how concerns raised by relevant public bodies had been addressed.	Comments noted. Matters relating to the High Weald National Landscape, landscape and visual impact, heritage, biodiversity, dark skies, rural character, infrastructure, highways and pollution have been considered through the site assessment process and any subsequent planning application.	Updated the WIT2 site assessment evidence to ensure National Landscape, landscape, biodiversity, dark skies, heritage, infrastructure and highways matters are clearly reflected. No change proposed at this stage.

SITE Ref: OCR2 (FLWP), CR6 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Beechenwood Farm, Pleasant View Road, Crowborough

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

This site was not proposed at this stage as an Option or an Allocation.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: OCR2 (FLWP), CR6 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Beechenwood Farm, Pleasant View Road, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	• No response required	• No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	• No response required	• No changes required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	• No response required	• No changes required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Carter Jonas on behalf of Greymoor Homes • Strongly supports the consideration of OCR2 for allocation as Crowborough is a Tier 1 settlement under Policy SS1 and has the highest level of services, facilities, employment opportunities and transport connections.	• Support noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing	• Include a site-specific policy for the development of the site which incorporates the findings and mitigation measures from the landscape evidence base assessment of the site, amongst

• Argue OCR2 should be assessed positively. Excluding OCR2 would go against the strategy to concentrate development in the districts most sustainable locations. • Argue the site could deliver around 120 dwellings, contribute to unmet housing need, provide affordable housing, be delivered within the first five years, and benefit from existing services, public transport, open space, biodiversity enhancements and landscape mitigation. • Considers the High Weald National Landscape designation is not an absolute constraint and that paragraph 190 of the NPPF can be satisfied.	need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The landscape evidence base identifies the site as having a moderate sensitivity to development and that development would have a moderate impact on the core character components of natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape. • The evidence base highlights that the western half of the site is considered to have a slightly greater impact on the core character components than the eastern half due to the historic field pattern being more intact than the eastern half, and proximity to Cooks Corner Farm historic farmstead; although not to the extent that there would be a change to the moderate impact. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OCR2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation, subject to	other policy considerations. This is Policy CR6 (CR).

	the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to OCR2 on the basis that it would constitute major development within the High Weald National Landscape. • The site would be difficult to justify against the test in paragraph 190 of the NPPF. • Development will result in expansion beyond the existing settlement boundary, resulting in countryside encroachment. • Development will cause harm to High Weald landscape character and scenic beauty • There will be a loss or degradation of medieval field patterns and historic boundaries. The majority of the site is recorded as part of a medieval field system (AD 1066-1499). • Potential impacts on nearby Ancient Woodland to the north • Consider the site is unsuitable for allocation and inconsistent with the policy requirements applying to development within a National Landscape	• Objections and concerns noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which can be addressed via a site-specific policy and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	• Include a site-specific policy for the allocation of the site which incorporates the findings and mitigation measures from the landscape evidence base assessment of the site, amongst other policy considerations. This is Policy CR6 (CR).
The Woodland Trust	• Comments noted • The site does not include ancient woodland, but it is noted that	• Include a site-specific policy which reflects the need to appropriately and adequately

• The Woodland Trust does not comment specifically on OCR2 by name, but its representation is highly relevant because OCR2 sits adjacent to Ancient Woodland. • The key issue is whether development can be designed to avoid deterioration of an irreplaceable habitat (Ancient Woodland bordering the north of the western field of OCR2), provide appropriate buffers, and maintain woodland integrity and ecological connectivity. • These considerations are important factors in assessing the suitability and capacity of OCR2 for allocation.	ancient woodland adjoins the northern boundary of the western field. • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas of Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	protect the ancient woodland adjoining the site. This is Policy CR6 (CR) and is incorporated in criterion 3.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Concerns that OCR2/Beechenwood Farm would increase traffic on London Road/Pilmer Road and worsen congestion, highway safety and pavement safety, particularly for school pupils and pedestrians. • Concerns that local roads are narrow, heavily used and already in poor condition, with potholes and existing traffic pressure. • Concerns that the site is outside the town boundary, detached from existing dwellings, and would extend development further into the High Weald National Landscape. • Concerns that development could be visible from the National Landscape and affect	• The Council acknowledges concerns raised regarding the potential traffic and highway impacts associated with development at OCR2/Beechenwood Farm, including effects on London Road, Pilmer Road and the local highway network, highway and pedestrian safety, and the condition and capacity of surrounding roads. Concerns regarding the site's relationship to the existing built-up area, its location within the High Weald National Landscape,	• Include a site-specific policy which reflects the need to appropriately and adequately protect the ancient woodland adjoining the site. This is Policy CR6 (CR).

routes used by walkers to access the countryside. • Concerns about pressure on local infrastructure and services, including GP surgeries, Crowborough MIU, Uckfield Hospital and water supply. • General objection to additional growth at Crowborough and concern that previous consultation comments have not received feedback.	potential effects on landscape character and views, impacts on recreational routes and countryside access, and the ability of local infrastructure and services, including healthcare and water supply, to accommodate growth are also noted. Concerns regarding the scale of growth proposed at Crowborough and the consultation process have likewise been considered. • Following further assessment of the site, its constraints, the evidence base and reasonable development options, the Council considers that OCR2/Beechenwood Farm represents a suitable and sustainable location for development and has therefore been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	

SITE Ref: CR7 (FWLP), CR7 (CR) (Reg 19) – Spring Cottage, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Site was not proposed for allocation at this stage.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: CR7 (FWLP), CR7 (CR) (Reg 19) – Spring Cottage, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
	No response required.	No change required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
	No response required.	No change required.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
	No response required.	No change required.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
	No response required.	No change required.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
	No response required.	No change required

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• A resident objected to CR7 Spring Cottage, stating that the site would be completely car	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to	No change required

dependent and is beyond the town boundary.	identify all deliverable or developable options The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	

SITE Ref: CR4 (FWLP), CR9 (CR) (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at Byeways, Palesgate Lane, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 9	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 6

SITE Ref: Allocation: CR4 – Land at Byeways, Palesgate Lane, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • This allocation site is both within the AONB and outside of any existing developed area and should be considered in combination with CR3 which is proposed c. 90 houses. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA	• Comments noted • An update Habitats Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan • Policy NE7 address impacts of development on the High Weald National Landscape. The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required. The number of dwellings is considered appropriate for its High Weald National Landscape setting.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • CR3 allocates for 60 dwellings, and site reference CR 4 allocates for 30 dwellings.	• Comment noted • Site specific policy for CR4 will include such requirements.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure

Both sites adjoin a site recently granted planning permission (reserved matters reference WD/2022/0398/MRM).
• HWNL Unit does not object to these allocations in principle, however a site-specific policy should address matters of:
  ○ Ensuring the retention of the site boundary hedgerows (especially along Palesgate Lane)
  ○ Ensuring the retention of a suitable buffer area against the heathland that abuts the eastern boundary.
	• Policy NE7 address impacts of development on the High Weald National Landscape. The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
		• Proposals for CR4 will comply with all relevant policies in the plan (i.e. NE7).

Landstrom Group Ltd • Consider this site allocation together with CR3, HAR2, HEA2, HEA3, HEA4, HEA5, HEA8, WIT1, WIT2 represent large scale development in the High Weald National Landscape, in conflict with draft Local Plan Policy NE7 • Acknowledge that while some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB.	• Comments noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No change required
Local Residents		

Support: • Site will contribute to the housing requirement for the district and benefits from an existing access **Object:** • The developments in progress on Palesgate Lane have caused flooding in the area, concerned more development would make it worse. • Concerned the infrastructure in Crowborough can't accommodate further development • Adverse impacts on drainage system, Ghyll Nature Reserve and AONB. • Traffic concerns	• Support and objection noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: CR4 – Land south of Braeburn Fields, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Wates Developments	• Comments noted.	• No change required

• The response does not provide specific objections, amendments or detailed comments on CR4 itself. The comments are contextual in regard to the wider area for development. • Acknowledges and supports the allocation of CR4 for approx. 30 dwellings as part of the wider Steel Cross Farm (CR3)/Green Lane area. • Highlight that because CR4 is also being allocated adjacent to existing and proposed housing developments, it reinforces the case that this part of Crowborough is an appropriate and sustainable location for residential growth.	• The representation mainly seeks an uplift in capacity for the adjacent CR3 allocation, with related comments on CR4 as part of the wider Steel Cross Farm/Braeburn Fields context.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• No response	• No response required	• No change required

SITE Ref: CR3 (FWLP), CR10 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Steel Cross Farm, Green Lane, Crowborough

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 12	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: CR3 (FWLP), CR10 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Steel Cross Farm, Green Lane, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • The site may require some network reinforcement locally in order to deliver the maximum growth figure indicated.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
Natural England • Concern on site allocation as it is both within the AONB and outside of any existing developed area. • The area is surrounded by priority habitats and ancient woodland which is of further concern. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	• Concerns noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Site boundaries are distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy	Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

	NE4), the Ashdown Forest (NE5), High Weald National Landscape (NE7) and the wider landscape (NE6). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Criteria 2 of the policy requires a suitable buffer to the woodland, and Policy CR3 will be reviewed and illustrated to demonstrate this.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Batcheller Monkhouse (agent) • Support site allocation on behalf of their clients. • Confirm that the site is available, suitable, and deliverable in the short to medium term, with active progress being made on a promotion agreement with a reputable developer. • Request that the allocation be increased from 60 to 70 dwellings, noting that the site extends to approximately 4.5 hectares and	• Support welcomed. • Note the updated evidence submitted on density of development on adjoining site, which is noted.	• The quantum of development has been increased to 95 units for this proposed site allocation.

that this level of development would remain appropriate for an edge-of-settlement location. • The adjacent Steel Cross site has a resolution to grant permission for 120 dwellings on 7.8 hectares, equating to around 15 dwellings per hectare. Applying a comparable density to CR3 would accommodate approximately 67 dwellings, supporting the case for a 70-unit allocation. • Access to the site is achievable through the adjoining Steel Cross development. An existing access corridor agreement secures the necessary access rights • Consider that no significant environmental constraints have been identified that cannot be addressed through the design and planning process.		
Landstrom Group Ltd • Object to Policy CR3 on the basis that it is located within the High Weald National Landscape (AONB) and forms part of a wider group of allocations that would result in significant cumulative development within the protected landscape. • The allocation of CR3 has not been sufficiently justified if suitable and achievable non-AONB alternatives exist.	• Objection noted. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The SA assesses all reasonable alternative sites.	• No change required.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

High Weald National Landscape
 	
• We do not object to these allocations (CR3 and CR4) in principle, however a site-specific policy should address matters of:
  ○ Ensuring the retention of the site boundary hedgerows (especially along Palesgate Lane)
  ○ Ensuring the retention of a suitable buffer area against the heathland that abuts the eastern boundary.
	• Comment noted
	• Site specific policy will include such requirements.
		• Include policy criteria to retain, protect and enhance boundary vegetation and suitable buffers to the appropriate habitats.
		• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

<u>Local Residents</u>
 	
• <u>Support:</u>
  ○ The site is stated to be available for development and is actively being promoted for development.
  ○ The allocation would contribute towards meeting the district's housing requirement.
  ○ The site benefits from existing access arrangements.
  ○ No known immediate environmental constraints preventing development.
• <u>Object</u>
  ○ Significant concerns regarding flooding and drainage, including claims that recent developments on Palesgate Lane have increased flooding in the area.
  ○ Concerns that further development could exacerbate flooding problems,
	• Support noted and welcomed
	• Objections moted.
	• The site allocation process has been informed by evidence base including the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, the Landscape Sensitivity/Visual appraisal and Sustainability Appraisal.
	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy will identify key constraints for the site which will be addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.
	• Policy NE7 addresses the High Weald National Landscape, NE13 deals with water infrastructure and CC7 and CC8 deal with managing flood risks.
		• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

place additional pressure on the drainage network, and worsen existing issues that reportedly require regular gully clearance by the Highway Authority ○ Concerns about the capacity of local infrastructure, including roads and water infrastructure, to accommodate additional growth. ○ Potential effects on the Ghyll Nature Reserve. ○ Concerns regarding the site's location within or impact upon the High Weald National Landscape (AONB).	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: CR3 (FWLP), CR10 (CR) (Reg 19) – Land at Steel Cross Farm, Green Lane, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Southern Water • Notes that CR3 may have limited local sewerage network capacity and requests policy wording requiring occupation to be phased to align with delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Timescales for delivery of the site will be related to WWTW capacity at this site.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Wates Developments • Supports the allocation of Land at Steel Cross Farm under Policies SA1 and CR3 but considers the site capable of delivering approximately 95 dwellings rather than 60. • The promoter states that the uplift is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Technical Note and Illustrative Masterplan, with a landscape-led layout, open space, play provision, green infrastructure, circular recreational route and suitable buffers to priority habitat/woodland. • The site is described as a sustainable edge-of-Crowborough location, with access proposed through Braeburn Fields and pedestrian/cycle links, including potential connection to nearby public rights of way. • The promoter requests that Policy CR3 and the housing trajectory be amended to	Comments noted.	• The quantum of development has been increased to 95 units for this proposed site allocation.

increase the indicative capacity to 95 dwellings in the first five-year period, and that criterion (4) require access to the site boundary to enable public access to Limekiln Forest rather than beyond the boundary.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to Policy CR3, citing overdevelopment, failure to respect the local pattern of development within the High Weald National Landscape, further encroachment into open countryside and potential cumulative landscape impact.	• Objection noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects.	• No action required
The Woodland Trust • Objects because the site is adjacent to Limekiln Wood ancient semi-natural woodland and requests that Policy CR3 make explicit reference to buffering the ancient woodland from development.	• Objection noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy	• Policy wording amended to identify Limekiln Wood ASNW specifically. • Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

	NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Criteria 2 of the policy requires a suitable buffer to the woodland.	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Residents object to CR3/Steel Cross Farm on landscape grounds, stating that the area should be protected for its scenic quality and that views cannot be replaced. • Concerns are raised that development would harm the character and appearance of the countryside/National Landscape and contribute to wider development pressure around Crowborough.	• Objections noted. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on the wider countryside / landscape (NE6), and specifically the High Weald National Landscape (NE7). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• • Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. •

SITE Ref: EH5 (FWLP), EH1 (EH) (Reg 19) – Harrisons, south of London Road, East Hoathly

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: EH5 (FWLP), EH1 (EH) (Reg 19) – Harrisons, south of London Road, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised	• Amend policy to address issue raised, reflecting phasing of development.
Natural England • Raise concerns that this site is located between blocks of ancient woodland • Potential impacts of this allocation site should be assessed	• Concerns noted. • The site boundaries do not include the ancient woodland and other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

cumulatively with those arising from EH3 as both developments would influence the same woodland resource	read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Policy includes a requirement for a suitable buffer to the ancient woodlands (criteria 4). • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the East Hoathly sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses received		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses received		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann / Hesmonds Stud Ltd • Undertaken a public consultation on the land. • Likely to submit a hybrid application shortly	• Comment noted	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • The southern and western boundaries of this site are adjacent to an area of approximately 16ha of	• Comment noted. • Policy includes a requirement for a suitable buffer to the ancient woodlands (criteria 4).	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and

woodland (Moat Wood) designated as Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and replanted ancient woodland. • We request a buffer zone between this area and any development on this site.	• Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to EH5 • Site is in a remote location. • Development would be car dependent • Adverse impact on village character including the conservation area and listed buildings.	• Objection noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken which considers heritage issues on this site and the location/accessibility of development.	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 41	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 39

SITE Ref: EH5 FWLP), EH1 (EH) (Reg 19) – Harrisons, south of London Road, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Raised ecological comments on EH5, advising that a suitable and appropriate buffer should be provided to ancient woodland. • ESCC noted that the minimum buffer required is 15m, but larger buffers may be necessary to address recreational impacts, disturbance, garden escapes, compaction, hydrological changes and increased predation by domestic pets. • Buffers should be retained as semi-natural habitat and should exclude residential gardens and infrastructure such as footpaths, cycleways, SuDS and play areas.	• Comments noted. • Criteria 4 of the site allocation policy includes requirement for appropriate buffer to the ancient woodland. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, namely NE4 which specifically deals with ancient woodland.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann, on behalf of Hesmonds Stud Ltd • Support the allocation of EH5 alongside EH1 and EH2.	• Support noted	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust	• Comments noted.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints,

• The Woodland Trust does not object specifically to EH5 as an allocation but seeks stronger safeguards to protect the adjacent ancient woodland at Moat Wood, including the provision of an appropriate buffer zone between the woodland and any future development.	• Criteria 4 of the site allocation policy includes requirement for appropriate buffer to the ancient woodland. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, namely NE4 which specifically deals with ancient woodland.	designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
CPRE Sussex • Object to EH5 due to its countryside location (even though, outside of the protected High Weald National Landscape, the draft spatial strategy seeks to restrict development in the open countryside). There is no attachment to the existing settlement, and future occupiers would entirely rely on cars. The field is in the middle of countryside surrounded by Ancient Woodland.	• Comments noted. • Criteria 4 of the site allocation policy includes requirement for appropriate buffer to the ancient woodland. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, namely NE4 which specifically deals with ancient woodland and NE6 which addresses landscape character. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment	• No change required

	undertaken which considers the location/accessibility of development.	
Village Concerns • Strongly object to EH5 alongside EH2 and the hybrid planning application covering both sites (WD/2025/0376/MAJ). • Argue that the environmental assessment work supporting EH5 is inadequate and fails to properly assess impacts on the nearby Park Corner Heath Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). • Insufficient capacity at, and performance of, East Hoathly Wastewater Treatment Works. • Argue that EH5 should not be viewed in isolation and that impacts including sewerage and infrastructure should be assessed cumulatively alongside other planned growth in East Hoathly and the A22 corridor.	• Objections and concerns noted. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the East Hoathly sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • Issues such as water capacity and infrastructure needs are considered in other parts of the evidence base as set out, and have been undertaken in consultation with statutory consultees.	• No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong objections to EH5 (alongside EH3, EH4 and EH2) on the grounds that the	• Objections and concerns noted	• No change required

proposed level of development is excessive for a small rural village and would fundamentally alter East Hoathly's character
• Residents highlight that East Hoathly has already accommodated significant recent growth and argue that the proposed allocations would add around 650 homes, resulting in a substantial increase in housing stock since 2009, often described as a near fourfold expansion.
• Concerns that existing infrastructure is already stretched, including
  • Frequent sewage overflows and limited wastewater treatment capacity.
  • Concerns regarding water supply and electricity resilience.
  • Poor mobile phone coverage.
  • Pressure on GP services, school places and other community facilities
• Transport and highways objections focus on:
  • Existing congestion on the A22 and key junctions.
  • Heavy dependence on private cars due to limited public transport.
  • Inadequate bus services.
  • Increased use of narrow rural lanes by traffic and HGVs.
  • Road safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists.
  • Further deterioration of local road conditions.
• Environmental concerns include:
  • Loss of greenfield and agricultural land.
	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.
	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.
	• Issues such as water capacity and transport impact are considered in other parts of the evidence base as set out, and have been undertaken in consultation with statutory consultees on their suitability and parameters in considering evidence in Wealden.
	• Additional evidence has been updated, such as the IDP and a review of the Sustainable Settlement Study, in formulation of the emerging Local Plan.
	• Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in	

• Potential effects on ancient woodland, protected species and habitats. • Impacts on dark skies and landscape character. • Risks to the Park Corner Heath SSSI and associated impact risk zones. • Flood risk, drainage capacity and drinking water safeguard areas • Some representations raise concerns about: • Housing density and overall layout. • Overlooking and loss of privacy. • Construction impacts on neighbouring residents. • Insufficient green/open space provision. • Potential impacts on properties around The Mews and Lydfords. • Preference for lower-density development and greater provision of bungalows if development proceeds. • Several respondents object to the combined impact of growth proposed in East Hoathly, Halland and along the A22 corridor, including links with OEH1/Laughton Park Farm and Owlsbury Farm, and advocate reducing or removing allocations to limit cumulative impacts on infrastructure and the environment • • Some respondents refer specifically to EH5/Harrison's as isolated from the core of the village, harmful to the approach and setting of East Hoathly, and unsustainable in strategic and local service terms.	highways movements; however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal including an assessment of the village as presently exists, noting recent development undertaken • Any development of the site will be subject to detailed assessment of a planning application, where issues such as layout, density, open space provision, relationship between dwellings on site, and impact on neighbouring residential amenity will be considered. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. Any development must accord with policies in the Local Plan, and that plan should be read a whole. • The site psecifi Sustainbility Apparisal considers thie specific location of the site to the western	

	extent of the village and its relationship with the village core, and services/facilities/transport options available.	

SITE Ref: EH3 (FWLP), EH2 (EH) (Reg 19) – Broomy Lodge Field, London Road, East Hoathly

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support: 0**	**Neutral: 3**	**Object: 0**

SITE Ref: EH3 (FWLP), EH2 (EH) (Reg 19) – Broomy Lodge Field, London Road, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Advised that EH3 should be considered cumulatively with EH5 because both could affect the same ancient woodland, with around 180 homes in total. • Emphasised the strong national protection afforded to ancient woodland from direct loss and degradation through indirect effects.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Requested a buffer between development at site and the adjoining approximately 16-hectare Moat Wood, which includes ancient semi-natural woodland and replanted ancient woodland.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Allocation should provide affordable social housing only.	• Comment noted. The type and tenure of affordable housing would be determined through the Local Plan's housing policies and supporting evidence, having regard to identified local needs and viability.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 34	**Support: 0**	**Neutral: 0**	**Object:** 34

SITE Ref: EH3 (FWLP), EH2 (EH) (Reg 19) – Broomy Lodge Field, London Road, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Raises concerns regarding EH3's proximity to Moat Wood ancient woodland along the southern and western boundaries. Requests an appropriate buffer between development and the ancient woodland to protect it from pollution, encroachment, fragmentation and other development impacts.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Object to EH3 as part of the overall scale of development proposed at East Hoathly, which is considered disproportionate to the size and rural character of the village. • Consider that East Hoathly has already experienced significant housing growth and that further development would result in overdevelopment and loss of village character. • Concern that existing infrastructure and services are insufficient to accommodate further growth, particularly water supply, sewerage, electricity, healthcare and education. • Raise concerns regarding car dependency, increased traffic and congestion, particularly on the A22 and surrounding narrow rural lanes, together with highway safety and road condition. • Concern regarding the loss of countryside, farmland, green space, biodiversity and wildlife habitat, as well as increased noise, light and air pollution. • Consider that limited public transport, employment opportunities and access to services make East Hoathly an unsustainable location for development of the proposed scale. • Some concerns are also raised regarding residential amenity, development density, provision of recreational green space and	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the scale of growth, village character, highway impacts, car dependency and pressure on local services and infrastructure. Infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth are considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, while landscape, biodiversity, amenity and other environmental impacts are addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. • The cumulative impacts of development have also been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal.	• No change

the relationship of new development with existing properties. • Request that the scale of housing growth at East Hoathly is substantially reduced or the allocations removed, with some respondents favouring smaller-scale, more gradual growth supported by appropriate infrastructure.		

SITE Ref: EH2 (FWLP), EH3 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land At Hesmonds Stud, East Hoathly

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: EH2 (FWLP), EH3 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land At Hesmonds Stud, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • The site is 500metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatment works. • New development must be adequately separated from a wastewater treatment works, to safeguard the amenity of future occupiers. • Site specific policy wording should therefore be included to account for this in future revisions of the Local Plan, and in subsequent planning conditions for sensitive development.	• Comment noted. • The site will be subject to further assessment at planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole. The site is of adequate scale to address this issue on a strategic level, as has been assessed during the Sustainability Appraisal process.	• No change needed.

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No Responses received		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses received		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann / Hesmonds Stud Ltd • Undertaken a public consultation on the land. • Likely to submit a hybrid application shortly	• Comment noted	No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses received		

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Strong opposition to development of the site on the basis that valued open countryside and green space should not be sacrificed for housing. • Concerns that the land was identified as Local Green Space, or should have been designated as such, through the East Hoathly Neighbourhood Plan process. • Concerns regarding the size of the allocation and its impact on the rural setting of East Hoathly. • Potential adverse effects on views towards the South Downs from nearby properties. • Landscape impacts have been underestimated, including inconsistencies	• Comments and concerns noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial	• Update to the site allocation policy EH2 to better illustrate constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed.

between the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and SHELAA findings. • Concern that the cumulative landscape effects of this site alongside neighbouring allocations have not been properly assessed. • Potential impacts on the nearby Conservation Area and listed buildings. • Concern over the loss of wildlife corridors, particularly links between Moat Wood Ancient Woodland and open countryside to the east of the village. • Objections based on the site's ecological value and the role it plays in maintaining habitat connectivity. • Concerns regarding increased traffic generation and its impact on the village road network. • Concerns that access arrangements depend on routes through EH1, including areas affected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs). • Existing infrastructure and services are insufficient to support additional development. • Concerns about adverse effects on community cohesion and the existing village environment. • Concern that the allocation could lead to additional development proposals coming forward on adjacent sites, resulting in incremental expansion of the village beyond the current allocation.	Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the East Hoathly sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Site allocation Policy EH2 notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, environmental constraints and the need for suitable access and further infrastructure provision. • Future development will be considered on its merits, based on planning policies applicable at the time of consideration.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 41	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 40

SITE Ref: EH2 (FWLP), EH3 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land At Hesmonds Stud, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Objects that previous wastewater comments have not been fully incorporated and requests EH2 wording requiring an odour assessment for development within 500m of operational wastewater treatment works.	• Comment noted. • The site will be subject to further assessment at planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole; the addition of criteria in the site allocation policy would be a repetition of this policy already applicable elsewhere in the Plan. The site is of adequate scale to address this issue on a strategic level, as has been assessed during the Sustainability Appraisal process.	• No change necessary. "
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses received		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses received		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann / Hesmonds Stud Ltd • Support the allocation	Support noted. Amendment to the boundary is noted and will be reviewed.	Boundary of site amended to align with planning application.

• Seek a minor amendment to the allocation boundary so that it fully aligns with the site currently being promoted through planning application WD/2025/0376/MAJ, including land proposed for a school.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Village Concerns • Object to EH2 as East Hoathly has already experienced excessive growth without a masterplan or supporting infrastructure • Object to EH2 together with EH5 and OEH1 Laughton Park Farm, due to landscape, ecological, agricultural and transport concerns • Development could exceed runoff thresholds and adversely affect Park Corner Heath SSSI. • Expansion of East Hoathly Waste Water Treatment Works to accommodate growth could affect the SSSI • Combined impacts of EH2 development and potential Halland development could harm the SSSI. • Existing WWTW lacks capacity for further housing growth - increased sewage discharges and environmental harm • Southern Water capacity assumptions underestimate real-world impacts • IIDP evidence is outdated because it does not fully reflect additional growth proposals including Owlsbury and Halland.	• Objections and concerns noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Issues such as water capacity and transport impact are considered in other parts of the evidence base as set out, and have been undertaken in consultation with statutory consultees on their suitability and parameters in considering evidence in Wealden. • Additional evidence has been updated, such as the IDP, in formulation of the emerging Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the East Hoathly sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and the SA.	• No change required

• East Hoathly is highly car dependent - No realistic measures exist to reduce car dependency • A22 corridor and key junctions are already operating near capacity - Modal shift assumptions used in transport modelling are unrealistic for rural settlements • Existing bus provision is poor • Delivery of additional school capacity is uncertain. • No sport and recreation infrastructure improvements being proposed.	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Site allocation Policy EH2 notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, environmental constraints and the need for suitable access and further infrastructure provision.	
CPRE Sussex • Objection as development not suitable for this size of village which is already extensively extended. This development would lead to the increase of traffic in the area and would affect the integrity of the local community.	• Objection noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan	• No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong objections to EH2 (alongside EH3, EH4 and EH5) on the grounds that the proposed level of development is excessive	• Objections and concerns noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key	• Update to the site allocation policy EH2 to better illustrate constraints and designations, and ensure

for a small rural village and would fundamentally alter East Hoathly's character
• Residents highlight that East Hoathly has already accommodated significant recent growth and argue that the proposed allocations would add around 650 homes, resulting in a substantial increase in housing stock since 2009, often described as a near fourfold expansion.
• Concerns that existing infrastructure is already stretched, including
  • Frequent sewage overflows and limited wastewater treatment capacity.
  • Concerns regarding water supply and electricity resilience.
  • Poor mobile phone coverage.
  • Pressure on GP services, school places and other community facilities
• Transport and highways objections focus on:
  • Existing congestion on the A22 and key junctions.
  • Heavy dependence on private cars due to limited public transport.
  • Inadequate bus services.
  • Increased use of narrow rural lanes by traffic and HGVs.
  • Road safety risks for pedestrians and cyclists.
  • Further deterioration of local road conditions.
• Environmental concerns include:
  • Loss of greenfield and agricultural land.
	constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.
	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.
	• Issues such as water capacity and transport impact are considered in other parts of the evidence base as set out, and have been undertaken in consultation with statutory consultees on their suitability and parameters in considering evidence in Wealden.
	• Additional evidence has been updated, such as the IDP and a review of the Sustainable Settlement Study, in formulation of the emerging Local Plan.
	• Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements; however this can only preclude development
		development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed.

• Potential effects on ancient woodland, protected species and habitats. • Impacts on dark skies and landscape character. • Risks to the Park Corner Heath SSSI and associated impact risk zones. • Flood risk, drainage capacity and drinking water safeguard areas • Some representations raise concerns about: • Housing density and overall layout. • Overlooking and loss of privacy. • Construction impacts on neighbouring residents. • Insufficient green/open space provision. • Potential impacts on properties around The Mews and Lydfords. • Preference for lower-density development and greater provision of bungalows if development proceeds. • Several respondents object to the combined impact of growth proposed in East Hoathly, Halland and along the A22 corridor, including links with OEH1/Laughton Park Farm and Owlsbury Farm, and advocate reducing or removing allocations to limit cumulative impacts on infrastructure and the environment	where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal, including an assessment of the village as presently exists, noting recent development undertaken • Any development of the site will be subject to detailed assessment of a planning application, where issues such as layout, density, open space provision, relationship between dwellings on site, and impact on neighbouring residential amenity will be considered. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision.Any development must accord with policies in the Local Plan, and that plan should be read a whole.	

SITE Ref: EH4 (FWLP), EH4 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land east of South Street, East Hoathly

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: EH4 (FWLP), EH4 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land east of South Street, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Existing Southern Water sewerage infrastructure crosses the site and will need to be accommodated within the development layout, including an appropriate easement for maintenance and future upgrading. • The site is within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works, raising potential odour and amenity concerns for future residents. • An odour assessment, undertaken in consultation with Southern Water, is requested to establish an appropriate separation distance for sensitive development. • Request that the site allocation includes policy wording requiring continued access	• The site will be subject to further assessment at the planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole; the addition of criteria in the site allocation policy would be a repetition of this policy already applicable elsewhere in the Plan. The site is of adequate scale to address this issue on a strategic level, as has been assessed through the Sustainability Appraisal process.	• No change

to existing sewerage infrastructure and appropriate consideration of the wastewater treatment works when determining the development layout.		
Natural England • The allocation lies directly adjacent to woodland. Ancient woodland should be protected from direct loss and indirect degradation in accordance with national policy.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Request a buffer between development and Matinland Wood, an approximately 15-hectare area of replanted ancient woodland adjoining the site's southern boundary.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies	• No change

	in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objects that the allocation was remote from the centre of East Hoathly and should be reduced in scale.	• The Council acknowledged the concern. The allocation formed part of the spatial strategy and had been informed by evidence on housing need, site suitability and deliverability. Its relationship with the settlement and appropriate development scale would be addressed through the policy, masterplanning and detailed design.	• No change.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 36	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 34

SITE Ref: EH4 (FWLP), EH4 (EH) (Reg 19) – Land east of South Street, East Hoathly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works.	• The Council acknowledged the operational constraints identified. Policy The site will be subject to further assessment at planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole; the addition of criteria in the site allocation policy would be a repetition of this policy already applicable elsewhere in the Plan. The site is of adequate scale to address this issue on a strategic level, as has been assessed during the Sustainability Appraisal process.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • For site allocation, request a buffer between development and Matinland Wood, identified as replanted ancient woodland. It also sought precautionary buffers, habitat connectivity protection and specialist surveys where ancient or veteran trees may be present.	• The developable area will be clearly distinguished from the overall site boundary to show where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
J D Courtney • Objected to site allocation, stating that East Hoathly is a rural area without sufficient infrastructure and that existing side roads already function as rat-runs, affecting farm movements.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the capacity of local infrastructure, increased traffic on rural roads and potential impacts on agricultural movements. Infrastructure requirements arising from planned growth are considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Highway impacts and appropriate access arrangements would need to be satisfactorily addressed at a planning application stage	• No change

	through relevant policies of the Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to the scale of EH4 and the cumulative level of housing growth proposed at East Hoathly. • Raised concerns that existing water, sewerage, electricity, healthcare, education and transport infrastructure could not accommodate further development. • Considered that additional traffic would worsen congestion, road safety and damage to narrow rural lanes, increasing dependence on private cars. • Objected to the loss of farmland, rural character, biodiversity and dark skies, including potential effects on ancient woodland and wildlife. • Raised concerns about overlooking, reduced light, noise and inappropriate density adjoining existing bungalows; sought removal or reduction of EH4 and, if retained, lower-density development with stronger buffers, green space and infrastructure requirements.	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the scale and cumulative impact of development, infrastructure capacity, highways, landscape, biodiversity and residential amenity. Infrastructure requirements arising from growth are considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, while highway, ecological and landscape constraints are addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. • Detailed matters relating to layout, density, buffers, green space and neighbouring amenity would be considered through the planning application process.	• No change

SITE Ref: BU5 (FWLP), FAD1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at The Walled Garden, Five Ash Down

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: BU5 (FWLP), FAD1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at The Walled Garden, Five Ash Down		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water: Southern Water infrastructure crosses the site and must be taken into account in the layout of any proposed development. An easement of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, may be required and should remain clear of buildings and substantial tree planting; diversion may otherwise be required.	Comments noted. This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is	No change required

	inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation.	
Natural England: The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	Comments noted. The relationship with Ashdown Forest SPA will need to be addressed through the relevant Habitats Regulations Assessment and mitigation requirements.	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council: • The Parish Council is not opposed to a sympathetically designed development on BU5, but considers 20 dwellings to represent overdevelopment adjacent to a listed building. • The Parish Council questions why the site has now been identified as suitable following a previous refusal for housing and dismissal at appeal.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	The quantum of development has been reduced to 15 dwellings on this proposed site allocation.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: BU5 (FWLP), FAD1 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land at The Walled Garden, Five Ash Down		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council Objected to BU5 and questioned why the site remains allocated following previous refusal and appeal dismissal. The Parish Council considered 20 dwellings to be overdevelopment adjacent to a listed building and stated that any scheme should be low density and sympathetically designed to match existing frontage development. It also raised concerns about the effect on the setting of the listed building and the lack of a suitable access, noting that access from the A272 had been deemed unacceptable and access through The Walled Garden did not provide adequate visibility.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	The quantum of development has been reduced to 15 dwellings on this proposed site allocation.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann on behalf of Greymoor Homes Referred to BU5 as an example of a site that remains proposed for allocation despite previous refusal and appeal dismissal. The representation	Comments noted. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the	The quantum of development has been reduced to 15 dwellings on this proposed site allocation.

argued that refused applications or dismissed appeals should not automatically mean a site is not deliverable or developable, particularly where an amended or lower-impact scheme may address previous concerns. The consultee used BU5 to support the case that other promoted sites, including land at Catsfield Road, Ninfield, should be reconsidered for allocation.	need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No other consultee body comments relating specifically to BU5 were identified	No response required.	No change proposed.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Resident objections raised concern about the cumulative scale of development in Buxted and nearby settlements, including BU5. Key issues included overdevelopment, loss of rural character, increased traffic, harm to biodiversity, pressure on GP services and reduced quality of life for existing residents.	Comments noted. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, within the Local Plan Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	The quantum of development has been reduced to 15 dwellings on this proposed site allocation.

Allocation: FR5 (FWLP) – Land at Whinlatter, St Mark's Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:**	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR5 (FWLP) – Land at Whinlatter, St Mark's Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • FR5, FR6, FR7 Natural England has significant concerns regarding these allocations which lie directly within the High Weald National Landscape. • These applications must be considered together for the significant and direct impact they have on the High Weald National Landscape. • FR5,6, and 7 combine to 267 houses. • We advise that the impact is considered in combination with FR2 and FR3 above.	• Concerns noted • The evidence base identifies key constraints for the site which are addressed via other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the Frant sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA.	• Ensure FR5 is considered within any coordinated framework for the wider Frant allocations.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Frant Parish Council • Impact in the SHELAA assessment for 7 houses is 'minor negative' – the same level of assessment as for 170 houses at Pinewood. • A proposal for 7 new houses could be regarded as small-scale but the impact is still, according to the LUC reports, moderate to high in terms of landscape sensitivity. • much is made of the benefits of piggy-backing onto Tunbridge Wells and a playing down of the impact on the AONB • The SA baseline assessment is flawed as it does not take account of the inevitable cumulative impact with other sites and development. Had it done, we consider it would need to be rated as a major negative in terms of impact on the AONB.	• Objection and concerns noted • The site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process • Site sensitivity has been taken into account in the site's assessment and is reflected in the proposed capacity and site boundary • Site has been proposed for allocation on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites • Scale of development proposed and the potential cumulative effects arising from other allocations in the area have been considered through the site assessment process, SA and landscape evidence base. • The site's proximity to Tunbridge Wells is a material consideration in sustainability terms, including access to services, facilities, employment opportunities and	• Ensure FR5 is considered within any coordinated framework for the wider Frant allocations.

	public transport. This consideration forms part of the overall planning balance and does not diminish the importance attached to conserving and enhancing the National Landscape. • National planning policy recognises that mitigation and design measures may be used to avoid, reduce or minimise adverse effects where appropriate. • The allocation does not remove the requirement for future proposals to demonstrate that landscape, visual and environmental impacts have been appropriately addressed.	
Site promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to FR5 individually and in combination with all Frant allocations. • Development of these sites would constitute a highly significant and intrusive break of the boundary line of the High Weald AONB, jumping over as it would from the present clearly defined built settlement of Tunbridge Wells, into the AONB to the south.	• Objection noted • The site has been assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process • Site sensitivity has been considered in the site's assessment and is	• Ensure FR5 is considered within any coordinated framework for the wider Frant allocations.

• Encroachment with built development beyond that clear line would threaten the integrity of the rural area of the AONB • Do not agree with landscape evidence base conclusions that that the settlement edge here is not well-defined. • The sites express a number of the defining components of character of the High Weald AONB • We do not consider that the harms identified can be mitigated.	reflected in the proposed capacity and site boundary • Site has been proposed for allocation on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites • Scale of development proposed and the potential cumulative effects arising from other allocations in the area have been considered through the site assessment process, SA and landscape evidence base. • The site's proximity to Tunbridge Wells is a material consideration in sustainability terms, including access to services, facilities, employment opportunities and public transport. This consideration forms part of the overall planning balance and does not diminish the importance attached to conserving and enhancing the National Landscape. • National planning policy recognises that mitigation and design measures may be used to avoid, reduce or minimise adverse effects where appropriate.	

	• The allocation does not remove the requirement for future proposals to demonstrate that landscape, visual and environmental impacts have been appropriately addressed.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 31	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 30

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR5 – Land at Whinlatter, St Mark's Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Pantiles and Park ward councillors • Object to FR5 and the wider boundary allocations due to cumulative impacts on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure. • Raise concerns about traffic, schools, local services and reliance on Tunbridge Wells facilities. • Seek coordinated masterplanning and agreed cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation before any development proceeds.	• Objection and concerns noted • The site was assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process, and allocated on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

	requirements and the availability of suitable sites • The site in part now benefits from planning permission for housing, with the remaining land unlikely to yield the minimum five dwellings required for assessment through the SHELAA process. The site is therefore omitted form any ongoing assessment process.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Objects to FR5 for the same reasons as FR6. • Concerns raised about development within the National Landscape, landscape harm and the cumulative impact of the wider Frant Road allocations. • The SHELAA assessment only records minor positive effects – why is a nationally protected landscape being sacrificed for only minor positive effects. • Balance of harm and benefit has not been properly justified. • Concern that FR5 is allocated when other nearby sites were discounted on landscape grounds. • Cumulative scale of development proposed around Frant Road will create a form of development that is out of character with the area, where large housing estates currently do not exist	• The site was assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process, and allocated on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites • The site in part now benefits from planning permission for housing, with the remaining land unlikely to yield the minimum five dwellings required for assessment through the SHELAA process. The site is therefore omitted form any ongoing assessment process.	• Site omitted for reasons set out.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Knight Frank • Supports FR5 as part of the wider FR1–FR9 corridor south of Tunbridge Wells. • Argues the area is sustainable and could help meet housing and affordable housing shortfalls. • Promotes a broader, coordinated and landscape-led growth strategy with improved infrastructure, active travel and green/blue infrastructure.	• Support noted.	• Site omitted for reasons set out.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Green Weald Alliance • Objects to FR5 as part of FR1–FR9, arguing the allocations amount to a substantial edge-of-town growth strategy within Frant Parish and the High Weald National Landscape. • Raises concerns about incomplete evidence, cumulative impacts, infrastructure, reliance on mitigation and lack of exceptional circumstances. • Also notes objections from Team Dynamics International regarding infrastructure, highways, flooding, water supply, public transport and National Landscape impacts.	• The site was assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process, and allocated on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites • The site in part now benefits from planning permission for housing, with the remaining land unlikely to yield the minimum five dwellings required for assessment through the SHELAA process. The site is therefore omitted form any ongoing assessment process.	• Site omitted for reasons set out.
High Weald National Landscape Unit	• The site was assessed through the Council's evidence base, including	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

• Objects to FR5 as part of the wider Frant allocation cluster due to harm to the High Weald National Landscape. • Raises concerns about cumulative landscape harm, loss of rural edge, historic fieldscape impacts, dark skies and settlement separation. • Considers this site cumulatively with others to be major development. • States that exceptional circumstances and less harmful alternatives have not been demonstrated.	landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process, and allocated on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development requirements and the availability of suitable sites • The site in part now benefits from planning permission for housing, with the remaining land unlikely to yield the minimum five dwellings required for assessment through the SHELAA process. The site is therefore omitted form any ongoing assessment process.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents largely object to FR5 due to National Landscape harm, loss of rural character, dark skies, biodiversity and urbanisation. • Common concerns relate to cumulative development with FR2, FR3, FR6, FR7 and FR9 and erosion of the Tunbridge Wells rural edge. • Repeated issues include traffic, road safety, rat-running, limited public transport and pressure on Tunbridge Wells services.	• The site was assessed through the Council's evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, transport and sustainability assessments, as part of the wider plan-making process, and allocated on a balanced assessment of all relevant planning matters, including landscape sensitivity, the need to meet identified development	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

• Residents also raise flooding, drainage, water supply and infrastructure capacity concerns. • Many argue that National Landscape protections apply and exceptional circumstances have not been shown.	requirements and the availability of suitable sites • The site in part now benefits from planning permission for housing, with the remaining land unlikely to yield the minimum five dwellings required for assessment through the SHELAA process. The site is therefore omitted form any ongoing assessment process.	

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR10 – The Glebe Land, Church Lane, Frant

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan Stage.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 10	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR10 – The Glebe Land, Church Lane, Frant		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **None**		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **None**		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Objects to draft policy. • Loss of existing vehicular access to Parish Council playing fields and no suitable alternative access demonstrated. • Adverse impact on access to an important community, recreation and sports facility. • Highway and pedestrian safety concerns arising from the narrow nature of Church Lane, limited footway provision, existing	• Objection and concerns noted • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety, access to the playing fields, landscape and heritage impacts, and the assessment of adjoining land. The evidence base identified the key constraints affecting the site. Any	• The site was proposed as an allocation in the FWLP, but noting a change to the quantum of development proposed, the site is now too small for assessment/allocation through the SHELAA, thus is omitted.

parking/traffic pressures and proximity to Frant Primary School. • Additional residential traffic would exacerbate existing highway safety concerns. • Poor pedestrian connectivity between the site and village facilities. • Harm to rural character, landscape and settlement pattern. • Harm to the High Weald National Landscape and potential heritage impacts associated with Frant Conservation Area and nearby listed buildings. • Inconsistency with the rejection of adjoining SHELAA site 599/2030 on landscape, heritage and settlement character grounds. • Concerns regarding the accuracy, consistency and robustness of the SHELAA/Sustainability Appraisal assessment. • Site considered unsuitable for residential development and proposed allocation should be withdrawn.	development would need to demonstrate satisfactory vehicular and pedestrian access arrangements, including appropriate continued access to the playing fields. • The site's location within the High Weald National Landscape and Frant Conservation Area would require development to respond appropriately to identified landscape and heritage sensitivities. • Whilst the conclusions reached for adjoining SHELAA sites are noted, each site is assessed on its individual characteristics, constraints and relationship with the existing settlement.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Chichester Diocese • Supports FR10 for up to five dwellings, stating the land is surplus to school requirements and retained for future development. • Indicates the site is progressing through developer discussions, investigations and engagement with Development Management, and could make an early modest housing contribution.	• Support noted.	• The site was proposed as an allocation in the FWLP, but noting a change to the quantum of development proposed, the site is now too small for assessment/allocation through the SHELAA, thus is omitted.

Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• **None**		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object mainly on highway safety grounds, citing narrow Church Lane, limited pavements, school congestion, poor visibility and risks from additional traffic. • Concerns are raised that development could affect access to playing fields, allotments and recreation facilities, and may constrain future school expansion. • Residents consider the site poorly integrated with the village and harmful to Frant's rural character, conservation area, St Alban's Church setting and the High Weald National Landscape. • Wider objections refer to cumulative pressure on roads, schools, healthcare, water supply, sewerage and infrastructure, with some questioning whether five homes justify the identified harms.	• Objections noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding highway and pedestrian safety, access to community facilities, and impacts on the character, landscape and heritage of Frant. Any development would need to satisfactorily address these matters through relevant Local Plan policies. Infrastructure requirements associated with growth are considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, with cumulative effects considered through the Sustainability Appraisal.	• The site was proposed as an allocation in the FWLP, but noting a change to the quantum of development proposed, the site is now too small for assessment/allocation through the SHELAA, thus is omitted.

SITE Ref: WIT1 (FWLP), GR1 (WIT) (Reg 19) – Land south of Back Lane and west of the railway line, Groombridge

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 38	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 38

SITE Ref: WIT1 (FWLP), GR1 (WIT) (Reg 19) – Land south of Back Lane and west of the railway line, Groombridge		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Site lies within the Ashdown Forest Special Protection Area zone of influence.	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Withyham Parish Council • Requests reconsideration of the allocation due to previous refusals and strong public opposition	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

• If retained, expects the site to receive the full protections applicable to the National Landscape	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Policy NE7 provides specific policy protections to the National Landscape, and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Landstrom Group Ltd • WIT1 and other allocations are within the High Weald AONB/National Landscape. • Development could cumulatively conflict with draft policy NE7. • Alternative sites outside the AONB should be considered first	• Concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

	documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	
Orridge Consulting and Balfour Beatty • Object to WIT1 • Council failed to properly consider the appeal decision. • Assessment relied on a design and access statement from a proposal which was withdrawn or failed. • Current allocation mirrors the unsuccessful scheme. • Concerns regarding the substandard access road were not adequately considered. • Site assessment is flawed and allocation should be withdrawn.	• Objection noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

	the site specific assessment undertaken. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	
<u>High Weald National Landscape</u> • Object to WIT1 citing recent appeal dismissal for 21 dwellings on grounds of the site's open grassed character, verdant boundaries, tranquillity and relationship with Groombridge contribute positively to the AONB/HWNL. • Concerns relate fundamentally to the principle of developing the site, rather than the scale or design of a particular scheme. Consequently, the Partnership considers that alternative proposals would not overcome the underlying landscape harm. • The appeal decision demonstrates the site should not be allocated.	• Objections noted. • These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of these constraints • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns
Local Residents		

• Strong objection to allocation of WIT1. • Appeal findings have not been properly considered - Site assessment is therefore flawed and should be withdrawn • Development would harm the High Weald National Landscape • Site access is unsafe and difficult, and lack of pavements increases pedestrian safety concerns • Site has existing flooding and surface water problems. • Concerns over impacts on local watercourses and the River Medway. • Potential effects on Ayttons Wood ancient woodland. • Limited local services and facilities (GPs) and poor public transport accessibility. • Concerns regarding light, air and noise pollution • Potential impact on nearby listed buildings and the scale and height of development will be out of keeping with the character of the village. • Any development should [prioritise affordable/social housing.	• Objections noted. • These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of these constraints • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 15	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 12

SITE Ref: WIT1 (FWLP), GR1 (WIT) (Reg 19) – Land south of Back Lane and west of the railway line, Groombridge		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Withyham Parish Council • Does not support allocation WIT1/Little Wold. • Accepts only limited growth in or adjacent to Groombridge where village scale, character, views, landscape, separation, infrastructure and drainage are protected. • Considers WIT1 unsuitable due to harm to the High Weald National Landscape and rural character, previous Parish Council concerns, the current planning application and the need for careful landscape and transport assessment. • Requests that the site is not allocated.	• These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
DHA Planning Limited • Supports WIT1 for approximately 21 dwellings and considers residential development consistent with the spatial strategy and SHELAA findings. • Requests policy flexibility for a doctor's surgery/community healthcare facility, citing	• Support noted	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

the constrained existing Groombridge surgery, limited opening hours, lack of parking, accessibility issues, limited scope for expansion and the need for a modern purpose-built facility to serve Groombridge and Hartfield patients.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Object to WIT1 because it lies within the Ashdown Forest SPA Zone of Influence. • Raise concern that the Focused Local Plan has not been supported by an updated HRA or clear SANGS/mitigation provisions, and that cumulative impacts from WIT1/WIT2 and other nearby allocations on Ashdown Forest need to be assessed. • Key issues include recreation/access pressure, traffic on roads crossing Ashdown Forest, air/light/noise pollution, priority habitat/Ancient Woodland sensitivity and reduced ecological connectivity/wildlife corridors.	• These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns
<u>High Weald National Landscape</u> • Object to WIT1 citing recent appeal dismissal for 21 dwellings on grounds of the site's open grassed character, verdant boundaries, tranquillity and relationship with Groombridge contribute positively to the AONB/HWNL. • Concerns relate fundamentally to the principle of developing the site, rather than the scale or design of a particular scheme. Consequently, the Partnership considers that alternative	• Objections noted. • These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of these constraints • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

proposals would not overcome the underlying landscape harm. • The Partnership also objects to the proposed extension of the Groombridge development boundary to the south-east which includes an area of Priority Habitat	• An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to WIT1/Back Lane, stating it lies outside the existing development boundary and would encroach into the High Weald National Landscape/AONB • Key concerns include previous refusal/dismissed appeal and a live/repeat planning application; harm to landscape, rural character, historic settlement character, biodiversity, wildlife, dark skies and tranquillity; increased light/noise/air pollution; lack of infrastructure; highway/access constraints at Back Lane/Station Road, including narrow roads and absence of pavement; and objection to the settlement boundary change, which some consider unjustified and aligned with a refused development proposal.	• Objections noted. These issues have been considered in site assessment. The issues must be addressed further at planning application stage. • Other policies within the Local Plan address the issues raised and the Plan should be read as a whole. Development will need to comply with all relevant policies. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of these constraints • Other policies in the Local Plan address concerns

HA8 (FWLP), HA1 (HA) (Reg 19) - Grovelands Primary School, Gleneagles Drive, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA8 (FWLP), HA1 (HA) (Reg 19) - Grovelands Primary School, Gleneagles Drive, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level	• Comment noted.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA12 (FWLP), HA2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Hailsham Delivery Office, 11 North Street, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA12 (FWLP), HA2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Hailsham Delivery Office, 11 North Street, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level	• Comment of support noted.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

SITE Ref: HA13 (FWLP), HA3 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at the Market, Market Street, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA13 (FWLP), HA3 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at the Market, Market Street, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level	• Comment of support noted.	• No action required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: Allocation: HA3 (HA) - Land at the Market, Market Street, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA5 (FWLP), HA4 (HA) (Reg 19) – Hamlins Mill, Mill Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:**	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:**

SITE Ref: HA5 (FWLP), HA4 (HA) (Reg 19) – Hamlins Mill, Mill Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• No changes proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		

Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No responses		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA5 (FWLP), HA4 (HA) (Reg 19) – Hamlins Mill, Mill Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		

SITE Ref: HA9 (FWLP), HA5 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Howard Close, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:**

SITE Ref: HA9 (FWLP), HA5 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Howard Close, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted. • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• No change proposed.
Natural England • Allocation includes a priority habitat and any impacts to this must be avoided.	• Comment noted. The allocation does not assume that development will take place across the entirety of the site, and	• No changes proposed.

	any future proposal will be required to avoid, protect and appropriately buffer priority habitat in accordance with national and local planning policy. • It is considered that the presence of priority habitat does not, in itself, preclude allocation where there remains a reasonable prospect of delivering development whilst safeguarding important ecological assets. The indicative capacity of the site has therefore been reviewed to reflect known environmental constraints and to ensure that sufficient land is available for habitat retention, buffering and biodiversity enhancement measures.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Trafalgar Group Limited • Site allocation is in a sustainable location and adjacent to land with planning permission for residential dwellings.	• Support noted.	• No change proposed.

• Seek to provide a landscape-led, high quality scheme and has been informed by existing landscape features. • Site will provide community benefits such as pedestrian and cycle connectivity, open space and outdoor recreation activity. • Technical constraints such as transport, flooding and odour can be mitigated.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA9 (FWLP), HA5 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Howard Close, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• No change proposed.

consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

SITE Ref: HA17 (FWLP), HA6 (HA) (Reg 19) – Wellfield, 154-156 Station Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:**	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HA17 (FWLP), HA6 (HA) (Reg 19) – Wellfield, 154-156 Station Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works."	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

East Sussex County Council • Emphasise the need to safeguard existing and future waste management facilities. • Proposed allocation lies within a Waste Waste Consultation Area associated with the Hailsham Household Waste Recycling Centre and a tyre recycling facility, both identified as important waste management sites. • The wider Station Road/Old Swan Lane Industrial Estate is also designated as an Area of Opportunity for waste development, meaning future waste-related uses may come forward. Given the potential for impacts such as noise, vibration, dust, HGV movements and visual effects arising from waste operations, the Council advises against locating new residential development close to these facilities. • It recommends that any allocation of the site includes reference to waste site safeguarding requirements, the Waste Consultation Area, and the agent of change principle.	• The Council notes the comments regarding the safeguarding of existing and future waste management facilities and the site's location within a Waste Consultation Area (WCA). The importance of safeguarding strategic waste infrastructure in accordance with the East Sussex, South Downs and Brighton & Hove Waste and Minerals Local Plan and Sites Plan is recognised. • This can be dealt with through the planning application process and indeed, this site has had planning permission for such a residential use previously, which shows deliverability of the site in this case.	• No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HEL1 (FWLP) HA8 (HEL) (Reg 19) - Land adjoining 13 Station Road, Hellingly

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HEL1 (FWLP) HA8 (HEL) (Reg 19) - Land adjoining 13 Station Road, Hellingly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Existing infrastructure crosses the site which will need to be considered. • Planning policy should therefore require development layouts to safeguard access to the sewer network for ongoing maintenance and future capacity upgrades.	• Comment noted. · This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change
Natural England • We advise that HE1 allocates a further dwellings within 1km of Pevensey Levels. Ramsar/SAC.	• Comment noted. The proximity of HE1 to the Pevensey Levels Ramsar/SAC is recognised. Potential effects on the designated site have been considered through the Local Plan evidence base, and any development would be required to	• No change

	comply with relevant policies relating to biodiversity, water quality and sustainable drainage, including any necessary mitigation.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Chilton Partnership • Supportive of proposed allocation.	• Support noted.	• No change
Local Residents	• **WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents support this allocation.	• Support noted.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No responses received.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HEL7 (FWLP), HA9 (HEL) (Reg 19) – Land at Park Farm, New Road, Hellingly

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – N/A – Site proposed for allocation in FWLP

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: HEL7 (FWLP), HA9 (HEL) (Reg 19) – Land at Park Farm, New Road, Hellingly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • Development of this site should provide continuation of adopted highway to support the scale of development • Support the requirement for buffer to the ancient woodland. The minimum buffer required is 15m, but larger buffers may be required to reduce the impacts of a major residential development such as recreational impacts, disturbance, garden escapes, compaction, changes to hydrology, increased predation by domestic pets etc. Buffers should be maintained as semi-natural habitat, excluding residential gardens and infrastructure such as footpaths, cycleways, SuDS, play areas	• Comments noted	• Site connectivity and access will be required in accordance with the site specific allocation policy • Site specific policy requires s 25m buffer from ancient woodland in the absence site survey and detailed assessment, in line with Policy NE4.

Support criteria 2 in relation to the LWS		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Batcheller Monkhouse • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Impact on Local Wildlife Site and Ancient Woodland	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy, identify key issues on the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• Site specific policy requires s 25m buffer from ancient woodland in the absence site survey and detailed assessment, in line with Policy NE4.
Sussex Butterfly Conservation Site includes Ancient Woodland which should be removed from the allocations	• The site specific policy refers to the need for buffers to ancient woodland.	• Site specific policy requires s 25m buffer from ancient woodland in the absence site survey and detailed assessment, in line with Policy NE4.
Sussex Ornithological Society • Variety of species recorded in the Park Wood complex and further development at this location would be detrimental to biodiversity in the area • Lack of details in relation to the suitable buffer around ancient woodland	• The site specific policy refers to BNG requirements as well as buffers to ancient woodland.	• Site specific policy requires s 25m buffer from ancient woodland in the absence site survey and detailed assessment, in line with Policy NE4. • The policy also sets out the need for 20% BNG.
The Woodland Trust • Object to the inclusion of ancient woodland within the boundaries of the proposed allocation.	• The site specific policy refers to the need for buffers to ancient woodland.	• Site specific policy requires s 25m buffer from ancient woodland in the absence site survey and

• Recommend a precautionary 50m buffer from Ancient Woodland, including during the construction phase, unless the applicant can demonstrate how a small buffer would suffice		detailed assessment, in line with Policy NE4.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Development will put strain on their local current amenities and those of neighbouring area that cannot cope	• The IDP considers the infrastructure needed to support the Local Plan.	• No change necessary

SITE Ref: HA10 (FWLP), HA10 (HA) (Reg 19) – Amberstone Council Depot, Amberstone, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA10 (FWLP), HA10 (HA) (Reg 19) – Amberstone Council Depot, Amberstone, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level	Comment of support noted.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA4 (FWLP), HA11 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Harebeating Nursery, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA4 (FWLP), HA11 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Harebeating Nursery, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • The site is within 500m of the Pevensey Levels Ramsar/SAC alongside other allocations cumulatively providing c.595 dwellings • A joint masterplan including joined-up SuDS and green infrastructure led plan must be a critical part of these allocations should they proceed. • Site drains onto the Pevensey levels will need to demonstrate how hydrological impacts will be avoided	• Comments noted. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as Policy CC8 (Sustainable Drainage and Protection of the Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site).	• Amend site specific policy to include a requirement for a contribution to joint master plan for a cohesive SUDS strategy
Southern Water • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed • The site is 500metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatments works which	• Comments noted and agreed regarding phased occupation of the development. • Given the scale of the development allocated, it is not considered necessary to have further site-specific	• Amended site-specific policy to ensure the phased occupation of future development with the delivery of necessary infrastructure at criterion 6.

will require to safeguard amenity of future occupiers. Policy wording should be added to address this, with subsequent planning conditions to ensure a phased occupation.	criterion addressing the proximity of the waste water treatment works to the site and this can be dealt with at the planning application stage.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HA4 (FWLP), HA11 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Harebeating Nursery, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage*	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement for suitable phasing of occupation alongside infrastructure provision/upgrades.

infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider."		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Cumulative impact of proposed allocation with neighbouring sites in countryside location	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA3 (FWLP), HA12 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent Pattenden Farm, Battle Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA3 (FWLP), HA12 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent Pattenden Farm, Battle Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • The site is within 500m of the Pevensey Levels Ramsar/SAC alongside other allocations cumulatively providing c.595 dwellings • A joint masterplan including joined-up SuDS and green infrastructure led plan must be a critical part of these allocations should they proceed. • Site drains onto the Pevensey levels will need to demonstrate how hydrological impacts will be avoided	• Comments noted • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as Policy CC8 (Sustainable Drainage and Protection of the Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site).	• Amend site-specific policy to include a requirement for a contribution to a joint master plan for a cohesive SUDS strategy.

Southern Water • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed • The site is 500metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatments works which will require to safeguard amenity of future occupiers. Policy wording should be added to address this, with subsequent planning conditions to ensure a phased occupation.	• Comments noted and agreed.	• Amended site-specific policy to ensure the phased occupation of future development with the delivery of necessary infrastructure at criterion 9. • Amended site-specific policy to ensure that development is sited to avoid unacceptable odour effects from Hailsham North Wastewater Treatment Works, informed by an appropriate assessment at criterion 8.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HA3 (FWLP), HA12 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent Pattenden Farm, Battle Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • Should include provision of a safe and suitable crossing point to reach the shared cycleway provision and bus stops on the north west side of Battle Road.	• Comment noted.	• Amended site-specific policy at criterion 2b to seek connection to this on site, and liaison with highway authority for provision off-site.
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*"	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amended site-specific policy at criterion 9 to include a requirement for suitable phasing of occupation alongside infrastructure provision/upgrades.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Batcheller Monkhouse • Supportive of the allocation	• Comment of support noted.	• No action required

Wates Development • Site to provide access for the neighbouring allocation HA1	• Comment of support noted.	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Concerns over the impact of development on heritage • Cumulative impact on the countryside of the proposed allocation	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan, including heritage impacts. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA1 (FWLP), HA13 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land east of Battle Road, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA1 (FWLP), HA13 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land east of Battle Road, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • The site is within 500m of the Pevensey Levels Ramsar/SAC alongside other allocations cumulatively providing c.595 dwellings. • A joint masterplan including joined-up SuDS and green infrastructure led plan must be a critical part of these allocations should they proceed. • Site drains onto the Pevensey levels will need to demonstrate how hydrological impacts will be avoided/	• Comments noted • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as Policy CC8 (Sustainable Drainage and Protection of the Pevensey Levels SAC and Ramsar Site).	• Amend site-specific policy to include a requirement for contribution to a joint master plan for a cohesive SUDS strategy.

Southern Water • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed • The site is 500 metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatments works which will require to safeguard amenity of future occupiers. Policy wording should be added to address this, with subsequent planning conditions to ensure a phased occupation.	• Comments noted and agreed.	• Amended site-specific policy to ensure the phased occupation of future development with the delivery of necessary infrastructure at criterion 9. • Amended site-specific policy to ensure that development is sited to avoid unacceptable odour effects from Hailsham North Wastewater Treatment Works, informed by an appropriate assessment at criterion 8.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Wates Development • Supportive of the allocation for the provision of at least 300 homes. • Site promoted for some time and always included as a sustainable and suitable location for development • Access via third party land (neighbouring allocation HA3) • Control further land to the east of the allocation which can be used for off-site mitigation • No constraints to delivery. • On and off-site mitigations identified to address surface water drainage	• Comments of support noted	• Comment of support noted. No action required

• Joint work with the Council and Highway Authority to support local improvement to manage the effect of development across the wider area. Measures to be provided to reduce the reliance on the private car.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: HA1 (FWLP), HA13 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land east of Battle Road, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*"	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amended site specific policy to include a requirement for suitable phasing for occupation alongside infrastructure provision/upgrades at Criterion 9.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Wates Development • Supportive of the allocation for the provision of at least 300 homes • Site to be delivered in conjunction with neighbouring sites, with access via HA3 • No identified constraint to delivery • The planning history reference for the site does not relate to the proposed allocation • Criteria 2b should be reworded as land referred to is outside the control of the landowner and site promoter. • Criteria 2c should be clarified to ensure the pedestrian link is both necessary and achievable with the control of the landowner and site promoter. • Criteria 5: landscape and ecological policies will be addressed elsewhere is the Plan, "*using locally prominent native species*" should be removed from the policy. • Final sentence of criteria 7 should be removed due to lack of evidence to support the requirement and the appropriate use of such land.	• Comment noted • Agree that criteria 2b should read "PRoW 26a" which crosses the site. • Criteria 5 aligns with the requirement of policy NE3 (Woodland, Trees and Hedgerow) which provides further detail on the matter, with this site specific policy seeking use of locally prominent native species on site boundaries in proximity of the Pevensey levels SSSI. • Criteria 8 of the Regulation 19 policy relating to the requirement to residential development, curtilages and associated infrastructure, including equipped play areas, has been included to ensure that sensitive uses are not exposed to unacceptable odour impacts arising from the operation of Hailsham North Wastewater Treatment Works. The approach is informed by evidence relating to amenity impacts and reflects the need to avoid land use conflicts that could prejudice either future residents or the continued operation of essential infrastructure. The Council considers that the wording	• Amended criteria 2b to read PRoW 26a to correct the earlier drafting.

	provides an appropriate safeguard and that its retention is justified	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Major development in the countryside	• Comments noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Development in open countryside • Excessively large and disproportionate • Significant expansion that would permanently alter settlement character and exceed the scale that local infrastructure can support • Plan fails to demonstrate infrastructure capacity to address proposed development • Plan fails to assess cumulative impact of proposed development • Plan fails to prioritise local need • Environmental harm	• Comments noted – Development of this size will inevitably generate changes. The Council recognises the level of local concern regarding the scale of development, settlement character, infrastructure and biodiversity. These issues have been considered through further evidence and policy refinement. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. • Infrastructure required to meet growth from site is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No action required

	• The Sustainability Appraisal includes the assessment of the likely cumulative impact on the Plan.	

SITE Ref: HA14 (FWLP), HA14 (HA) (Reg 19) - Harebeating Farm, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA14 (FWLP), HA14 (HA) (Reg 19) - Harebeating Farm, Harebeating Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth would be required.	• Comment noted. • This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage.	• No change proposed.
Natural England • Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level.	• Comment noted. • The Council agrees that development in proximity to the Pevensey Levels must demonstrate that there will be no unacceptable adverse effects on the hydrological	• No changes proposed.

• Site allocation is within very close proximity to the Pevensey Levels and will need to demonstrate how hydrological impact pathways are demonstrably avoided.	regime or ecological interest of the designated site. This matter is addressed through Policy CC8 and other relevant environmental policies, which require site-specific assessment and appropriate mitigation where necessary.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

SITE Ref: HA18 (FWLP), HA15 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Oaklands, west of Coldthorn Lane, Ersham Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not Applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan Stage.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA18 (FWLP), HA15 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Oaklands, west of Coldthorn Lane, Ersham Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Ceres Property, Orchestra Land • Site is supported as a sustainable and deliverable allocation, helping meet the housing requirement.	• Support noted. • The Council have reviewed the settlement development boundaries and have updated these to	• Amended the development boundary for Hailsham to incorporate site allocation.

• Site is well located at the edge of Hailsham, adjoining the settlement boundary and sitting between two recently approved residential developments, making it a logical and well-integrated extension to existing growth. • Site has few constraints and is considered deliverable with SHELAA confirming this. • Development will provide social, economic and environmental benefits including affordable housing, support for local economy, biodiversity net gain and opportunities to protect surrounding woodland. • Wish to retain allocation and include site within the settlement boundary so it can contribute to sustainable pattern of growth in Hailsham.	incorporate allocated sites, including HA15 (HA).	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Request a buffer zone between the adjacent Coldthorn Wood and any development on the site.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the Local Plan.	• No change proposed.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA6 (FWLP), HA16 (HA) (Reg 19) – Bolneys Farm, South Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA6 (FWLP), HA16 (HA) (Reg 19) – Bolneys Farm, South Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • Site is adjacent to Ancient Woodland • Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level	• Comments noted and ancient woodland addressed within the site-specific policy and Policy NE4 of the Local Plan.	• No further action required, but the yield has decreased to account for this issue.
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required. • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed.	• Comment noted. This issue must be addressed further at planning application stage and site criteria has been address this concern at criterion 5.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint. • Amended site-specific policy at criterion 5 to include phasing requirement for network reinforcement.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • The site is adjacent to 5ha of Ancient Woodland and policy wording should include the requirement for a buffer	• Site policies address this site-specific matter and should be read alongside other policies in the plan, such Policy NE4, which allocations will need to comply with.	• This site-specific policy has been amended at criterion 2 to address the site-specific matter. The yield has decreased to account for this issue also.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

Hailsham SITE Ref: HA6 (FWLP), HA16 (HA) (Reg 19) – Bolneys Farm, South Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • No reference is made to access nor accessibility • Site has good bus connections to the north of the site, but only a dropped kerb crossing is provided to stay on the footway on A295 South Road (footway is only on one side of the carriageway at one time).	• Comments noted. • The site-specific policy has been amended to ensure enhancements and connectivity issues are address in relation to site specific issues. • Other policies within the Plan require the provision of safe and suitable	• Policy HA 16 (HA) has been amended to include further requirements in relation to accessibility and necessary improvements at criterion 6. • This site-specific policy has been amended at criterion 2 to address the site-specific matter of Ancient

• Additional bus stops would be required closer to the site. • An access on the A22 is not considered to be viable and an access on A295 South Road is difficult due to the proximity to Eagles Roundabout and speeds require good visibility. Access provision would therefore need to be reviewed in detail. • Suitable buffer will need to be provided from the Ancient Woodland	access, and any development would need to comply with those policies. The Plan should be read as a whole.	Woodland. The yield has decreased to account for this issue also.
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*" • Southern Water infrastructure crosses the site, the following wording should be included: "*Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes*."	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at the planning application stage.	• Amended policy at criterion 5 to include a requirement to address the issue raised. • No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

JW Stratton • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Object Assemble Ltd • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CRPE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Countryside location on the edge of settlement, adjacent to the woodland.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements in locations such as this between existing built form and neighbouring industrial development. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• No action required
The Woodland Trust • The site is adjacent to 5ha of Ancient Woodland and policy wording should include the requirement for a buffer	• The site-specific policy addresses this matter and should be read alongside other policies in the plan, such as NE4, which allocations will need to comply with.	• This site-specific policy has been amended at criterion 2 to address the site-specific matter of Ancient Woodland. The yield has

		decreased to account for this issue also.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HA15 (FWLP), HA17 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at the Paddocks, South Road, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HA15 (FWLP), HA17 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at the Paddocks, South Road, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth would be required.	• Comment noted. • This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage.	• No change proposed.
Natural England • Welcome the inclusion of policy CC8 requirement SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey level.	• Comment noted. • The plan should be read as a whole. The protection of ancient woodland is addressed through Policy NE4 and a minimum buffer of 25m will be required unless detailed	• No change required.

• Site allocation is adjacent to ancient woodland which is afforded robust protection in the NPPF from direct loss and degradation through indirect impacts.	assessments demonstrate otherwise.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

SITE Ref: HAR1 (FWLP), HAR1 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Castle Farm, Withyham Road, Hartfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HAR1 (FWLP), HAR1 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Castle Farm, Withyham Road, Hartfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. • The site is 500metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatment works.	• The Council notes these comments. Development proposals will be required to take account of existing utility infrastructure, including sewerage assets and any associated easements, through the detailed design and planning application process. The Council agrees that the amenity of future occupiers must be protected from potential odour impacts associated with wastewater treatment infrastructure, and proposals will be expected to demonstrate an acceptable relationship with	Comment noted. No changes required.

• New development must be adequately separated from a wastewater treatment works, to safeguard the amenity of future occupiers. • This approach is endorsed by paragraph 180(e) of the NPPF which requires the planning system to prevent new development from being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected, by unacceptable levels of pollution. • Sensitive development within 500m of a WTW should have an odour assessment carried out (in consultation with SW) in order to agree the 1.5 OdU contour, within which no sensitive development should be located. • We will therefore need appropriate planning policy wording to be associated with these site allocations in future versions of the Local Plan, for example - Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	existing treatment works through appropriate technical assessment where necessary. Requirements relating to drainage, wastewater infrastructure, easements, odour assessment and infrastructure safeguarding are addressed through the relevant infrastructure, environmental health, drainage and design policies of the Local Plan, together with consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers at the planning application stage.	
Natural England • Lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design.	• The Council agrees that development within the High Weald National Landscape should conserve and enhance its natural beauty, landscape character and special qualities. Proposals within the National	Comment noted. No changes required.

	Landscape will be assessed against the relevant landscape and design policies of the Local Plan, which require development to be sensitively designed and integrated into its surroundings. The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides appropriate safeguards to ensure that impacts on the High Weald National Landscape are avoided or appropriately mitigated.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Site reference HAR 1 allocates for 5 dwellings. We object to this allocation for the following reasons: • The western boundary of the proposed site, bound by a small copse and stream, forms an important and highly legible visual and landscape termination to the existing settlement to the west. To 'spill' beyond this copse to the east with new development	• The Council notes the objection. The suitability of HAR1 has been assessed through the site selection process, informed by landscape, heritage, environmental and settlement pattern evidence. The Council acknowledges the sensitivity of the site and its location within the High Weald National Landscape. However, the allocation has been	Comment noted. No changes required.

would adversely impact on the settlement character and form, and encroach into the undeveloped countryside of the AONB in a prominent location. • Development on this side would infill the important green gap between the existing settlement and the sporadic few dwellings further along Withyham Road, coalescing these to the detriment of the landscape character here, and undermining the functional and visual countryside context of these originally early 20th century farmworkers cottages probably associated with Castle Farm to the north- east. • We consider this has been significantly under-played in the LUC assessment of the site (p269 of their Landscape & Visual Appraisal: Potential Development Sites in the High Weald AONB: Appendix A) in the context of dispersed settlement character in the AONB. However, that assessment rightly also highlights that the site displays many of the defining components of character that define the natural beauty of the High Weald, including that the site is part of a medieval field system, a historic routeway (PRoW) runs northwards through the site, and we agree with the LUC conclusion that the site would be of high sensitivity to small scale residential development. • We consider the development of the site would be contrary to a number of the	identified on the basis that a limited amount of development can be accommodated subject to appropriate design, layout, landscaping and mitigation measures that respond to the site's landscape setting, rural character and other constraints. The Council considers that the allocation is capable of being developed in a manner that conserves the character of the area and complies with the relevant policies of the Local Plan, including those relating to the High Weald National Landscape. The Council therefore remains satisfied that the allocation is appropriate.	

objectives of the High Weald AONB Management Plan. We do not consider that the substantial harms we (and LUC) have identified above to the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB of development of the site could be mitigated, relating as those harms do to the principle of development of this site. • As such, we consider the allocation of the site for development would not conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB, would be contrary to para 182 of the NPPF, and we consider the site should not be allocated for development in the Wealden District Local Plan.		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: HAR1 (FWLP), HAR1 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Castle Farm, Withyham Road, Hartfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water Requested an odour assessment, agreed with the statutory wastewater undertaker, because HAR1 lies within 500 metres of an operational wastewater treatment works.	• The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW as other sites do in the area, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	No change required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Trustees of the Withyham Settlement c/o CLM Ltd • Supported allocation of HAR1 and confirmed that planning application WD/2025/2304/PIP demonstrated capacity for five dwellings. • Requested that HAR1 be included within the Hartfield development boundary.	• The Council welcomed the support for HAR1. The proposed capacity of five dwellings was supported by the available site evidence, including planning application WD/2025/2304/PIP, and was considered appropriate having regard to landscape and heritage constraints. The Council agreed	Amended the Hartfield development boundary to include the allocated HAR1 site.

• Sought clearer justification for Hartfield's overall housing distribution, including how the assumed windfall allowance had been calculated.	that the allocated site should be included within the Hartfield development boundary. Hartfield's wider housing distribution and the windfall allowance were addressed through the spatial strategy and supporting housing evidence and did not justify increasing the capacity of HAR1.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Objected to HAR1 as it would extend development eastwards beyond the copse and stream that form a clear settlement edge and into undeveloped countryside. • Raised concerns that the allocation would reduce the green gap along Withyham Road and harm the character of the High Weald landscape. • Noted that the site forms part of a medieval field system, contains a historic routeway, and had been assessed as highly sensitive to residential development. • Considered the harm incapable of mitigation, contrary to the High Weald Management Plan and paragraph 189 of the National Planning Policy Framework, and objected to extending the development boundary.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the extension of development eastwards beyond existing landscape features, the potential reduction of the green gap along Withyham Road, and the effects on the character of the High Weald National Landscape. The Council also notes the site's historic landscape characteristics. • These matters have been considered through the site assessment process, supporting evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal. The allocation has been assessed against relevant landscape, heritage and environmental considerations, and any development proposals will be required to comply with the allocation requirements and the wider policies of the Local Plan.	Comments noted. No changes required.

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Local Residents, grouped summary, five respondents • Objected to HAR1 on the grounds that it would conflict with the High Weald Management Plan and harm the High Weald National Landscape, including its landscape character, historic field pattern, biodiversity, wildlife, rural setting and dark skies. • Considered that insufficient weight had been given to advice from the High Weald Management Board and questioned how the Sustainability Appraisal had addressed its concerns. • Requested a more detailed site assessment to demonstrate the suitability of the allocation. • Raised concerns about wider impacts, including light, noise and air pollution, infrastructure and highway pressures, and potential disturbance to habitats and wildlife.	• The allocation has been assessed through the Local Plan evidence base, including landscape, environmental, heritage, infrastructure and sustainability assessments. The Council has had regard to the purposes of the High Weald National Landscape designation, relevant management plan objectives and consultation responses received during the plan-making process. Whilst acknowledging the sensitivity of the site, the Council considers that the scale of development proposed, together with the wider landscape, biodiversity, design and environmental policies of the Local Plan, provide an appropriate framework to avoid or mitigate unacceptable impacts on the High Weald National Landscape and other environmental assets. Detailed matters relating to landscape character, biodiversity, dark skies, highways, drainage, infrastructure and residential amenity would be addressed	Comments noted. No changes required.

	through any subsequent planning application.	

SITE Ref: HAR2 (FWLP), HAR2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Old Crown Farm, Edenbridge Road, Hartfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HAR2 (FWLP), HAR2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Old Crown Farm, Edenbridge Road, Hartfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • The site is 500metres or less from one of our operational wastewater treatment works. • New development must be adequately separated from a wastewater treatment works, to safeguard the amenity of future occupiers. • This approach is endorsed by paragraph 180(e) of the NPPF which requires the planning system to prevent new development from being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected, by unacceptable levels of pollution.	• The Council notes these comments. Development proposals will be required to take account of existing utility infrastructure, including sewerage assets and any associated easements, through the detailed design and planning application process. The Council agrees that the amenity of future occupiers must be protected from potential odour impacts associated with wastewater treatment infrastructure, and proposals will be expected to demonstrate an acceptable relationship with	Comment noted. No changes required.

• Site specific policy wording should therefore be included to account for this in future revisions of the Local Plan, and in subsequent planning conditions for sensitive development. • Sensitive development within 500m of a WTW should have an odour assessment carried out (in consultation with SW) in order to agree the 1.5 OdU contour, within which no sensitive development should be located.	existing treatment works through appropriate technical assessment where necessary. Requirements relating to drainage, wastewater infrastructure, easements, odour assessment and infrastructure safeguarding are addressed through the relevant infrastructure, environmental health, drainage and design policies of the Local Plan, together with consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers at the planning application stage.	
Natural England • Lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design.	• The Council agrees that development within the High Weald National Landscape should conserve and enhance its natural beauty, landscape character and special qualities. Proposals within the National Landscape will be assessed against the relevant landscape and design policies of the Local Plan, which require development to be sensitively designed and integrated into its surroundings. The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides appropriate safeguards to ensure that impacts on the High Weald National Landscape	Comment noted. No changes required.

	are avoided or appropriately mitigated.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Site reference HAR 2 allocates for 6 dwellings. We object to this allocation for the following reasons: • We previously submitted objections to application WD/2021/1494/MAO for development of this site. Although that application was an outline for 12 dwellings, and it is noted the current allocation is for 6 dwellings, nevertheless the issues that we highlighted relating to the harms to the High Weald AONB of the principle of development of the site still pertain. • These issues included that the site ais part of a medieval field system, and that a historic routeway (PRoW) runs across the southern boundary of the site. • In addition, the site occupies a highly elevated position in relation to Edenbridge Road.	• The suitability of HAR2 has been assessed through the site selection process, informed by landscape, heritage, environmental and sustainability evidence. The Council acknowledges the site's location within the High Weald National Landscape and the sensitivity of its landscape setting. However, the allocation has been identified on the basis that a limited scale of development can be accommodated, subject to appropriate design, layout, landscaping and mitigation measures that respond to the site's constraints and surroundings. The Council considers that the allocation is capable of being developed in a manner that conserves the	Comment noted. No changes required

• It is considered that development northwards of the existing modern development of Sackville Lane would not respect the existing settlement pattern of Hartfield, which is primarily focussed on the 'L' shape street pattern of the High Street and Castlefields, and would represent an uncharacteristic and harmful encroachment into the undeveloped countryside of the AONB in this area. • We do not consider that the harms we (and LUC) have identified above to the landscape character and natural beauty of the AONB of development of the site could be mitigated, relating as those harms do to the principle of development of this site. • As such, we consider the allocation of the site for development would not conserve and enhance the High Weald AONB, would be contrary to para 182 of the NPPF, and we consider the site should not be allocated for development in the Wealden District Local Plan.	character and appearance of the area and accords with the relevant policies of the Local Plan, including those relating to the High Weald National Landscape, heritage assets and landscape character. Detailed matters relating to visual impact, settlement pattern, public rights of way and biodiversity would be addressed through any subsequent planning application.	
Landstrom Group Ltd • CR3, CR4, HAR2, HEA2, HEA3, HEA4, HEA5, HEA8, WIT1, WIT2 These allocations listed are all within the High Weald AONB and will cumulatively (if not individually) represent large scale development in conflict with draft policy NE7.	• Comments noted. The spatial strategy seeks to meet identified housing needs through a balanced distribution of development, including limited growth in settlements within the High Weald National Landscape, where justified by the evidence. The availability of alternative land	Comment noted. No changes required

• While it is acknowledged that some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB.	outside the designation has been considered alongside settlement sustainability, deliverability and other constraints. Each allocation must also satisfy the statutory duty to conserve and enhance the National Landscape.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 6

SITE Ref: HAR2 (FWLP), HAR2 (HA) (Reg 19) – Land at Old Crown Farm, Edenbridge Road, Hartfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Requested an odour assessment, prepared in consultation with the statutory wastewater undertaker, because HAR2 lies within 500 metres of an operational wastewater treatment works.	• The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW as other sites do in the area, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole.	Comment noted. No changes required.

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No Responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Trustees of the Withyham Settlement c/o CLM Ltd • Supported the allocation of HAR2 for housing. • Considered the site capable of accommodating more than six dwellings while respecting its landscape and heritage constraints, and requested that the capacity be increased to around ten homes. • Requested that HAR2 be included within Hartfield's development boundary and that the overall level of development and windfall allowance for Hartfield be clarified.	• Support for the allocation is noted. The proposed capacity reflects the Council's site assessment, including landscape, heritage, access and deliverability considerations. An increase to around ten homes would require robust evidence demonstrating that the additional development could be accommodated without unacceptable effects. The windfall strategy is considered as part of the wider spatial strategy.	Comment noted. Retain the allocation at six dwellings. Amended the Hartfield development boundary to include the allocated HAR2 site.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Objected to HAR2 because development north of Sackville Lane would not respect Hartfield's established settlement pattern and would cause harmful encroachment into undeveloped countryside within the nationally designated landscape. • Identified the site as part of a medieval field system, crossed along its southern boundary by a historic public right of way, and occupying an elevated position above Edenbridge Road.	• The Council notes the site's historic landscape characteristics, including its association with a medieval field system, the presence of a public right of way and its elevated position. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process, Sustainability Appraisal and supporting evidence base, including landscape and heritage considerations. The allocation has been identified as capable of accommodating	Comment noted. No changes required.

• Considered the landscape harm inherent to the principle of development and not capable of mitigation; concluded that the allocation would conflict with national policy and should be removed.	development subject to the wider policies of the Local Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Local Residents (4 responses) • Objected to HAR2 and other allocations within the High Weald National Landscape, stating that the Council should act on the advice of the High Weald Management Board and treat the Management Plan as a material consideration. • Requested more detailed site assessment of landscape, historic environment and biodiversity effects. • Raised concerns about harm to settlement character, wildlife, rural remoteness and dark skies, together with increased light, noise and air pollution and inadequate infrastructure and road capacity.	• The allocation of HAR2 and other sites within the High Weald National Landscape has been informed by the Local Plan evidence base, including landscape, heritage, biodiversity, infrastructure and sustainability assessments. The Council has had regard to the High Weald National Landscape Management Plan and consultation responses received during plan preparation. Whilst acknowledging the sensitivity of sites within the National Landscape, the Council considers that the proposed allocation, together with site-specific requirements and the wider landscape, biodiversity, heritage and design policies of the Local Plan, provides an appropriate framework to conserve and enhance the special qualities of the High Weald National Landscape. Detailed matters relating to landscape impacts, biodiversity, dark skies, infrastructure and	Comment noted. No changes required.

	highways would be considered through the planning application process.	

SITE Ref: HEA5 (FWLP), HEA1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at and surrounding Rothershaw, High Street, Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: HEA5 (FWLP), HEA1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at and surrounding Rothershaw, High Street, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting.	• Comment noted. • The Council acknowledges the presence of Southern Water infrastructure crossing the site and the need for appropriate easements and stand-off distances to be taken into account in the design and layout of any future development. These matters will be considered through the planning application process in consultation with the relevant utility provider, and development proposals will be required to demonstrate that existing infrastructure can be	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint

	appropriately accommodated or diverted where necessary.	
Natural England • The majority of this allocation site is nationally important priority habitat. • The identification of this allocation site does not appear to comply with Wealden Local Plan Policy NE1 or the NPPF. • The site lies within the High Weald National landscape	• Comments noted. • The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by the available environmental evidence. Development proposals will be required to avoid, minimise and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on priority habitats in accordance with the biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken	• Comment noted. No changes required.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • The Parish Council does not object to HEA5. • HEA5 is well located in terms of existing residential development, not least Millennium Way, but will need to be carefully designed and laid out to avoid adverse impacts on National Landscape (AONB) and Priority Habitats. • Access could be an issue, and ideally combined with the existing Millennium Way development, subject to practicality.	• Comments noted. Any development proposal for HEA1 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that it conserves and enhances the special qualities of the High Weald National Landscape, appropriately protects Priority Habitats and provides safe and suitable access. • The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides appropriate safeguards.	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to the northern two thirds of the proposed allocation as it lies within the National Landscape. • The northern part of the site contains a large area of Priority Habitat and a strip of Ancient Woodland. • It is unacceptable to include Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland within a development allocation – fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the HWNL and conflicts with NPPF paras 189, 192 and 193.	• Objection noted. • Any development proposal will be required to conserve and enhance the High Weald National Landscape and protect Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland in accordance with national policy and the wider policies of the Local Plan. The detailed site design process will ensure that these environmental constraints are appropriately taken into account. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed	• No change required.

• These habitat areas should not be included as recreational or amenity space within a development. • Request that site boundary is redrawn to exclude the Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland.	development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and Priority Habitat (NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
The Woodland Trust • Object to the northern part of the allocation as it includes ancient woodland. • Notes that this is a smaller part of the larger Tilsmore Wood ancient woodland which adjoins the site. • Request that the site boundary is redrawn to exclude this area.	• Objection noted. • Any development proposal will be required to protect Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland in accordance with national policy and the wider policies of the Local Plan. The detailed site design process will ensure that these environmental constraints are appropriately taken into account. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and Priority Habitat (NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required.
Landstrom Group Ltd • Object to HEA5 alongside CR3, CR4, HAR2, HEA2, HEA3, HEA4, HEA8, WIT1 and WIT2 as they are all within the HWNL and will cumulatively (if not individually)	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need,	• No change required

represent large scale development in conflict with draft policy NE7. • While it is acknowledged that some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB.	including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • The cumulative impact of the sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgement, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to HEA5. • Conclusion has been drawn based on designing out problems at planning stage. • Concern over drainage capacity. • Lack of services e.g. dentist, schools, doctors	• Objection noted. • Infrastructure required to meet growth in the Local Plan is set out in policy and the supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), accompanying the Local Plan.	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 8

SITE Ref: HEA5 (FWLP), HEA1 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at and surrounding Rothershaw, High Street, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • The Council did not make any site-specific comments for HEA5 and refers back to the Reg 18(1) comments. • Overall, the Parish Council objects to allocations HEA1-HEA9.	• Comments noted. Any development proposal for HEA1 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that it conserves and enhances the special qualities of the High Weald National Landscape, appropriately protects Priority Habitats and provides safe and suitable access. • The Council considers that the existing policy framework provides appropriate safeguards.	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to the northern two thirds of the proposed allocation as it lies within the National Landscape.	• Objection noted. • Any development proposal will be required to conserve and enhance the High Weald National Landscape and protect Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland in	• No change required.

• The northern part of the site contains a large area of Priority Habitat and a strip of Ancient Woodland. • It is unacceptable to include Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland within a development allocation – fails to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the HWNL and conflicts with NPPF paras 189, 192 and 193. • These habitat areas should not be included as recreational or amenity space within a development. • Request that site boundary is redrawn to exclude the Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland. • Objects to the proposed extension of the Heathfield development boundary northwards (to include the site). • Does not object to allocation of southern third of the site (outside the HWNL) and a small area immediately north of this that lies within the HWNL but outside the Priority Habitat, subject to site-specific policies protecting the adjacent wooded copse.	accordance with national policy and the wider policies of the Local Plan. The detailed site design process will ensure that these environmental constraints are appropriately taken into account. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and Priority Habitat (NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
The Woodland Trust • Object to the northern part of the allocation as it includes ancient woodland. • Notes that this is a smaller part of the larger Tilsmore Wood ancient woodland which adjoins the site.	• Objection noted. • Any development proposal will be required to protect Priority Habitat and Ancient Woodland in accordance with national policy and the wider policies of the Local Plan. The detailed site design process will ensure that these	No change required.

• Request that the site boundary is redrawn to exclude this area.	environmental constraints are appropriately taken into account. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and Priority Habitat (NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to allocation HEA5. • Argue that Wealden District Council should give significant weight to the advice of the High Weald Management Board and treat the High Weald Management Plan as a material consideration in decision-making • Concerns that the proposal has not been supported by sufficient assessment of landscape, historic and biodiversity impacts within the High Weald National Landscape • Objections highlight potential conflict with the High Weald Management Plan, • Concern that the allocation could adversely affect the area's rural character, remoteness and tranquillity. • Greater regard should be given to Dark Skies policies, with concerns about increased artificial lighting	• Objection noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No change required

• Development is viewed as having wider environmental impacts beyond the site itself, including light, noise, air pollution and wider habitat disturbance. • Proceeding contrary to the High Weald Management Board's advice would suggest the Council is disregarding expert advice and the objectives of the High Weald Management Plan.	• The landscape evidence base takes full account of the latest High Weald National Landscape Management Plan and the objectives within it when assessing impact and sensitivity of the site. This has informed site selection alongside other relevant evidence base.	

SITE Ref: HEA7 (FWLP), HEA2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at Heathfield Police Station, Heathfield

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: HEA7 (FWLP), HEA2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at Heathfield Police Station, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. This needs to be taken into account when designing the layout of any proposed development. • An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required, which may affect site layout or require diversion. This easement should be clear of all proposed buildings and substantial tree planting. • We will therefore need appropriate planning policy wording to be associated with this site allocation in future versions of the Local Plan, for example - Layout of the development must be planned to ensure future access to existing sewerage	• Comment noted. Existing utility infrastructure and associated easements are important considerations in the design and layout of development proposals. Detailed matters relating to the safeguarding of sewerage infrastructure, maintenance access, easement requirements and any necessary diversion works will be addressed through the planning application process in consultation with the relevant statutory undertakers. The Council considers that existing site requirements, together with the wider infrastructure and design policies of the Local Plan, provide an appropriate framework	• No further action required – allocations/yield takes account of the constraint.

infrastructure for maintenance and upsizing purposes.	to ensure that development takes account of utility infrastructure constraints and operational requirements.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Local Residents		
• Conclusion has been drawn based on designing out problems at planning stage. • Concern over drainage capacity. • Lack of services e.g. dentist, schools, doctors	• Comments noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and	• No change required

	supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) accompanying the Local Plan.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: HEA7 (FLWP), HEA2 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at Heathfield Police Station, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to the proposed site allocations affecting Heathfield and Waldron parish, including HEA7. • The Parish Council referred to its previous comprehensive representations on HEA1 to HEA9 and asked that those earlier comments be read alongside the Focused Local Plan response. • The response raised wider concerns relating to landscape impact within the High	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA,	• No change required

Weald National Landscape, settlement form, drainage, highways, access, heritage impacts and cumulative effects of development across the parish.	landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the sites in Heathfield and Waldron parish is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: HEA2 (FWLP), HEA3 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the south west of Ghyll Road, Tilsmore, Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 19	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 17

SITE Ref: HEA2 (FWLP), HEA3 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the south west of Ghyll Road, Tilsmore, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Allocation lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design	• The Council agrees that development within the High Weald National Landscape should conserve and enhance its natural beauty, landscape character and special qualities. The allocation will be subject to the relevant landscape, design and environmental policies of the Local Plan, which require development to respond sensitively to its setting and avoid unacceptable harm to the National Landscape.	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • HEA2, including its location within the High Weald National Landscape and its contribution as undeveloped open space close to Heathfield. • Raise highway concerns due to the site's location near the junction of Tilsmore Road and Ghyll Road, on a steep hill, with traffic calming measures already under pressure. • Request retention of public footpath no. 77, protection of TPO trees, native hedge and tree planting, separation from Jubilee Park, strengthened boundary planting, and no vehicular link into adjoining land. • Raise additional concerns about surface water drainage, flooding and the need to safeguard adjoining National Landscape land from further development pressure.	• Concerns noted • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the allocation, including its location within the High Weald National Landscape, its contribution as undeveloped land on the edge of Heathfield and the potential effects on local landscape character. The Council also notes concerns relating to highway safety, traffic impacts, surface water drainage and flooding. • The Council recognises the importance of retaining Public Footpath 77, protecting existing trees and hedgerows, providing appropriate landscaping and maintaining separation from adjoining open land. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process and supporting evidence base and are reflected in the site-specific requirements and wider policies of the Local Plan.	• No changes required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Vistry Group @ Savills • Strongly support the allocation for housing. • Believe that the allocation should be extended to maximise housing delivery on potentially developable land and to secure	• Support welcomed. • The extent of the site allocation and the indicative capacity of 35 dwellings have been informed by the site assessment process, evidence base and consideration	• No change required

environmental, ecological and health benefits. • Promoting site for around 45 dwellings. State that technical work supports delivery of 40-45 dwellings. • Consider that WDC will need to explore every available option to bring forward sustainable development within the District, particularly when potential sites are in well-connected and sustainable locations. • To assist the site in delivering the required BNG on site, and to help to deliver other aspects, it would be appropriate to include all three fields within the site allocation.	of site-specific constraints, including landscape, environmental, infrastructure and design considerations. Whilst the Council acknowledges the view that a higher number of dwellings may be achievable, it considers that the proposed allocation represents an appropriate and deliverable capacity that balances housing delivery with the need to achieve a high-quality development and address environmental and landscape constraints. The Council is satisfied that the allocation provides sufficient opportunity to deliver biodiversity enhancements and other site requirements.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Do not object to this allocation in principle, however a site-specific policy should address matters of: ○ Ensuring retention of the site boundary hedgerows, including that along Ghyll Road, and that on the south- eastern boundary of the site, that bounds the historic routeway (PRoW) here, so as to maintain both landscape character and habitat features, and perceptual qualities of the site and historic routeway.	• Comments noted. • The importance of retaining and integrating existing landscape features, including hedgerows and public rights of way, has been considered through the site assessment process. Development proposals will be required to respond appropriately to site characteristics, landscape features, biodiversity interests and local settlement character through the detailed design and	• No change required.

○ Built development supporting settlement character and pattern. ○ Eventual quantum of dwellings to be informed by the above.	layout of the scheme. The indicative capacity of the allocation reflects a balanced assessment of the site's opportunities and constraints, with the final form and layout of development to be determined through the planning application process.	
Landstrom Group Ltd • Allocation alone and in combination with others in Heathfield and the wider area represent large scale development in conflict with draft policy NE7. • While it is acknowledged that some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB	• Comments noted • The site allocation has been assessed through the Local Plan preparation process, including consideration of reasonable alternatives, landscape impacts, housing needs, sustainability and the objectives of the High Weald National Landscape. The Council acknowledges that development within the National Landscape requires careful consideration; however, the spatial strategy and site selection process have concluded that the allocation is appropriate and capable of being developed in a manner consistent with the relevant policies of the Local Plan, including Policy NE7. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the	• No change required

	proposal in question and its context.	
Sheepsetting Pre-school • Object to allocation • Concerns raised about safety of pedestrians, especially children, as the pavement leading down from Sheepsetting Lane to Ghyll Road is extremely narrow. • With more traffic the journey will become extremely dangerous and local families will choose to drive instead of walk. This will make the already overwhelmed roads around the school even more so. • Use of more cars instead of walking will also be detriment to the wellbeing of children both mentally and physically.	• The Council notes the objection and the concerns raised regarding pedestrian safety, traffic generation and accessibility. The allocation has been assessed through the SHELAA and SA process, including consideration of transport and accessibility matters. Any planning application for the site will be required to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users and that the impacts of development on the local highway network and pedestrian environment can be appropriately mitigated where necessary.	• No change required

Local Residents		
• Object to allocation HEA2 and consider the site unsuitable for housing development. • There is concern that the site assessments do not address the issues related to planning application WD/2020/0170. • Raise concerns about loss of High Weald National Landscape countryside, AONB character, open	• Concerns noted • The allocation has been assessed through the Local Plan site selection process, informed by landscape, heritage, transport, flood risk, infrastructure and sustainability evidence. The Council acknowledges the sensitivity of the site and the concerns raised regarding its location within the High	• No change required

views, dark skies, hedgerows, trees, habitats, biodiversity and wildlife.Raised highway and pedestrian safety concerns, including congestion on Ghyll Road, Tilsmore Road, Sheepsetting Lane and Pook Reed Lane, narrow or absent pavements, school drop-off and pick-up traffic, poor visibility, road maintenance, construction traffic and emergency access. • Raise concerns that development will worsen drainage, surface water run-off, flooding and waterlogging, particularly affecting Ghyll Road, Tilsmore Road, Pook Reed Lane and lower-lying properties. • Raise infrastructure concerns, including pressure on GP surgeries, dentists, schools, public transport, water supply, sewage, utilities, power supply and local services. • Consider that the proposal could set a precedent for further expansion into adjoining National Landscape land and referenced the previous withdrawn planning application for a larger scheme. • Raised concerns about residential amenity, including noise, disturbance, light pollution, loss of outlook, privacy, rural character and the impact on nearby properties.	Weald National Landscape. However, the allocation is considered capable of accommodating development in a manner that responds to site constraints and accords with the relevant policies of the Local Plan. Detailed matters relating to landscape impacts, biodiversity, drainage, flood risk, highways, pedestrian safety, infrastructure capacity, residential amenity and design will be addressed through the planning application process, supported by appropriate technical assessments where necessary. • The Council considers that the allocation represents an appropriate balance between meeting identified housing needs and protecting the District's environmental and community assets. Alternative sites and reasonable alternatives have been considered through the plan-making process.	

• Suggested that brownfield sites, town-centre sites, smaller-scale development, affordable/social housing or better-connected locations should be prioritised instead.		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 24	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 24

SITE Ref: HEA2 (FWLP), HEA3 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the south west of Ghyll Road, Tilsmore, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • Reiterate previous concerns about HEA2, including its location within the High Weald National Landscape and its contribution as undeveloped open space close to Heathfield. • Raise highway concerns due to the site's location near the junction of Tilsmore Road and Ghyll Road, on a steep hill, with traffic calming measures already under pressure. • Request retention of public footpath no. 77, protection of TPO trees, native hedge and	• Concerns noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base	• No change required

tree planting, separation from Jubilee Park, strengthened boundary planting, and no vehicular link into adjoining land. • Raise additional concerns about surface water drainage, flooding and the need to safeguard adjoining National Landscape land from further development pressure.	documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the sites in Heathfield and Waldron parish is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to allocation HEA2 and consider the site unsuitable for housing development. • Raise concerns about loss of High Weald National Landscape countryside, AONB character, open views, dark skies, hedgerows, trees, habitats, biodiversity and wildlife. • Raised highway and pedestrian safety concerns, including congestion on Ghyll Road, Tilsmore Road, Sheepsetting Lane and Pook Reed Lane, narrow or absent pavements, school drop-off and pick-up	• The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by landscape, biodiversity, transport, flood risk, infrastructure and sustainability evidence. The Council recognises the site's location within the High Weald National Landscape and the concerns raised regarding environmental, highway, drainage and amenity impacts. However,	• No change required

traffic, poor visibility, road maintenance, construction traffic and emergency access. • Raise concerns that development will worsen drainage, surface water run-off, flooding and waterlogging, particularly affecting Ghyll Road, Tilsmore Road, Pook Reed Lane and lower-lying properties. • Raise infrastructure concerns, including pressure on GP surgeries, dentists, schools, public transport, water supply, sewage, utilities, power supply and local services. • Consider that the proposal could set a precedent for further expansion into adjoining National Landscape land and referenced the previous withdrawn planning application for a larger scheme. • Raised concerns about residential amenity, including noise, disturbance, light pollution, loss of outlook, privacy, rural character and the impact on nearby properties. • Suggested that brownfield sites, town-centre sites, smaller-scale development, affordable/social housing or better-connected locations should be prioritised instead.	the Council considers that the site is capable of accommodating development subject to compliance with the site-specific requirements and the wider policies of the Local Plan. • The Council is satisfied that the allocation represents an appropriate balance between meeting identified housing needs and protecting the District's environmental and community assets.	

SITE Ref: HEA3 (FWLP), HEA5 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land south of Burwash Road and east of Tower Street

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: HEA3 (FWLP), HEA5 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land south of Burwash Road and east of Tower Street		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Allocation contains priority habitat of national importance which should be avoided. • The allocation lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design	• Comments noted. • The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by the available environmental evidence. Development proposals will be required to avoid, minimise and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on priority habitats in accordance with the biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan, including site specific criterion at 3 and 4. Detailed ecological surveys and assessments will be required at the planning application stage where appropriate.	• No change required.

	• The allocation is subject to the relevant landscape, design and environmental policies of the Local Plan, which require development to respond sensitively to its setting and avoid unacceptable harm to the National Landscape.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • HEA3 was previously granted planning permission for the same number of houses proposed	• Comment noted.	• No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Landstrom Group Ltd • Allocation alone and in combination with others in Heathfield and the wider area represent large scale development in conflict with draft policy NE7. • While it is acknowledged that some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB.	• Comments noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal,	• No change required

	including the site-specific assessments being undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the sites in Heathfield and Waldron parish is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgement, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA3. • Development will be a prominent and significant intrusion into the High Weald National Landscape on the southern side of the A265, where the open rural character contributes to the landscape setting of Heathfield. • Concerns include harm to the rural setting of Heathfield, erosion of the clear urban-to-rural transition along the historic ridgeway route, conflict with High Weald AONB Management Plan objectives and national policy, and cumulative impacts with HEA4, HEA10 and HEA11. • Also, object to the proposed enlargement of the Heathfield development boundary to include HEA3 and HEA4.	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessments undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether	• No change required

	development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Conclusion has been drawn based on designing out problems at planning stage. • Concern over drainage capacity. • Lack of services e.g. dentist, schools, doctors	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessments undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP).	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 8

SITE Ref: HEA3 (FWLP), HEA5 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land south of Burwash Road and east of Tower Street		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to HEA3 as part of the wider proposed Heathfield and Waldron site allocations. • The Parish Council does not support the allocations affecting the parish and refer to its earlier comprehensive representations on HEA1 to HEA9. • In relation to nearby and cumulative allocations, concerns are raised about prominent ridge development, erosion of the gap between Heathfield and Broad Oak, the setting of Heathfield Park and nearby heritage assets, drainage, highways and access.	• Objections and concerns noted. The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the	• No change required

	proposal in question and its context.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA3. • Development will be a prominent and significant intrusion into the High Weald National Landscape on the southern side of the A265, where the open rural character contributes to the landscape setting of Heathfield. • Concerns include harm to the rural setting of Heathfield, erosion of the clear urban-to-rural transition along the historic ridgeway route, conflict with High Weald AONB Management Plan objectives and national policy, and cumulative impacts with HEA4, HEA10 and HEA11. • Also, object to the proposed enlargement of the Heathfield development boundary to include HEA3 and HEA4.	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	• No change required

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Residents object to HEA3 and other allocations within the High Weald National Landscape. • Concerns included the need to conserve and protect the High Weald, insufficient site assessment, impacts on landscape, biodiversity, historic character, dark skies, wildlife, pollution, infrastructure and highway safety.	• Objections and concerns noted. The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The allocation will be subject to the relevant landscape, biodiversity, heritage, design, transport and infrastructure policies of the Local Plan, and detailed site-specific policy criterion will be assessed through the planning application process.	• No change required.

SITE Ref: HEA4 (FWLP), HEA6 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at 15 Tower Street , Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: HEA4 (FWLP), HEA6 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at 15 Tower Street , Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Allocation contains priority habitat of national importance which should be avoided. • The allocation lies within the High Weald National Landscape therefore impacts to the conservation of the natural beauty of the High Weald National Landscape must be avoided through sensitive design	• Comments noted. • The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by the available environmental evidence. Development proposals will be required to avoid, minimise and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on priority habitats in accordance with the biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan (such as NE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required.

	• The allocation is subject to the relevant landscape, design and environmental policies of the Local Plan, which require development to respond sensitively to its setting and avoid unacceptable harm to the National Landscape.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Any development of HEA4 needs to be carefully assessed against this location in the National Landscape (AONB). As well as Heathfield Park it abuts, and residential properties in Tower Street, either side of the access indicated to be gained.	• Concerns noted. The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Any development proposal for HEA6 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that it conserves and enhances the natural beauty, landscape character and special qualities of the High Weald	• No change required

	National Landscape and avoids unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity, access arrangements and the setting of adjacent land and properties.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to allocation of HEA4. • The inclusion of Priority Habitats within allocated development sites is not considered acceptable. The south-western third (approx.) of the site is Priority Habitat. • Concerns include heritage impacts (site lies immediately north of and adjoins Heathfield Park Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden); impact on adjacent ancient woodland; Priority Habitat present within the site; impacts on ecological links between onsite vegetation and the adjacent ancient woodland; harm to rural setting and significance of Heathfield Park and impact on National Landscape.	• Comments and objections noted • The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by the available environmental evidence. Development proposals will be required to avoid, minimise and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on priority habitats in accordance with the biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan (such as Policy NE1), ancient woodland (Policy NE4) and for heritage assets (Policies HE1 and HE2). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA.	• No change required
The Woodland Trust	• General objections noted. • The Council recognises that ancient woodland is an	• No change required

• Objects in general to ancient woodland being included within allocated development sites. Requests review of allocated sites to exclude such areas and implementation of appropriate buffer zones. • The southern boundary of HEA4 adjoins ancient woodland within Heathfield Park and concerns raised about impact of development on it. Request a buffer zone.	irreplaceable habitat that requires a high level of protection. The allocation has been informed by the site assessment process and environmental evidence available at the plan-making stage. Development proposals for HEA6 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts on ancient woodland and its setting are avoided and that appropriate buffer zones and mitigation measures are provided where necessary in line with Policy NE4.	
Landstrom Group Ltd • Allocation alone and in combination with others in Heathfield and the wider area represent large scale development in conflict with draft policy NE7. • While it is acknowledged that some quantum of development may be required within the AONB to support local housing needs in exceptional circumstances, those same needs and circumstances should first be capable of supporting the allocation of alternative sites where they are available and achievable outside of the AONB	• Comments noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessments being undertaken. • The cumulative impact of the sites in Heathfield and Waldron	• No change required

	parish is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgement, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Conclusion has been drawn based on designing out problems at planning stage. • Concern over drainage capacity. • Lack of services e.g. dentist, schools, doctors	• Comments noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA, landscape evidence and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting the Infrastructure Delivery Plan accompanying the Local Plan.	• No change required.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 9	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: HEA4 (FWLP), HEA6 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land at 15 Tower Street, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to HEA4 as part of the wider proposed Heathfield and Waldron site allocations. • The Parish Council does not support the allocations affecting the parish and refer to its earlier comprehensive representations on HEA1 to HEA9. • In relation to nearby and cumulative allocations, concerns are raised about prominent ridge development, erosion of the gap between Heathfield and Broad Oak, the setting of Heathfield Park and nearby heritage assets, drainage, highways and access.	• Objections and concerns noted. The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No change required

	• The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • Any development proposal for HEA6 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that it conserves and enhances the natural beauty, landscape character and special qualities of the High Weald National Landscape and avoids unacceptable impacts on neighbouring amenity, access arrangements and the setting of adjacent land and properties.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to allocation of HEA4 individually and in combination with HEA3, HEA10 and HEA11. • Concerns include heritage impacts (site lies immediately north of and adjoins Heathfield Park Grade II listed Registered Park and Garden); impact on adjacent ancient woodland; Priority Habitat present within the site; impacts on ecological links between onsite vegetation and the adjacent ancient woodland; harm to rural setting and significance of Heathfield Park; impact on National Landscape; cumulative impacts	• Comments and objections noted • The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process and informed by the available environmental evidence. Development proposals will be required to avoid, minimise and, where necessary, mitigate impacts on priority habitats in accordance with the biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan (such as Policy NE1), ancient woodland (Policy NE4) and for heritage assets (Policies HE1 and HE2). The plan should	• No change required

with HEA3, HEA10 and HEA11 and objection to extending the Heathfield development boundary.	be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The cumulative impact of the Heathfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgement, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	
The Woodland Trust • Objects in general to ancient woodland being included within allocated development sites. Requests review of allocated sites to exclude such areas and implementation of appropriate buffer zones. • The southern boundary of HEA4 adjoins ancient woodland within Heathfield Park and concerns raised about impact of development on it. Request a buffer zone.	• General objections noted. • The Council recognises that ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat that requires a high level of protection. The allocation has been informed by the site assessment process and environmental evidence available at the plan-making stage. Development proposals for HEA6 (HEAW) will be required to demonstrate that adverse impacts on ancient woodland and its setting are avoided and that appropriate buffer zones and mitigation measures are provided where necessary in line with Policy NE4.	• No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• Residents object to HEA4 and other allocations within the High Weald National Landscape. • Concerns include disregard for the High Weald Management Plan, insufficient assessment of landscape, historic and biodiversity impacts, effects on dark skies, wildlife, pollution, infrastructure and highway safety. • Additional comments on the Sustainability Appraisal state that it has not shown how concerns from public bodies have been addressed and refers to the Council's duty to conserve and enhance the National Landscape.	• Objection and concerns noted. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • In preparing the Plan, the Council has had regard to the High Weald National Landscape Management Plan and the need to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, character and special qualities of the National Landscape. The allocation will be subject to the relevant landscape, biodiversity, heritage, design, transport and infrastructure policies of the Local Plan, and detailed impacts will be assessed through the planning application process.	• No change required

	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan within the Local Plan.	

SITE Ref: HEA10 (FWLP), HEA7 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Parklands, Burwash Road, Heathfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

No responses received at this stage of consultation.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: HEA10 (FWLP), HEA7 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Parklands, Burwash Road, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to HEA10 • The Parish Council raises concerns about the potential development boundary expansion, stating that HEA10 and HEA11 would extend development along the prominent ridge in the High Weald landscape, erode the gap between Heathfield and Broad Oak, and affect the	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in	Comment noted. No changes required.

setting of Heathfield Park and nearby heritage assets. • Concerns about drainage into Heathfield Park, traffic and highway access, including the junction with Newick Lane, and the relationship with the Grade II listed Old Half Moon.	accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA10, individually and cumulatively with HEA3, HEA4 and HEA11. • Concerns that the combined allocations will represent a substantial eastward extension of Heathfield into the High Weald National Landscape, potentially amounting to major development. • Concerns included harm to landscape character, the rural setting of Heathfield, the setting of Heathfield Park, and impacts on the High Weald National Landscape contrary to the NPPF.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, including the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Cumulative impact of the sites and Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	Comment noted. No change required
The Woodland Trust	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the importance of protecting ancient	• No changes required

• Object to ancient woodland areas being included in, or affected by, allocated sites. • For HEA10 and HEA11, the response identifies proximity to Heathfield Park Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and requests an appropriate buffer between any development and the ancient woodland.	woodland as an irreplaceable habitat. The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process, informed by environmental evidence and consultation responses. Development proposals affecting the site or other sites in close proximity to ancient woodland will be required to demonstrate that adverse effects on ancient woodland and its setting are avoided and that appropriate buffers and mitigation measures are provided where necessary in line Policy NE4. These matters are addressed through the relevant biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan and will be considered in detail at the planning application stage.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: HEA11 (FWLP), HEA8 (HEAW) (Reg 19) – Land to the rear of Breton House, Cross in Hand

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

No comments received at this stage of consultation.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: Allocation: HEA11 (FWLP), HEA8 (HEAW) – The Old Half Moon, Burwash Road, Heathfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council • Object to HEA11 • The Parish Council raises concerns about the potential development boundary expansion, stating that HEA11 and HEA10 would extend development along the prominent ridge in the High Weald landscape, erode the gap between Heathfield and Broad Oak, and affect the	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base	• No changes needed

setting of Heathfield Park and nearby heritage assets. • Concerns about drainage into Heathfield Park, traffic and highway access, including the junction with Newick Lane, and the relationship with the Grade II listed Old Half Moon.	documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding drainage impacts on Heathfield Park, highway safety and access arrangements, including the junction with Newick Lane, and the potential effects on the setting of the Grade II listed Old Half Moon. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process and supporting evidence base and will be subject to further detailed assessment at the planning application stage. Any future proposal will be required to demonstrate that impacts on heritage assets, drainage, highway safety and access can be appropriately mitigated in accordance with wider policies of the Local Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to HEA11, individually and cumulatively with HEA3, HEA4 and HEA10.	• The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options	• No change required

• Concerns that the combined allocations will represent a substantial eastward extension of Heathfield into the High Weald National Landscape, potentially amounting to major development. • Concerns included harm to landscape character, the rural setting of Heathfield, the setting of Heathfield Park, and impacts on the High Weald National Landscape contrary to the NPPF.	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Cumulative impact of the sites and Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	
The Woodland Trust • Object to ancient woodland areas being included in, or affected by, allocated sites. • For HEA10 and HEA11, the response identifies proximity to Heathfield Park Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland and requests an appropriate buffer between any development and the ancient woodland.	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the importance of protecting ancient woodland as an irreplaceable habitat. The allocation has been assessed through the site selection process, informed by environmental evidence and consultation responses. Development proposals affecting the site or other sites in close proximity to ancient woodland will be required to demonstrate that adverse effects on ancient woodland and its setting are avoided and that appropriate buffers and mitigation measures	• No changes required

	are provided where necessary in line with Policy NE4. These matters are addressed through the relevant biodiversity and environmental policies of the Local Plan and will be considered in detail at the planning application stage.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: Allocation: HMX1 (FWLP), HMX1 (HMX) (Reg 19) - Land at Collins Honda, Hailsham Road, Herstmonceux

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: HMX1 (FWLP), HMX1 (HMX) (Reg 19) - Land at Collins Honda, Hailsham Road, Herstmonceux		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • This allocation contains nationally important priority habitat and irreplaceable ancient woodland.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Herstmonceux Parish Council	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns	• No change

• Object to the allocation, citing uncertainty over the site boundary, ownership and the proposed housing capacity, with concern about potential overdevelopment. • Request clarification regarding the proposed number and tenure of dwellings, including the reference to all homes being affordable. • Raise concerns regarding existing surface water drainage and highway safety issues, which are considered to be underestimated. • Note that the site is previously developed land in active business use, and question its availability if existing businesses or tenancies remain. • Concern that redevelopment could result in the loss of existing businesses, employment, retail and service provision, including facilities considered important to the rural community. • Identify a number of errors or ambiguities within the site assessment, including references to the wrong settlement and statements regarding integration of the site.	regarding the site boundary, indicative capacity, housing tenure, surface water drainage and the potential loss of existing businesses and employment. The identified errors and matters requiring clarification within the site assessment are also noted however the fundamental assessment conclusion remains. The site's availability, capacity and existing uses have been considered through the site assessment process, and any future development would need to satisfactorily address drainage, highway and employment impacts through the relevant policies of the Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
		•
Local Residents	• **WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No responses received.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HOR1 (FWLP), HOR1 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land Adjoining Discovery Way and Village Hall, Horam

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: HOR1 (FWLP), HOR1 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land Adjoining Discovery Way and Village Hall, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Object to the draft allocation because the site had been proposed as Local Green Space in the Horam Neighbourhood Plan. It considered that allocating the land for housing directly contradicted the neighbourhood plan approach.	• The Council notes that site was promoted as a Local Green Space through the Horam NDP. However, the NDP Examiner recommended that the proposed designation be deleted as there was no assurance that the site was capable to enduring beyond the plan period or that its designation was consistent with the sustainable development. The	• No change proposed.

	NDP has now been 'made' without that LGS designation. • The site was assessed through the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal and was considered capable of making a modest contribution to housing in a central location adjoining existing development.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to the allocation of HOR1, noting that the site has been proposed as Local Green Space through the Horam Neighbourhood Plan. • Consider the site more appropriate for informal open space and note its identification as accessible natural greenspace in the Council's Open Space Study. • Question the conclusions and robustness of the Sustainability Appraisal for the site. • Raise concerns regarding the site's location within a Major Hazard Site (H2001). • Raise concerns regarding potential land contamination.	• Objections noted. The Council notes the history of the site vis-a-vis Horan's NDP and the concerns regarding the Sustainability Appraisal, major hazard considerations and potential contamination. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process and are addressed through other policies within the Plan. • Any development on land with known or suspected contamination would require appropriate assessment and remediation, where necessary.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 54	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 53

SITE Ref: HOR1 (FWLP), HOR1 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land Adjoining Discovery Way and Village Hall, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council Objects to allocation. • Considers residential development would result in the loss of valuable green space close to the village centre and recreation ground. Highlights its status as a habitat creation area, identification as natural greenspace, Horam's existing greenspace deficit, biodiversity value and the Neighbourhood Plan. • Considers the SA and SHELAA underestimate its green infrastructure, biodiversity, landscape, amenity and wellbeing value and requests that it instead be retained and enhanced as accessible natural greenspace.	• Objection noted. The Council notes the history of the site vis-à-vis the Horam NDP, biodiversity, amenity and wellbeing value of the site, together with its identification as a project in the Neighbourhood Plan. Concerns regarding the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal assessments are also noted. • These matters have been considered through the site assessment process. The Council considers that the proposed small-scale allocation remains appropriate, with important ecological and green infrastructure features to be protected and enhanced through the site-specific requirements and other relevant policies of the Plan.	• No change

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• The majority of respondents object to HOR1 and consider that the site should be retained and enhanced as accessible natural greenspace and habitat, referring to its role as a habitat creation area associated with the Merrydown development, its biodiversity and amenity value, the identified deficiency of greenspace in Horam and aspirations within the Horam Neighbourhood Plan. • Concerns are also raised regarding landscape and village character, traffic, pedestrian safety, pollution, drainage, sewerage and infrastructure. • Several respondents question the conclusions of the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal and request removal of the allocation. One respondent supports the allocation, considering the site suitable for small-scale residential development due to its relationship with existing development and the A267.	• Objections noted. The Council notes the history of the site vis-à-vis the Horam NDP, biodiversity and habitat, local amenity and the relationship of the site with the previous Merrydown development. Concerns regarding highways, drainage, infrastructure and the Sustainability Appraisal are also noted. • The site's environmental and amenity constraints have been considered through the site assessment process and are appropriately addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. The Council considers that the proposed small-scale residential allocation remains appropriate, subject to the protection and enhancement of important ecological features and appropriate provision of green infrastructure.	• No change

SITE Ref: HO4 (FWLP), HOR2 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Clearview Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: HO4 (FWLP), HOR2 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Clearview Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Advises that existing sewerage infrastructure crosses the site and must be accommodated within the development layout. • An appropriate easement should be maintained free from buildings and substantial tree planting, which may influence the developable area or require infrastructure diversion. • Request that the site allocation includes policy wording requiring continued access to sewerage infrastructure for future maintenance and upgrading.	• Comment noted. • This issue is considered in the site assessment supporting the allocation. Policy INF4 contained within the Plan sets out the approach to utilities infrastructure including wastewater. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail.	• No change
Natural England	• Policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development	• No change

• This allocation is surrounded by nationally important priority habitat and impacts must be avoided.	on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Objects because the proposed dwelling capacity would imply demolition of Great Easterfields farmhouse, which it considers to be of historic interest and value, contrary to Policies HE1 and HE2.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the potential historic interest of Great Easterfields farmhouse and the concern regarding its demolition. Any planning application would be required to appropriately assess and respond to the significance of heritage assets in accordance with Policies HE1 and HE2. The detailed layout and treatment of the existing farmhouse would be considered through the planning application process.	• No change
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to the allocation due to concerns regarding the loss of Great Easterfields farmhouse, which is considered to have historic interest and value, contrary to heritage Policies HE1 and HE2.	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding heritage, surface water drainage, ancient woodland, watercourses and biodiversity.	• No change

• Note that development of the site has previously been refused, with concerns relating to surface water drainage and impacts on ancient woodland. Consider that Biodiversity Net Gain would not adequately compensate for impacts on ancient woodland and watercourses. • Reference is made to an enforcement notice affecting the site. • Consider that the site should be retained as green space for the village, noting its identification within the Horam Neighbourhood Plan.	These have been considered through the site assessment process and any planning application would need appropriately address the relevant policies of the Plan. • Previous planning and enforcement matters are noted but do not, in themselves, preclude consideration of the site through the Local Plan process. • The comments regarding the retention of green space are also noted.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 10	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: HO4 (FWLP), HOR2 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Clearview Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Object to the allocation of HOR4 and request that the site is reappraised, with	• Objection noted. The Council notes concerns regarding landscape and visual impact,	• No change

consideration given to reducing the housing yield or removing the allocation. • Note that a recent planning application for development of the site was refused and consider that a reduced scheme would still represent inappropriate backland development. • Concern regarding the site's prominent ridgeline location and resulting landscape and visual impacts, including visibility from distant viewpoints. • Concern about potential impacts on adjacent ancient woodland, as well as the stream and ponds located downhill from the site. • Consider the site to be poorly located in accessibility terms, being over 1.5km walking distance from the village centre and served by relatively infrequent bus services. • Raise concerns that development could exacerbate existing surface water drainage issues on Chiddingly Road. • Question the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal, considering that the landscape, accessibility, biodiversity and drainage constraints have not been adequately reflected in the assessment.	accessibility, surface water drainage and potential effects on ancient woodland and other ecological features. These have been considered through the site assessment process. • The request to reduce the indicative yield or remove the allocation is noted; however, the Council considers the proposed allocation appropriate, subject to detailed assessment and design at planning application stage.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust	• These matters are covered by policies contained within the Plan. Any planning application	No change

• The site adjoins Clear Hedge Farm Shaw ancient woodland, and an appropriate buffer is requested between the ancient woodland and any future development.	proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Local Residents • Object to the allocation of HOR4 and request that the site is removed or the proposed housing yield substantially reduced. • Note that development of the site has previously been refused planning permission, including on landscape grounds, and consider this weighs against its allocation. • Concern that development would constitute backland development inappropriate to Horam's rural character. • Concern regarding landscape and visual impacts, particularly due to the site's prominent ridgeline location and visibility from wider viewpoints. • Potential adverse impacts on adjacent ancient woodland, the ghyll, ponds and other ecological features, including potential pollution from surface water runoff. • Significant concerns regarding surface water drainage, including existing drainage problems on Chiddingly Road and potential for development to exacerbate these issues.	• Objections noted. The Council notes concerns regarding landscape and visual impacts, the site's accessibility, surface water drainage and potential effects on ancient woodland and other ecological features. These have been considered through the site assessment process and any planning application would need appropriately address the relevant policies of the Plan. • Previous planning decisions are noted; however, the allocation has been assessed through the Local Plan process taking account of the proposed scale of development and available evidence. The request to reduce the indicative yield or remove the allocation is noted, but the Council considers the proposed allocation appropriate.	• No change

• Consider the site to be poorly located in accessibility terms, due to its distance from the village centre and relatively infrequent bus services. • Consider that smaller-scale development would be more appropriate to Horam's rural setting. • Question whether the SHELAA/Sustainability Appraisal adequately reflects the identified landscape, drainage, accessibility and environmental constraints.		

SITE Ref: HOR3 (FWLP), HOR3 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land at Great Easterfields, Chiddingly Road, Horam

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: HOR3 (FWLP), HOR3 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land at Great Easterfields, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Object to allocation because surface-water run-off or engineered drainage could damage ancient woodland and increase flows to the Bull River, potentially raising flood risk to streets and dwellings in Hellingly.	• The concerns are noted. Surface-water drainage, effects on ancient woodland and downstream flood risk are material considerations. The evidence base supporting this allocation has considered these matters. Any subsequent planning application will need to be supported by appropriate drainage, flood-risk and ecological evidence to demonstrate compliance in line with the policy requirements of the Development Plan.	• No change

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object due to surface-water run-off or engineered drainage could damage ancient woodland and increase flood risk along the Bull River in Hellingly. They also raised the site's historical and cultural significance, demolition of the historic farmhouse, previous refusal of planning permission, the site's partial location within the H2001 blast zones, and impacts on ancient woodland.	• The objections are noted. The site's heritage significance, the farmhouse, ancient woodland, drainage and downstream flood risk, planning history and any relevant safety constraints have been considered through the evidence base and policy review. The evidence base supporting this allocation has considered these matters. Any subsequent planning application will need to be supported by appropriate drainage, flood-risk and ecological evidence to demonstrate compliance in line with the policy requirements of the Development Plan.	No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	Support: 0	Neutral: 0	Object: 6

SITE Ref: HOR3 (FWLP), HOR3 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Land at Great Easterfields, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **Horam Parish Council** Object to the allocation of HOR3, considering the proposed scale of development inappropriate. • Concern that development would require the demolition of the historic Great Easterfields farmhouse, which is considered to have local heritage significance and is recommended for consideration as a non-designated heritage asset. • Consider that demolition of the farmhouse would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area and result in unnecessary embodied carbon emissions. • Consider the site to be poorly located in accessibility terms, being approximately 1.2km from the village centre and with relatively infrequent bus services. • Raise concerns regarding existing surface water drainage issues on Chiddingly Road,	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of the existing farmhouse, heritage and character impacts, accessibility, surface water drainage, biodiversity and landscape. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process and are addressed through the site-specific requirements and other relevant policies of the Plan. The request to reduce the indicative yield to allow retention of the farmhouse is noted; however, the Council considers the proposed allocation appropriate, subject to detailed design and assessment at planning application stage.	• No change

which could be exacerbated by development. • Raise potential impacts on biodiversity, landscape and townscape character. • Question the conclusions of the Sustainability Appraisal and SHELAA, considering that the environmental, heritage and accessibility impacts have not been adequately reflected. • Request that, rather than removing the allocation entirely, the Council considers a reduced number of dwellings that would enable the existing farmhouse to be retained.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents considered the site unsuitable or sought a smaller allocation. Key concerns were demolition of the historic farmhouse and loss of embodied carbon; harm to local heritage, rural character, landscape and biodiversity; the site's distance from the village centre; poor and potentially unsafe access to infrequent bus services; and possible worsening of surface-water drainage. Several respondents supported retaining and adapting the farmhouse as part of any redevelopment, with fewer dwellings.	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the loss of the existing farmhouse, heritage and landscape impacts, biodiversity, accessibility and surface water drainage. These matters have been considered through the site assessment process and would be addressed through the site-specific requirements and other relevant policies of the Plan. The request to retain and adapt the farmhouse and reduce the	• No change

	number of dwellings is noted; however, the Council considers the proposed allocation appropriate, subject to detailed assessment and design at planning application stage.	

HOR6 (FWLP); HOR4 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Coxlow Farm, Horam Road, Horam

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 24	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 6	**Object:** 16

HOR6 (FWLP); HOR4 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Coxlow Farm, Horam Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • Significant concerns regarding the allocation • Site of key importance for biodiversity with suite of priority habitats • Significant amount of ancient woodland running through and around the site • Further work should be undertaken to explore other allocation sites with less or no environmental impacts • Unclear how impacts will be mitigated or avoided	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. The developable area of the site will differ from the full extent of the site area as submitted through the SHELAA process. The quantum and extent of development allocated takes account of constraints on site and conformity with other policies in the Plan will ensure those constraints and designations are considered. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need. The process	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	is set out in full in the accompanying evidence base.	
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, but adequate space exists on site to address the constraint and still deliver development identified. • Comment noted	• Amend policy to include phasing requirement
The National Grid • Site will be constrained by the presence of NGET infrastructure	• This issue has been considered in site assessment, with the allocation and quantum of development taking account of this constraint. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage.	• No action required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Site would represent a 100% increase in the size of the village • Allocation is too large and unsustainable for the infrastructure • Impact on the character of the village • Contrary to the proposed spatial strategy	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements such as Horam, as set out in the spatial strategy. The village is a Type 3 settlement in the settlement	• No action required

	hierarchy, and a Primary village, offering a number of services and facilities, located in a relatively unconstrained area. The site has been submitted for assessment in full, but the area of developable land and quantum of development is reduced to reflect the site constraints and characteristics. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Gladman Developments Limited • Supportive of the allocation	• Support welcome	• No action required
Parker Dann • The site should be a standalone strategic site allocation policy considering the scale of the allocation	• Comment noted	• Creation of a site allocation policy to guide suitable and appropriate development on site.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Concerns that the allocation includes a number of areas of Ancient Woodland and Priority Habitats which should not be used for recreational/amenity use and therefore not included within the allocation site • Policy should include the need for development to demonstrate a landscape-led approach to	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas, the latter being where development should be directed to. The quantum and extent of development allocated takes account of constraints on site and conformity	• Update to the site allocation policy set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

design and layout which seeks to avoid or minimise adverse impacts on the setting of the High Weald AONB, and safeguards the dark skies of the AONB, and should follow the advice in the High Weald AONB Housing Design Guide.	with other policies in the Plan will ensure those constraints and designations are considered. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4), or the High Weald National Landscape (Policy NE7). The later includes a requirement for landscape-led design. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of surroundings. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider effects.	
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Concerned with the allocation • Scale of development likely to have impacts • Southern part of the site contains a number of constraints that will require bespoke assessment and mitigation • Preliminary ecological appraisals should be provided	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Site allocation Policy notes key designations in the south of the site, with requiring sensitivity to the south and east of the site. Any development	• Update to the site allocation policy set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	will be required to conform with other policies in the Plan.	
The Woodland Trust • Site contains fragmented areas of Ancient Woodland which should be afforded appropriate buffer zones.	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such policy NE4 which sets out the approach to buffer zone in relation to Ancient Woodland.	• Update to the site allocation policy set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas, including to Ancient Woodland
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Site allocation is too large and out of scale with Horam's rural character. • Development would effectively double the size of the village. • Site is considered inconsistent with the draft Local Plan spatial strategy and Horam Neighbourhood Plan. • Adverse impacts on village character, landscape setting and countryside. • Scale of development should be reduced, particularly in the southern part of the site. • Development boundary should be amended to better protect the Cuckoo Trail and surrounding countryside. • Impacts on biodiversity, wildlife habitats, ancient woodland and ecological corridors. • Substantial buffer should be introduced between development and the Cuckoo Trail. • Concerns regarding flood risk, surface water drainage and impacts on existing ponds and watercourses.	• Comments noted. The Council recognises the level of local concern regarding the scale of development, settlement character, infrastructure capacity, traffic, public transport, water and sewerage capacity, landscape, biodiversity and impacts on the Cuckoo Trail. These issues have been considered through further evidence, masterplanning and policy refinement. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability	• Update to the site allocation policy set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

• Inadequate sewage and water infrastructure. • Existing infrastructure, facilities and services cannot support the proposed scale of development. • Concerns regarding highway capacity, traffic generation, access arrangements and road safety. • Insufficient evidence has been provided, particularly in relation to transport and highway impacts. • Lacks supporting detail and is not justified or sound. • Concerns regarding pollution and public health impacts. • Lack of local employment opportunities relative to housing growth. • Existing environmental and drainage issues should be addressed as part of any future development. • Support for the allocation due to the provision of new open space, play facilities and enhanced services and facilities for existing and future residents. • Requests for ongoing consultation with affected residents on drainage, ecological and environmental matters.	Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The Council acknowledges that the proposed allocation differs from the approach contained within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The latter forms part of the development plan and has been taken into account in preparing the Local Plan. However, unlike neighbourhood plans, the Local Plan is required to address strategic development needs across the district and has been informed by the latest available evidence.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 157	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 7	**Object:** 149

SITE Ref: HOR6 (FWLP); HOR4 (HOR) (Reg 19) – Coxlow Farm, Horam Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Site is neighbouring the Horam Brickworks, a safeguarded mineral site, which should be acknowledged and benefit from wording with policy. • The policy should include a package of appropriate highway works to support any junction reconfiguration on the highway such as review of the speed limit and active travel user demands to and from the site. Reference should be made to no accessibility to public transport and a bus service strategy.	• Comments noted	• Policy amended to include policy criteria in relation to Horam Brickworks in line with detailed comments provided, require highway improvements and the need for a sustainable transport strategy.
National Grid Electricity Transmission • The site is crossed by 400kV Bolney–Ninfield overhead transmission lines. • Suggested wording: “The development will include a strategy for responding to the NGET Overhead Cable Route present within the site which demonstrates how the NGET Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the masterplanning stage and how the impact of the assets has been reduced through good design.”	• Comment noted. Transmission infrastructure constraints will be addressed through masterplanning.	• Amend policy with appropriate wording
Southern Water		

• Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed	• Comments noted	• Amend policy to include phasing requirement
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Object to the allocation • Development is of an excessive scale • Fails to take account of the landscape evidence developed by the Parish Council • Impact on the character of the village • Fails to take account of recent changed in services and facilities reducing the sustainability of Horam • Inconsistencies between the development description in the policy and the Sustainability Appraisal (the Sustainability Appraisal include the provision for a community hub and a country park) • Queries raised on extent of the site, as the Parish Council have been informed that the land parcel SHELAA Ref 1172/3030 has not been agreed for inclusion by the landowner.	• Comments noted • The Council carried out an update of the Sustainable Settlement Hierarchy (2026) which did not result in significant changes for the settlement of Horam, as set out. • Evidence submitted by the Parish Council has been reviewed and considered against the evidence gathered via the Council's evidence base. This includes an update to landscape evidence. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed. • The provision of open space has been added to the development description within the policy.

	accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken and consideration of reasonable alternatives. • Site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting and more rural parts of the site to the south and east. • The provision of a community hub is included within the policy via the provision of a community floorspace. • The site has been assessed in its entirety, based on previous submission information. The current ownership/option issue is noted, and the Council note that this may result in the allocation being delivered in parts across the entirety of the Plan period.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Gladman Developments Limited & Brookworth Homes • Supportive of the allocation • Yield should identified as a minimum provision • Notes some repetition between policy criteria and the rest of the local plan	• Comments noted • Yield is considered appropriate for the site and constraints and characteristics, as set out in the evidence base.	• Policy wording has been reviewed to ensure site specific matters are addressed or amended.

• Wording should be added to criteria 4 to acknowledge the need legal agreement with relevant bodies for deliverability purposed • Criteria 10 does not align with the 'Allocated for' section of the policy		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object due to countryside encroachment, ancient woodland, priority habitat, flood risk and disproportionate village growth.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed.
The Woodland Trust • Site contains fragmented areas of Ancient Woodland which should be afforded appropriate buffer zones.	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such policy NE4 which sets out the approach to buffer zone in relation to Ancient Woodland.	• Update to the site allocation policy set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas, including to Ancient Woodland

Walk Wheel Cycle Trust • Seek stronger active travel wording and contributions to improve the Cuckoo Trail/NCN Route 21.	• Noted. Active travel and Cuckoo Trail improvements will be reviewed.	• Policy wording in site allocation policy has been refined and strengthen on the matter
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Raise biodiversity, ancient woodland and ecological network concerns from the scale of allocation.	• Comment noted.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure appropriate development.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong local objection to the scale of HOR6, with residents considering 750–960 homes disproportionate to Horam's village character and likely to transform the settlement into a small town without the infrastructure of a town. • Repeated concerns that existing infrastructure is already overstretched, including GP and dental provision, schools, pharmacy, local shops, parking, water supply, sewerage, electricity, internet and road maintenance. • Concerns that the A267, Horebeech Lane, Chiddingly Road and surrounding rural lanes cannot accommodate construction traffic or long-term traffic from hundreds of additional homes; residents cite congestion, potholes, road safety risks and limited parking. • Many residents object to the site's reliance on private cars due to poor public transport, no railway	• Comments noted. The Council recognises the level of local concern regarding the scale of development, settlement character, infrastructure capacity, traffic, public transport, water and sewerage capacity, landscape, biodiversity and impacts on the Cuckoo Trail. These issues have been considered through further evidence, masterplanning and policy refinement. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure appropriate development. Suitable mitigation will also be required as set out. • Corrections have been made to the policy wording as identified.

station and reduced/irregular bus services, commonly cited as approximately every 75 minutes. • Environmental objections focus on loss of greenfield land, rural landscape character, dark skies, ancient woodland, hedgerows, veteran/oak trees, ponds, ghyll habitats, wildlife corridors and species including bats, owls, badgers, deer, reptiles, amphibians and birds. • Frequent concern that development would harm the rural character and tranquillity of the Cuckoo Trail/NCN Route 21, with requests for substantial separation, retention of fields/green buffers and protection of views and biodiversity along the trail. • Residents raise water, drainage and flooding concerns, including existing hosepipe bans, low water pressure, sewage capacity, tanker use, blocked drains, surface water runoff and downstream impacts on watercourses. • A number of residents suggest the allocation should be removed or substantially reduced, commonly citing 400–500 dwellings as a more proportionate maximum, with development concentrated away from the Cuckoo Trail and sensitive southern/eastern parts of the site. • Development boundaries should be drawn to maintain buffer with sensitive areas to the south and east of the site. • Contrary to the Horam Neighbourhood Plan • Lack of detailed engagement with the Highway Authority • Lack of employment in Horam to accommodate further development • Likely increased air and light pollution	all deliverable or developable options. This spatial strategy approach includes extension to sustainable settlements that offer services and facilities, and bus connections to primary towns or further facilities nearby. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Site allocation Policy sets a quantum of development across the entirety of the site, reduced to ensure a level of development that can be supported in a village of this size whilst still delivering on site infrastructure to address needs. Further reduction has been considered in the Sustainability Assessment as an alternative, but rejected for reasons set out. The site allocation policy also notes key designations in the south of the site, requiring sensitivity to the south and east of the site. Any development will be required to conform with other policies in the Plan. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic	

• The indicative capacity should include a reference to open space • The policy includes an incorrect reference to the A271	Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The Council acknowledges that the proposed allocation differs from the approach contained within the adopted Neighbourhood Plan. The latter forms part of the development plan and has been taken into account in preparing the Local Plan. However, unlike neighbourhood plans, the Local Plan is required to address strategic development needs across the district and has been informed by the latest available evidence.	

SITE Ref: HOR5 (FWLP), Commitment (Reg 19) – Horeham Flat Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: HOR5 – Horeham Flat Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • The allocation site is bordered by priority woodland habitat of national importance and impacts must be avoided.	The ecological sensitivities of the site, including priority habitat and ancient woodland, are recognised. This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Thought site was to be used for new/additional allotments. • Also mention trees have been illegally felled on the site.	• Comments noted. This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan • The reported felling of trees is a separate matter from the Local Plan allocation process.	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan

Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Thought site was to be used for new/additional allotments. • Also mention trees have been illegally felled on the site.	• Comments noted. This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan. • The reported felling of trees is a separate matter from the Local Plan allocation process.	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: HOR5 – Horeham Flat Farm, Chiddingly Road, Horam		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Note the site now has planning permission for four of the six dwellings identified as part of allocation.	• Comments noted. • This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan

• State site should therefore be removed from a future version of the plan.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • The site contains veteran and notable oak trees recorded on the Ancient Tree Inventory. A specialist tree survey is requested, with appropriate root protection areas identified and protected throughout the design, construction and occupation of any development.	• Comments noted. • This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Horam Parish Council • Note the site now has planning permission for four of the six dwellings identified as part of allocation. • State site should therefore be removed from a future version of the plan.	• Comments noted. • This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan	• This site now has planning permission and is counted as a committed site in the Local Plan

SITE Ref: IS1 (FWLP), IS1 (IS) (Reg 19) - Holly Gap Farm, Isfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: IS1 (FWLP), IS1 (IS) (Reg 19) - Holly Gap Farm, Isfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Sifelle Limited @ Batcheller Monkhouse • Support draft allocation as it is close to village services like the farm shop, village hall, pub, recreation ground, and bus stops. • Request a larger area at Holly Gap Farm should be considered for more dwellings.	• Support noted. • The site's proximity to existing village services, facilities and public transport is recognised. The request to extend the allocation at Holly Gap Farm to accommodate additional development is noted; however, the Council has assessed the	• No change.

	development potential of the site through the site assessment process and considers the proposed allocation to represent an appropriate scale of development having regard to the site's constraints and the character of the settlement.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents were concerned about potential flood risk, restrictive covenant on the land next to the road which prevents building and that any housing should be sited further back from the road.	• Flood risk and the suggested siting of development further back from the road are recognised considerations and would inform the detailed design and layout of any future proposal. The restrictive covenant is a private land matter and does not, in itself, preclude the allocation of the site.	• No change.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: IS1 (FWLP), IS1 (IS) (Reg 19) - Holly Gap Farm, Isfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Support for the site's allocation due to its central and sustainable location within Isfield, with good access to existing services and public transport. • The site could accommodate approximately 30 dwellings, including affordable housing, alongside a replacement shop/café and publicly accessible green space. • Landscape impacts are considered limited, with boundary hedgerows and green space proposed to be retained. • The site benefits from an existing access and is considered capable of being developed within 1–3 years following planning permission.	• Support noted.	• No change, site is proposed for 10 dwellings. There are heritage constraints that limit the capacity of that site.

• Pre-application advice has been sought for schemes of 29 and 35 dwellings.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: IS2 (FWLP), IS2 (IS) (Reg 19) – Land to rear of Sandpit Cottage. Station Road, Isfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: IS2 (FWLP), IS2 (IS) (Reg 19) – Land to rear of Sandpit Cottage. Station Road, Isfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Isfield Parish Council • The inclusion of IS2 'Land to rear of Sandpit Cottage', Station Road, Isfield is supported The settlement is sustainable and has regular bus service connections to the higher order settlement of Uckfield. The site is within the proposed development boundary and forms a natural and logical extension to the settlement, is free from major constraints in landscape and environmental terms.	• Support welcomed • The site is considered an appropriate location, but only for the quantum of development proposed – 10 dwellings. This is justified based on the sustainability and prevailing densities within the local area.	• No changes required

• Agree with the SHELAA for the 114/3040 site, byt questions the SA/SEA findings and requires clarity over the 10 dwelling yield.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Parker Dann • The inclusion of IS2 'Land to rear of Sandpit Cottage', Station Road, Isfield as a residential site allocation listed in SA1 is supported. • The settlement is sustainable and has regular bus service connections to the higher order settlement of Uckfield. • The site is within the proposed development boundary and forms a natural and logical extension to the settlement, is free from major constraints in landscape and environmental terms	• Support welcomed • The site is considered an appropriate location, but only for the quantum of development proposed – 10 dwellings. This is justified based on the sustainability and prevailing densities within the local area.	• No changes required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• The access point to this site would be dangerous. • Site not feasible for people wishing to use public transport. • No footpaths to site. • Concern of flood risk.	• The site is considered an appropriate location, but only for the quantum of development proposed – 10 dwellings. This is justified based on the sustainability of the location. This is evidenced in the Council's SHELAA assessment.	• No changes required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: IS2 (FWLP), IS2 (IS) (Reg 19) – Land to rear of Sandpit Cottage. Station Road, Isfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: HEL3 (FWLP), LOH2 (HEL) (Reg 19) - Woods Corner, North Street, Lower Horsebridge

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HEL3 (FWLP), LOH2 (HEL) (Reg 19) - Woods Corner, North Street, Lower Horsebridge		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Existing infrastructure crosses the site which will need to be considered. • Planning policy should therefore require development layouts to safeguard access to the sewer network for ongoing maintenance and future capacity upgrades.	• Comment noted. · This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	• **WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No responses received.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: HEL5 (FWLP), LOH3 (HEL) (Reg 19) – Field at North Street, Lower Horsebridge

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total:	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: HEL5 (FWLP), LOH3 (HEL) (Reg 19) – Field at North Street, Lower Horsebridge		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Hellingly Conservation Area, Site to the rear of gardens, situated in the between cemetery	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy	• Reviewed site-specific policy wording to ensure heritage, access and tree impacts are

and Primary School - rather challenging location. • The access would require loss of mature trees	requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	appropriately addressed where necessary.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• These developments will put a further strain on their local current amenities & those of the neighbouring areas that currently cannot cope.	Comments noted. Infrastructure capacity and the ability of local amenities to accommodate growth has been considered through the Local Plan evidence base and infrastructure planning process.	No change proposed. Infrastructure requirements will continue to be addressed through IDP.

SITE Ref: HEL6 (FWLP), LHO4 (HEL) (Reg 19) – HEL6 – Land at Horselunges Manor, Hellingly

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – N/A, site proposed for allocation in FWLP

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: HEL6 (FWLP), LHO4 (HEL) (Reg 19) – HEL6 – Land at Horselunges Manor, Hellingly		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Gladman Developments Limited • Support the allocation of Land at Horselunges Manor, Hellingly for residential development. • They state that the 6.13ha site sits on the western edge of the settlement, fronts Hailsham Road, can be accessed directly from Hailsham Road and could come forward within the plan period.	• Support noted. The site has been identified through the site assessment and site selection process. A site specific policy has been developed which requires specific consideration to appropriate access arrangements, as well as nearby heritage and environmental considerations.	• See site specific policy wording. • The indicative capacity should remain.

• They consider the site to be a logical extension to Hailsham, within walking and cycling distance of Hailsham High Street, and not affected by statutory nature conservation designations, heritage assets or flood risk areas. • Gladman indicate that their latest concept suggests the site may accommodate up to 75 dwellings, rather than the 60 dwellings identified in the draft allocation, and that development would provide a balanced mix of market and affordable housing.	• The opportunity to increase yield on site is noted, however only the southern part of the site is deemed suitable for development and that part of the site is located at an edge of village location, adjacent to a number of heritage assets. A lower density development, sensitive to this location, is deemed more suitable for the number indicated in allocation.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to HEL6, raising concerns about development in an unsustainable countryside location within/near Hellingly Conservation Area. • They state that HEL5 and HEL6 would wrap around Hellingly Cemetery, resulting in a combined 74 dwellings, and refer to the need to maintain the tranquillity of the cemetery.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. These policies include specific criteria on the need to consider sensitivities in proximity of the site.	• The site specific policy now supports the allocation, including reference to maintaining the tranquillity of the adjacent cemetery. Any subsequent planning application would also need to comply with other relevant policies within the Local Plan.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to HEL6, with concerns that development would place further pressure on local and neighbouring amenities already considered unable to cope.	• Comments noted. Infrastructure capacity, local services, transport impacts and flood risk/drainage have been considered through the site assessment process. The site	• The site specific policy now supports the allocation. Any subsequent planning application would also need to comply with

• Specific concerns are also raised about HEL6 being located on high groundwater and heavy clay soils, with development considered likely to worsen flood risk in Lower Horsebridge, increase discharge into the River Cuckmere, and contribute to downstream flooding impacts at Hellingly, Lower Horsebridge, Alfriston and West Dean.	now has a specific policy supporting its allocation.	other relevant policies within the Local Plan.

SITE Ref: MA3 (FWLP), MA2 (MA) (Reg 19) – Land East of Top Drive, Maresfield Park, Maresfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: MA3 (FWLP), MA2 (MA) (Reg 19) – Land East of Top Drive, Maresfield Park, Maresfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Maresfield Parish Council • Raised concerns that allocation would provide a low-density allocation likely to deliver larger 4 to 6 bedroom homes, which would not reflect local need for smaller and more affordable 3-bedroom homes.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding housing mix and affordability. Any future development would be expected to provide an appropriate mix of dwelling sizes and tenures having regard to identified local housing needs and relevant Local Plan policies. Concerns regarding the	No change.

• Also raised concerns about the impact of 10 additional dwellings on the narrow private road network within Maresfield Park.	capacity and suitability of the private road network are also noted and would need to be satisfactorily addressed as part of any future development proposal.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Jarvis Land SE Ltd • Supported draft allocation, including the proposed indicative capacity of 10 dwellings.	• Support noted.	• No change.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to MA3, considering development outside the existing development boundary would result in further expansion of Maresfield and harm its village identity. • Question the allocation of the site given that it was previously rejected through the 2024 SHELAA, principally due to access constraints and the limited capacity of Top Drive to accommodate additional traffic. • Consider that these access constraints remain, including the absence of an existing vehicular access to the site and the restricted nature of Top Drive. • Raise concerns regarding increased traffic within Maresfield Park.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the development boundary, village character, access, traffic and biodiversity. The Council has undertaken further assessment of potential development sites to inform the Local Plan, including consideration of previously identified constraints. Development boundaries are being reviewed through the plan-making process to accommodate identified development needs where appropriate. Any	• No change.

• Concern about the loss of existing green space and impacts on wildlife and biodiversity.	development of the site would need to demonstrate satisfactory access and highway arrangements and appropriately address ecological impacts in accordance with the site-specific requirements and other relevant policies of the Plan.	

SITE Ref: MA1 (FWLP), MA3 (MA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Maresfield, A22, Maresfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 16	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 13

SITE Ref: MA1 (FWLP), MA3 (MA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Maresfield, A22, Maresfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • The site lies within the zone of influence of the Ashdown Forest SPA.	• Comment noted – allocation takes account of this constraint	• No action required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Maresfield Parish Council • Significant housing allocation for Maresfield, although understand the benefit in terms of community provision of such development • Understand the value of providing comprehensive development at this location • Support the allocation subject to the following criteria: - a new roundabout and access off the A22 to serve the site; - community benefits, such as, but not limited to, a new village hall;	• Comments noted and the specific comments on support and community needs are welcomed. • Not all suggestions, in particular in relation to infrastructure provision and delivery timing, are within the Council's control and would require further consultation with the relevant authorities. Securing infrastructure requirements will need to show compliance with CIL Regulation 122	• No action required

- an extension to the Maresfield Recreation Ground and the provision of suitable green space within the development; - the whole site be developed as one, rather than in plots and/or phases; - the use of conditions to ensure the community benefits come forward as certain numbers of houses are completed; - that Wealden DC seek to expedite the development by requiring the works start within a period substantially less than the normal 3 years of the permission being extant. - the community and the parish council are fully engaged at a pre-application stage and during the application itself to resolve matters as above, and also housing mix, scale and design. - any infrastructure that is required is implemented prior to development commencing.	test. Infrastructure contributions will be secured via CIL to be spend towards the provision of infrastructure, but the explicit projects and timing of those cannot be determined at this stage. • The Council is currently implementing reduced time limits for scheme commencement to support housing delivery, as set out in the Housing Action Plan. This measure is kept under review. • Pre-application engagement is encouraged but not within the Council's gift to enforce. Notwithstanding, this Consultation Statement is a public document and issues can hopefully be noted.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Approximately 1ha of Ancient Woodland within the site boundary, at the south western end which should be excluded.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and	• Update to the site allocation policy MA1 to better illustrate constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

	proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Loss of green space used by residents. • Land should be used for carbon offsets and biodiversity. • Premature site • Already significant change for the village of Maresfield • Road through the village used as an alternative to major road • Development has split the village in 4 separate sections • Centre of the village overwhelmed • Threat to the strategic gap between Uckfield and Maresfield which should be identified and protected. Risk of coalescence. • Impact of surface water and drainage issues. • Lack of local infrastructure and services • Impact on wildlife • Site is car reliant • Access issues and impact on public rights of way	• Comments noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The site allocation process has been informed by relevant evidence which considers both individual and cumulative effects, including potential coalescence of settlements. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in	• No action required

	relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 8	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: MA1 (FWLP), MA3 (MA) (Reg 19) – Land south of Maresfield, A22, Maresfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • Should include reference to a public transport strategy as the majority of the site is in excess of 400m from committed bus stops • Ancient woodland in the south-west corner of the site and an ancient and/or veteran tree in the north-west, which is also an irreplaceable habitat. The minimum buffer required to ancient woodland is 15m, but larger buffers may be required to reduce the impacts of a major residential development such as recreational impacts, disturbance, garden escapes, compaction, changes to hydrology, increased predation by domestic pets etc. Buffers should be maintained as semi-natural habitat, excluding	• Comments noted	• Amend policy to include a criterion for a public transport strategy • Update to the site allocation policy MA1 to better illustrate constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

residential gardens and infrastructure such as footpaths, cycleways, SuDS, play areas Appropriate buffers to the ancient/veteran tree will also be required in accordance with Natural England's standing advice.		
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*"	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address issue raised
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Maresfield Parish Council • Supportive of the policy, although has objected to applications on the site • Policy should include an extension to the Maresfield Recreation Ground as a community benefit	• Welcome support • Securing infrastructure requirement will require to meet the CIL Regulation 122 test.	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
St Philips Land Limited • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest		

• Site is within the Ashdown Forest Zone of Influence, and include Ancient Woodland, but Plan fails to provide an updated HRA and provision for the associated SANGS • Plan fails to give sufficient attention to connectivity and corridors	• An updated HRA and associated evidence has been collated in formulation of the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. • The plan should be read as a whole and avoid repetition of national policy. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such a Policy NE1 (Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery) which speaks in relation to corridors and stepping stones.	• No actions required
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Site includes biodiversity opportunity area, priority habitat and flood zone 2 and 3 • Countryside location • Inappropriate location for development detached from the village and in close proximity with bypass	• Comments noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Update to the site allocation policy MA1 to better illustrate constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
The Woodland Trust	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable	• Update to the site allocation policy MA1 to better illustrate constraints,

• Approximately 1ha of Ancient Woodland within the site boundary, at the south western end which should be excluded.	areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to proposed level of growth in Maresfield – impact on character, lack of amenity and impact on infrastructure	The Council have considered the distribution of growth to settlement locations across the district as part of its development strategy, and considered overall proposed growth in settlements against sustainability and infrastructure considerations.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: NIN1 (FWLP), NIN1 (NIN) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to Ninfield Reservoir, High Street, Ninfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 5	**Support:**	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: NIN1 (FWLP), NIN1 (NIN) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to Ninfield Reservoir, High Street, Ninfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No responses		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Ninfield Parish Council • Object to the site allocation as it conflicts with policies aimed at protecting and enhancing environmentally important areas. • Site has previously been considered unsuitable due to designation as SSSI. • Concerned that the wildlife area adjacent to the water tower is a unique local habitat that can't be replaced.	• Comments noted. • The site is not designated as a SSSI and therefore does not benefit from statutory protection afforded to these sites. • The council recognises the ecological value of the adjacent local wildlife site. The site allocation has been assessed with regard to its environmental constraints, and any future development proposal would be required to respond appropriately to the presence of the	• No change proposed.

	neighbouring Local Wildlife Site. This would include retaining suitable buffers, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, and ensuring that development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the site's biodiversity value.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Object to the site allocation. • Site is entirely within a Local Wildlife Site and argues that development is likely to result in the loss or harm of part of the designated site, contrary to national policy and guidance requiring local plans to identify, safeguard and enhance locally designated wildlife sites and ecological networks. • Concerned that insufficient ecological evidence has been used to inform the allocation, noting that the site assessment acknowledges potential ecological harm and the need for further surveys. While the SHELAA suggests the allocated area may be of lower ecological value due to the reservoir, no supporting evidence is provided.	• The Council notes the representation regarding the site's location within/adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. The ecological value of Local Wildlife Sites is recognised, and the Council considers that this matter is appropriately addressed through Policy NE1 (Biodiversity), which seeks to protect designated and non-designated biodiversity assets and requires development to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts where necessary. Any future planning application will be required to be supported by appropriate ecological surveys and demonstrate compliance with Policy NE1 and other relevant national and local planning policies.	• No change proposed

High Weald National Landscape • Site allocation is within the HWNL but given its location we do not consider this allocation would affect the setting.	• Comment noted.	• No change proposed.
The National Grid • Site allocation is unsuitable as development can't be delivered effectively due to constraints associated with existing infrastructure.	• The Council notes the concerns regarding the deliverability of the site in light of existing electricity transmission infrastructure. The Council recognises the importance of ensuring that development proposals take account of site-specific constraints, including utility infrastructure, and that high standards of design and sustainable development are achieved. The Council's assessment indicates that development can be accommodated through an appropriately designed scheme that responds to the infrastructure constraints.	• No change proposed.
Landstorm Group Ltd • Object to the site allocation as it contradicts Planning Practice Guidance relating to designated Local Wildlife Sites.	• The council recognises the ecological value of the adjacent local wildlife site. The site allocation has been assessed with regard to its environmental constraints, and any future development proposal would be required to respond	• No change proposed.

	appropriately to the presence of the neighbouring Local Wildlife Site. This would include retaining suitable buffers, incorporating ecological mitigation and enhancement measures, and ensuring that development does not result in unacceptable impacts on the site's biodiversity value.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: NIN1 (FWLP), NIN1 (NIN) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to Ninfield Reservoir, High Street, Ninfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No responses	•	•
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No responses		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Sussex Wildlife Trust • Object to site allocation • Site is entirely within a Local Wildlife Site and will lead to destruction of a significant proportion of designated area. • Unclear what ecological information has been provided to inform the site allocation.	• The Council notes the representation regarding the site's location within/adjacent to a Local Wildlife Site. The ecological value of Local Wildlife Sites is recognised, and the Council considers that this matter is appropriately addressed through Policy NE1 (Biodiversity), which seeks to protect designated and non-designated biodiversity assets and requires development to avoid, mitigate and compensate for adverse impacts where necessary. Any future planning application will be required to be supported by appropriate ecological surveys and demonstrate compliance with Policy NE1 and other relevant national and local planning policies.	• No change proposed.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		

SITE Ref: POL6 (FWLP), POL1 (POL) (Reg 19) – Royal Mail Sorting Office, Polegate

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: POL6 (FWLP), POL1 (POL) (Reg 19) – Royal Mail Sorting Office, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
On the Go - Polegate High Street Shop Objected to the inclusion of POL6, stating that it is not known whether Royal Mail wishes to relocate and that the site currently supports employment through the sorting office and an existing bicycle shop. The respondent considered that redevelopment could undermine local	Comments noted. The concerns relate to the potential loss or relocation of existing employment uses, the impact on local businesses, and consistency with wider objectives for sustainable travel, climate change and	The Council consider that the site is available for residential development and therefore remains as a potential site allocation.

employment, local business support and climate change objectives by potentially requiring employees to commute further, lose employment or move jobs outside the district.	support for the local economy. These matters will be considered through the assessment of the site allocation and any future detailed proposal.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Objected to the allocation, stating that redevelopment of the Royal Mail Sorting Office would not be consistent with encouraging employment because it could remove jobs from the sorting office and the existing cycling shop. The response also raised concerns that loss of the cycling shop would conflict with green policy aims, support for local High Street businesses, and encouragement of cycling on the Cuckoo Trail and A27 cycle path.	Comments noted. The concerns relate to the potential loss or relocation of existing employment uses, the impact on local businesses, and consistency with wider objectives for sustainable travel, climate change and support for the local economy. These matters will be considered through the assessment of the site allocation and any future detailed proposal.	The Council consider that the site is available for residential development and therefore remains as a potential site allocation.

SITE Ref: POL7 (FWLP), POL2 (POL) (Reg 19) – Polegate Town Centre Car Park / Polegate Station Car Park, Polegate

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: POL7 (FWLP), POL2 (POL) (Reg 19) – Polegate Town Centre Car Park / Polegate Station Car Park, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Harwood Properties Limited Supported allocation of the Polegate Station Car Park sites for residential development but requested higher-density development than identified in the focused Local Plan. The response stated that the sites are brownfield, adjacent to the mainline railway station and in a highly sustainable location. It also sought clarification on the stated capacity figures and suggested that the larger site	Comments noted. Higher densities are appropriate in highly sustainable locations, but on balance it is considered that the site can accommodate the identified yield of 25 dwellings. This enables sufficient car parking to remain for other services and facilities.	No change proposed.

could provide at least 50 new homes with commercial ground floor frontage, while the smaller site could provide at least 36 units.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Willingdon and Jevington Liberal Democrats Objected to POL7, stating that development of the town centre car park would have a detrimental effect on the vitality of Polegate High Street and make access to the nearby medical centre more difficult. The response also raised concerns about congestion on the A2270 and additional rat-running in nearby Willingdon side streets, particularly at school times.	Comments noted. Transport matters have been considered through transport evidence, infrastructure planning and the overall assessment of the site allocation. A more modest amount of development will ensure that a satisfactory level of parking provision for other services and facilities remain.	No change proposed.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Objected to the inclusion of POL7, stating that Polegate Town Centre Car Park should not be developed because it is the town's only car park and provides essential parking for High Street users, rail users, disabled parking, school drop-off and pick-up, and access to local services. Concerns were raised about the impact of approved housing growth on parking demand, lack of parking enforcement, limited alternative on-street parking, the private and constrained access road, and potential harm to the vitality of Polegate High Street.	Comments noted. Transport matters have been considered through transport evidence, infrastructure planning and the overall assessment of the site allocation. A more modest amount of development will ensure that a satisfactory level of parking provision for other services and facilities remain.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: POL4 (FWLP), POL3 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (west), Eastbourne Road, Polegate

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 4	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:**

SITE Ref: POL4 (FWLP), POL3 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (west), Eastbourne Road, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • The site may require local wastewater network reinforcement to accommodate the full level of growth proposed. This is not considered a constraint to development, provided that development is appropriately phased alongside the delivery of the necessary infrastructure improvements.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Include appropriate policy wording to address issue in allocation policy, relating to phasing and timeframe for delivery.
Natural England • The allocation site appears to be in the setting of the South Downs National Park, and we refer you to our comments regarding Policy NE8	• Comments noted.	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CARE UK • Strong support is expressed for the allocation of POL4, which is considered to be a sustainable and appropriate location for development within Polegate. • Concern is raised that restricting the allocation to housing alone would not represent the most efficient use of the site and would be inconsistent with national planning policy objectives relating to the effective use of land. • Site is considered capable of accommodating a mix of uses, including residential development, commercial floorspace and specialist accommodation for older people. • Propose that the following wording should be included in allocation POL4 in order for the draft Plan to be sound: "Yield: 60 units or a care home of circa 80-bedrooms and circa 2,000sqm commercial floorspace (Class E(a))".	• Support noted • The Plan seeks to allocate residential development, but does not dictate residential type or products to be delivered on specific sites. Policy POL4 does not restrict this, as the allocation is for 'residential' development with an indicative capacity of 60 dwellings, to allow flexibility in the form these dwellings take. Subject to compliance with other policies in the Plan, any application for development will be considered on its merits. • The position on mixed use is noted. However, the evidence base updated as part of the emerging Local Plan does not identify any need for retail allocations in the district, and employment need is met as set out elsewhere int eh Plan. Noting this and the characteristics of this site, the allocation remains as set out.	• No change required

Aldi Stores Ltd • Strong support for allocation for development • Consider that the allocation should be updated to reflect emerging proposals for a mixed-use scheme incorporating an Aldi food store and Care UK care home accommodation • Recommend the allocation wording provides sufficient flexibility to accommodate these proposals as part of the site's future development.	• Support noted • The Plan seeks to allocate residential development, but does not dictate residential type or products to be delivered on specific sites. Policy POL4 does not restrict this, as the allocation is for 'residential' development with an indicative capacity of 60 dwellings, to allow flexibility in the form these dwellings take. Subject to compliance with other policies in the Plan, any application for development will be considered on its merits. • The position on mixed use is noted. However, the evidence base updated as part of the emerging Local Plan does not identify any need for retail allocations in the district, and employment need is met as set out elsewhere int eh Plan. Noting this and the characteristics of this site, the allocation remains as set out.	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:**	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:**

SITE Ref: POL4 (FWLP), POL3 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (west), Eastbourne Road, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	Include appropriate policy wording to address issue in allocation policy, relating to phasing and timeframe for delivery.
East Sussex County Council • No objection is raised to the principle of residential development itself. • The key issue identified is the design and location of site access, with a preference for access through the adjoining residential area to minimise impacts on the Eastbourne Road frontage, existing vegetation, and highway environment.	• Comments noted. • Criteria 1 of the allocation policy states: *"Provide a safe and suitable access in consultation with the Local Highway Authority. Where a vehicular access onto Eastbourne Road is required, this may be acceptable subject to detailed design and highway authority approval, provided that any access minimises the loss of existing trees and hedgerows on the frontage to Eastbourne Road"*	• No change required.

	• This provides flexibility in policy requirements for further discussion with Highways.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response received	**N/A**	**N/A**

SITE Ref: POL2 (FWLP), POL4 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (east), Eastbourne Road, Polegate

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: POL2 (FWLP), POL4 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (east), Eastbourne Road, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • The allocation site appears to be in the setting of the South Downs National Park, and we refer you to our comments regarding our comments regarding Policy NE8. We welcome Policy CC8 Sustainable Drainage which requires SuDS to include three tiers of drainage within the catchment of Pevensey Levels and applies to this allocation.	• Comments noted. The relationship of the site with the setting of the South Downs National Park is recognised and any development would be required to comply with relevant landscape policies within the Plan. Support for the requirements of Policy CC8 regarding Sustainable Drainage Systems within the Pevensey Levels catchment is welcomed.	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: POL2 (FWLP), POL4 (POL) (Reg 19) – Hindsland Fields (east), Eastbourne Road, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Willingdon and Jevington Liberal Democrats	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns	• No change.

• Object to the allocation due to concerns about additional traffic and congestion on the A2270, which is already heavily trafficked. • Concern that previously proposed highway mitigation measures have not been delivered, reducing confidence that sufficient mitigation would accompany further development. • Additional development could increase rat-running through residential streets in Willingdon, particularly during school times. • Concern that development would place further pressure on existing local infrastructure, with infrastructure improvements required alongside any development. • Consider that existing planning permissions have already met local housing needs, questioning the need for further allocations in this area.	regarding additional traffic on the A2270, potential rat-running and the delivery of highway mitigation. The cumulative impacts of development have been considered through the Transport Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, with necessary infrastructure identified through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. The Council has assessed its housing needs and reasonable development options through the plan-making process and considers that the matters raised do not preclude the allocation of POL2.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
On the Go - Polegate High Street Shop • Object to the allocation in the context of the significant level of existing and planned housing growth around Polegate and Willingdon, and consider that further development is inconsistent with the Spatial Strategy. • Concern about the cumulative impact of development on the local highway network,	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the cumulative scale of development, highway impacts and the capacity and timely delivery of supporting infrastructure. The distribution of growth has been informed by the Council's evidence base and assessment of reasonable	• No change

particularly congestion on the A2270 and Polegate crossroads. • Consider that necessary highway and other infrastructure improvements should be delivered alongside, or in advance of, development, with concern that previously anticipated improvements have not been secured or delivered. • Concern that existing and planned growth will place additional pressure on education and healthcare provision, including existing school capacity and the accessibility of proposed medical facilities. • Concern that further development would increase car dependency and vehicle movements and would not support the objective of creating compact, connected and sustainable neighbourhoods. • Request stronger policy requirements to ensure that development fully mitigates its infrastructure impacts and makes appropriate contributions towards necessary improvements.	development options. Infrastructure required to support planned growth is considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, with appropriate mitigation and contributions secured through the planning process where necessary. The cumulative impacts of development have also been considered through the Sustainability Appraisal.	

SITE Ref: POL5 (FWLP), POL5 (POL) (Reg 19) – Land within the parking area west of Polegate High Street, Polegate

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: POL5 (FWLP), POL5 (POL) (Reg 19) – Land within the parking area west of Polegate High Street, Polegate		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water Commented that previous Regulation 18 representations had not been fully incorporated. Southern Water requested wording for sites within 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works, including POL5, requiring development layouts to be informed by an odour assessment undertaken in consultation with the statutory wastewater operator. Southern Water also requested standard wording for relevant allocations where local sewerage network capacity may be limited, requiring occupation to be phased to align with sewerage infrastructure delivery, in consultation with the service provider.	Comments noted. The site lies in a similar proximity to the WWTW, this will be subject to further assessment as planning application stage, where the layout will be informed by odour assessment as requested. Any development will need to comply with Policy NE12, as the Plan should be read as a whole. Also, Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with. Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will	Appropriate phasing and timeframe for delivery of the site will be reviewed as part of the site allocation policy wording.

	be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: UCK11 (FWLP), RC1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at White House Farm, London Road, Uckfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 9	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 7

SITE Ref: UCK11 (FWLP), RC1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at White House Farm, London Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • Site surrounded by significant block of irreplaceable ancient woodland • Risk of deterioration, severing and isolating of irreplaceable habitat • Site lies within the zone of influence of the Ashdown Forest SPA	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as NEA1 (Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery) and NE4 (Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees)	• Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees.
Southern Water • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed • Connection of new development at this site ahead of new infrastructure delivery could lead to an increased risk of flooding unless the requisite works are implemented in advance of occupation.	• Comments noted	• Policy refers to the need to phase occupation of future development with the delivery of needed infrastructure

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No Responses	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council • Site outside development boundaries and isolated from settlement which would result in overdevelopment • Development at this location will have negative ecological impact	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements, which requires development beyond existing development boundaries. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The latter includes a site specific assessment, noting ecological and other impacts of development. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
ARBB Services • Allocation should be removed to protect ancient heritage, geodiversity	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as NEA1 (Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery)	• Specific refers to ancient woodland buffers is included within the policy wording.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• Threatens to unbalance the social infrastructure. • Need to preserve ecological, wildlife corridors and historical landscapes. • Impact on Buxted Park and Budletts Common. • Impact of traffic.	• Comments noted. The Council recognises the concerns regarding the location of development, transport, biodiversity and heritage impacts. These issues have been considered through further evidence. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are mitigated.	• Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees. The need for a specific public transport strategy is also required.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 31	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 4	**Object:** 27

SITE Ref: UCK11 (FWLP), RC1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at White House Farm, London Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • Reference should be made to a public transport strategy as existing bus stops are in excess of 400m from the central point of the site. This strategy should secure conveniently located bus stops and a crossing point. • Ancient woodland on the southern and close to western boundaries and an ancient/veteran tree in the north-east, requiring appropriate buffers and protection in line with Natural England standing advice.	• Comments noted.	• Policy amended to include a criterion for a public transport strategy • Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees.
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed	• Policy refers to the need to phase occupation of future development with the delivery of needed infrastructure.

occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*"	through engagement with the service provider.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Object to the allocation • Cumulative overdevelopment around Uckfield, Maresfield, Buxted and Framfield • Lack of infrastructure capacity, settlement gap impacts, highway constraints, ancient woodland/SSSI harm and lack of transparency over the true scale of growth in the area.	• Comments noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements, which requires development beyond existing development boundaries. The extent of growth is noted, noting the significant housing need in the district. The process for addressing this need as far as practicable is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The latter includes a site specific assessment. • The Sustainability Appraisal considers cumulative impact of development and potential coalescence and overdevelopment. The Council note that whilst areas within Uckfield are altered as a result of growth, the strategy has sought to retain separate	• Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees. The need for a specific public transport strategy is also required.

	satellite villages around the town, as already exists. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
Uckfield Town Council • Object to the allocation • Provided a review of the Sustainability Appraisal assessment • Further growth around Uckfield would place unacceptable pressure on infrastructure, landscape, heritage and irreplaceable habitats, and requested stronger ancient woodland buffers, settlement gaps and revised settlement boundaries.	• Comments noted. • Comments on the Sustainability Appraisal have been reviewed and addressed as part of the Sustainability report. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements, which requires development beyond existing development boundaries. The extent of growth is noted, noting the significant housing need in the district. The process for addressing this need as far as practicable is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The latter includes a site specific assessment, considering	• The yield on this site has decreased based as a result of further evidence base worked undertaken to support the Proposed Submission Local Plan. • Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees. The need for a specific public transport strategy is also required. • Updated Inset Maps have been published to show revised development boundaries and all allocations for relevant settlements.

	heritage, landscape and ecological issues. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Additional work has been undertaken as part of the Regulation 19 Plan to identify revised settlement boundaries, and therefore enable depiction of settlement gaps also.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Responses	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Objected to the allocation • Site lies within the Ashdown Forest SPA Zone of Influence with little information on the HRA or the provision of SANGs • Site is surrounded by significant blocks of irreplaceable ancient woodland.	• An updated HRA and associated evidence has been published alongside the Regulation 19 version of the Plan. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation	• Comments noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key	Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well

• Unacceptable countryside location adjacent to ancient woodland, within a Biodiversity Opportunity Area and priority habitat context, and not clearly related to an existing settlement.	constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The latter includes a site specific assessment, noting ecological and other impacts of development.	as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees. The need for a specific public transport strategy is also required.
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong objection to the allocation and requests that the site be removed from the Local Plan. • Concerns that development would move the northern development boundary beyond Snatts Road and erode the countryside gap between Uckfield, Buxted and Maresfield, leading to coalescence and loss of settlement identity. • Harm to the ancient Budletts landscape, medieval field patterns, hay meadows, acid grassland, ghyll streams, ancient woodland, veteran trees and wildlife corridors. • Residents cite groundwater, surface water, flooding, clay soils, drainage, sewage and water supply constraints, including concerns that mapping and desk-based assessments do not reflect winter groundwater/surface water interactions.	• Comments noted. The objections raise a consistent set of issues relating to settlement boundaries, coalescence, landscape character, ancient woodland, biodiversity, heritage, hydrology, transport, infrastructure capacity and cumulative development. These matters have been considered through the site assessment and site selection process and have been tested further through updated evidence and detailed site-specific requirements of RC1 (UCK). • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable	• Site policy specifically refers to the need to retain, protect and enhance existing vegetation on the site. As well as ancient woodland buffers and TPO trees. The need for a specific public transport strategy is also required. • Updated Inset Maps have been published to show revised development boundaries and all allocations for relevant settlements.

• Site is car dependent, with no safe, direct or attractive walking/cycling routes to the town centre, railway station, schools or services, and that traffic impacts on the A22, A26, A272 and local rural roads would worsen congestion and air quality. • Cumulative impacts from existing and proposed development around Uckfield, including pressure on GPs, dentists, schools, water, wastewater, roads and other infrastructure. • Fails to address the limitations of the connected infrastructure. • Concerns regarding harm to Ashdown Forest through increased traffic, air pollution, recreational pressure and loss of ecological connectivity. • Heritage harm, including impacts on historic landscape character, non-designated and designated heritage assets, public rights of way and the rural setting of Budletts. • Several responses seek a brownfield-first approach, citing potential alternatives within Uckfield town centre such as Holy Cross School, the BT building, the Uckfield Hub and Bellbrook. • Consultation mapping omitted the site and did not show the full northern part of Uckfield parish.	settlements, which requires development beyond existing development boundaries. The extent of growth is noted, noting the significant housing need in the district. The process for addressing this need as far as practicable is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal. The latter includes a site specific assessment, considering heritage, landscape and ecological issues. • The Sustainability Appraisal considers cumulative impact of development and potential coalescence issues. The Council note that whilst areas within Uckfield are altered as a result of growth, the strategy has sought to retain separate satellite villages around the town, as already exists. • Evidence also considers the alterative options such as greater development on Brownfield land. However, as evidenced by the ongoing Brownfield land register, delivery of brownfield land is limited and would be inadequate to meet the housing needs in the district, thus requiring development of greenfield land where sustainable and suitable to do so. Other brownfield sites within development boundaries may continue	

	to come forward over the Plan period as windfall development. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The Council undertook consultation only on new/amended sites as part of the Focused Wealden Local Plan. However, the Council has reviewed consultation material and mapping accuracy to ensure the site and parish context are clearly presented.	

SITE Ref: BU1 (FWLP), RCR (BU) (Reg 19) – Land east of Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 13	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: BU1 (FWLP), RCR (BU) (Reg 19) – Land east of Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water advises that existing sewerage infrastructure crosses the site; an easement of at least 6m may be required and should be kept clear of buildings and substantial tree planting, or infrastructure may require diversion.	Comments noted. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation.	No changes required
Natural England objects that the majority of the allocation comprises nationally important priority habitat or irreplaceable ancient woodland, raising conflict with the NPPF and Policies NE1 and NE4; the site is also within the Ashdown Forest SPA zone of influence.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Buxted Parish Council objects, stating the site is unsuitable due to the presence of sewage infrastructure and flooding, and queries why BU1 is allocated for 20 dwellings despite being smaller than adjacent BU2, which is allocated for 15 dwellings.	Comments noted. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation. Proposed dwelling numbers of allocations within the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	No changes required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Signature Prime Property @ Nexus Planning supports allocation BU1, stating it is a logical development location accessible to Uckfield and reflects existing residential development on the western side of the road.	Support noted. The site's relationship to Uckfield and adjacent residential development has been considered through the site selection process alongside relevant constraints.	No change required.
Kitewood Estates Limited / Landowner Signature Buxted Limited supports the allocation.	Support noted.	No change required.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust notes approximately 0.3ha of ancient semi-natural woodland within the site and recommends amending the development boundary to exclude it.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required

ARBB Services objects and seeks removal of BU1 to protect ancient heritage/geodiversity.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to BU1 due to impacts on ancient woodland, adjacent ancient woodland, ecological corridors and historic landscapes. • Concerns are raised that the land functions as a floodplain and that development could worsen local flooding. • Potential impacts are identified on Buxted Park SSSI, Budletts Common, Buxted Park and surrounding ancient woodland. • Residents raise concerns about traffic impacts and the effect of new development on the character of the area, including compatibility with nearby 1930s detached properties.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1), Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water	No change required

	infrastructure, including surface drainage, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation. Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as 'severe' in national policy terms.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 7	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 7

SITE Ref: BU1 (FWLP), RCR (BU) (Reg 19) – Land east of Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council Objected to BU1, reiterating that the site is unsuitable due to flooding, sewerage infrastructure on the land, proximity to Buxted Park and Gardens	Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the	No change required

and ancient woodland, and concerns about the scale of allocation compared with neighbouring sites.	development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1), Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Catesby Strategic Land Limited Referred to the wider Coopers Green area and promoted additional land at Coopers Green/Five Ash Down, arguing that the area is a sustainable location for growth and that further allocation could help meet housing need. The representation challenged the Council's evidence base and requested further allocation of its promotion site.	The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	No change required.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

The Woodland Trust Objected to allocations affecting ancient woodland. The Trust requested that site allocations exclude ancient woodland, include appropriate buffers, and protect ancient and veteran trees through survey work and root protection areas.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Objected to BU1, citing urban sprawl towards Five Ash Down, loss of the green gap, impact on the setting of Cooper Green Road and Buxted Park, sewerage capacity, road congestion, pressure on local services and wider infrastructure limitations in Uckfield and surrounding villages.	Comments noted. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan within the Local Plan.	No change required

SITE Ref: BU3 (FWLP), RC3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land Opposite Roundwood, Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 10	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: BU3 (FWLP), RC3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land Opposite Roundwood, Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Sewerage infrastructure crosses the site and must be taken into account in the layout of any development. • An easement of 6 metres or more may be required, kept clear of buildings and substantial tree planting, or diversion may be necessary. • Requests site-specific policy wording to secure future access for maintenance and upsizing.	Comments noted. This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 does consider utilities and will need to be complied with. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including foul and surface drainage and drinking water supply, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation.	No change required

Natural England • The site lies adjacent to priority habitat and ancient woodland, which are strongly protected through the NPPF. • The site is within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the proposed submission version of the Local Plan	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council • Objects to BU3, stating that the site is unsuitable for development. • Considers there would be too much development at Coopers Green, particularly alongside the Mockbeggars site approval.	Comments noted. Cumulative impact of the proposed allocated sites in Coopers Green Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	No change required.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Signature Prime Property @ Nexus Planning • Supports the allocation of Land Opposite Roundwood, Coopers Green Road. • Considers the site to be a logical development location, accessible to Uckfield and reflecting residential development on the western side of the road.	Support noted.	No change required

Kitewood Estates Limited / Landowner Signature Buxted Limited • Supports the allocation.	Support noted.	No change required
MJD Designer Homes • Supports the site, stating that it is well screened, access is achievable and the location is sustainable. • Confirms the site remains available, suitable and deliverable in the short term and would contribute to Policy SS2 housing provision.	Support noted.	No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Notes that the eastern boundary of BU3 is adjacent to Views Wood, approximately 40ha of Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland. • Requests a buffer zone between the ancient woodland and any development on the site.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	No change required
ARBB Services • Objects to the allocation and requests removal of BU3 to protect ancient heritage/geodiversity.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to	No change required

	comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Residents object to BU3 due to impacts on ecological corridors, historic landscapes, Buxted Park SSSI, Budletts Common and adjacent ancient woodland. • Concerns are raised that development would harm the four fields east of Coopers Green Road and ancient woodland around the pumping station. • Objections also refer to impacts on Buxted Park, local character, compatibility with nearby 1930s detached properties, traffic and flooding.	Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1), Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Policy NE13 requires development to demonstrate that sufficient water infrastructure, including surface drainage, is available for the lifetime of the development. Where infrastructure is inadequate, necessary improvements must be completed before occupation. Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the	No change required

	increases are defined as ‘severe’ in national policy terms.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

SITE Ref: BU3 (FWLP), RC3 (BU) (Reg 19) – Land Opposite Roundwood, Coopers Green Road, Ringles Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Buxted Parish Council Objected to BU3 and maintained that the site is unsuitable due to its visibility from Buxted Park, with part of the site sitting higher than the park and therefore likely to be intervisible. The Parish Council also noted that the site appears to cover both fields from the railway line down to Binky’s Farm, extending beyond the previously suggested area, and questioned why this site is considered suitable when another Pound Green site was considered too far into the countryside.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Comments noted. Cumulative impact of the proposed allocated sites in Coopers	No change required

	Green Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No Response Required.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Objected to BU3 alongside BU1, stating that the developments would destroy the setting of Coopers Green Road, be out of character with the area, impinge on the green setting of Buxted Park and place further pressure on sewerage, roads, schools, healthcare, parking and other infrastructure. The comments also stated that BU1 and BU3 would cause urban sprawl from Uckfield towards Five Ash Down by removing the natural green break of the fields. • Objected to the proposed scale of development in Buxted and Maresfield, citing overdevelopment, pressure on GP services, loss of rural character, increased traffic, harm to biodiversity and reduced quality of life for existing residents.	Comments noted. Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery (Policy NE1), Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4) and The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment (Policy HE1). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements, however this can only preclude development where the increases are defined as ‘severe’ in national policy terms.	No change required

	Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. within the Local Plan	

SITE Ref: ORO2 (FLWP), RO1 (RO) (Reg 19) – Highfields Farm, Rotherfield

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

This site was not promoted at Regulation 18.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: ORO2 (FLWP), RO1 (RO) (Reg 19) – Highfields Farm, Rotherfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Genesis Town Planning Ltd / Genesis Town Planning • Support for ORO2 to be allocated but argues should be for more than 8 dwellings.	• Support noted • The consideration of ORO2 for allocation forms part of the Council's strategy for meeting housing and other development needs in sustainable locations while	• Support noted. Following a review of the site, a new specific policy to deliver 8 (net) dwellings under site specific policy RO1 (RO).

• States that Rotherfield is a sustainable settlement because it is located approximately 1.2 miles east of Crowborough, is served by a frequent hourly bus service operating Monday to Sunday, journey times to Crowborough are approximately 15 minutes, lies on National Cycle Route 21 and contains a range of local facilities and services. • Uses ORO2 as evidence that Rotherfield is a sustainable settlement capable of accommodating housing growth including a further allocation at Court Farm for around 75 dwellings.	seeking to minimise impacts on environmental and landscape assets. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in the accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence, site constraints and opportunities and consultation responses, the Council considers that ORO2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Rotherfield Protection Group • RPG does not agree with the proposed yield of 8 dwellings for ORO2	• Objection noted • The consideration of ORO2 for allocation forms part of the Council's strategy for meeting housing and other development	No change required.

• consider the site to be highly constrained by its landscape setting within the High Weald National Landscape • argue that the amount of development should be determined through detailed design and landscape assessment rather than a fixed dwelling number • Existing buildings already have a noticeable landscape impact. • Important public views, including towards St Denys Church, should be protected. • Traffic, access and drainage issues require further assessment. • Any development should conserve and enhance the landscape	needs in sustainable locations while seeking to minimise impacts on environmental and landscape assets. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence, site constraints and opportunities and consultation responses, the Council considers that ORO2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No Response	No response required	No change required

SITE Ref: WES5 (FWLP), STC1 (WES) (Reg 19) – Sharnfold Farm, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 9	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 7

SITE Ref: WES5 (FWLP), STC1 (WES) (Reg 19) – Sharnfold Farm, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, but adequate space exists on site to address the constraint and still deliver development identified. • Comment noted	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint • Policy wording amended to include phasing requirement for network reinforcement
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Westham Parish Council • Object to town denomination given to Stone Cross • Lack of capacity in local services and infrastructure • Site subject to flooding	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in	• Site specific policy included within the Plan covering a number requirements but in reference to the matters raised by Westham PC, specific reference is added to cover

• Impact on the countryside and visual amenity between Eastbourne and Hailsham	full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. This latter assessment and accompanying evidence consider matters such as flood risk. • The cumulative impact of development and landscape impacts are considered in the evidence base, such as the Sustainability Appraisal. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The site allocation reference will be reconsidered, noting the location of development.	protection and enhancement of boundary trees and hedgerows • The site information has been updated so specifically reference the siting of the allocation in Stone Cross which lies in the Parish of Westham but not the village of Westham.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Hop Farm Real Estate Limited • Supportive of the allocation • Site could be extended to accommodate further capacity	• he Council carried out further site assessment and associated testing between the consultation on the Draft Local Plan and on the Focused Local Plan and identified further capacity for the site	• A larger site with increased capacity was identified at this location
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Access/highway issues • Impacts on services • Traffic impacts • Flooding issues	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the	• The site policy wording is drafted to set out the expectation of what should come forward on the site, including sensitive areas like the

• Impact on the countryside • Impact on the Pevensey Levels SSSI • Object to town denomination given to Stone Cross • Impact on landscape • Loss of fertile farmland for development	need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The site allocation reference will be reconsidered, noting the location of development.	Grade II listed buildings to ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site • The site information has been updated so specifically reference the siting of the allocation in Stone Cross which lies in the Parish of Westham but not the village of Westham.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 6	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 4	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: WES5 (FWLP), STC1 (WES) (Reg 19) – Sharnfold Farm, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Policy should include improvement to provide level access across the A27 at Golden Jubilee Roundabout for all users to reach Dittons Road bus stops, employment, primary school (Stone Cross) and retail services (Stone Cross and Polegate) • Need for a sustainable transport strategy for this edge-of-settlement site which should be coordinated with adjacent draft allocations.	• Comments noted.	• Policy wording includes reference to access, as well as a comprehensive Sustainable Transport, Monitoring and Management Strategy.
National Highways • No objection in principle, but requests that the Transport Assessment identifies any proposed mitigation on the A27. • Any reliance on a new access to the Strategic Road Network must demonstrate feasibility and compliance with DfT Circular 01/2022, DMRB, Stage 1 RSA and WCHAR requirements.	• Comments noted. • Criteria 1 of Policy WES5 requires an access to the satisfaction of Highway authorities, supported by evidence of impact on the strategic highway network, not just the local highway network. This criteria can be broadened to consider mitigation measure son that network also.	• Policy wording includes reference to access, as well as a comprehensive Sustainable Transport, Monitoring and Management Strategy.
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Policy wording includes reference to the need to phase occupation of development aligned with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure.

wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.*"		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Objects to the allocation as countryside development adjacent to the A27 rather than the settlement. • Site within the Pevensey Levels catchment, biodiversity and amenity impacts. • Potential impacts on the historic character and rural setting of listed buildings at Sharnfold Farm.	• Comments noted. The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Policy wording includes reference to the need to sensitively locate development to protect the historic character and rural setting of Grade II listed building on the site. • Other policies within the plan deal with amenity impacts and the Pevensey Levels catchment considerations.
The Woodland Trust • Site adjacent to Drockmill Hill Shaw, an area of ancient semi-natural woodland.	• Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be	• Policy wording includes reference to the need to retain, protect and enhance mature boundary trees and hedgerows on the site.

• Explicit policy wording should require a buffer between ancient woodland and any development.	required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required

SITE Ref: WES6 (FWLP), STC2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at and adjacent to The Downs View and Emberson, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 6	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: WES6 (FWLP), STC2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at and adjacent to The Downs View and Emberson, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size and depth, would be required • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, but adequate space exists on site to address the constraint and still deliver development identified • Comment noted	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint • Infrastructure policies within the Plan consider timely provision of infrastructure.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Westham Parish Council • Access issues	• Noted. The access arrangements and phasing of any development will be considered at detailed planning application stage.	• No action required

• Highway improvements should be provided ahead of any development being delivered at this location.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Access and highway issues • Congestion issues have not been fully considered • Highway improvement should be provided ahead of any development being delivered at this location • Existing dwellings onto Hailsham Road should be retained with no access to Hailsham Road at that point • Excessive quantum of development proposed • Impact on local character • Flood risk • Location near Pevensey Levels	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken which considers flooding, character and biodiversity issues. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise.	No action required

	• The access arrangements and phasing of any development will be considered at detailed planning application stage. • The detailed layout of development and relationship with neighbouring properties will be considered at planning application stage.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: WES6 (FWLP), STC2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at and adjacent to The Downs View and Emberson, Hailsham Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Southern Water • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording*: "Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider."*	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration.	• Policy INF4 within the Plan considers timely provision of utilities infrastructure in line with development phasing.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Countryside location, with an extension of settlement beyond the obvious boundary created by the bypass to the open countryside with all the consequences for landscape, etc. • Cumulative impact • The open countryside and open character of the Pevensey Levels, with views to the South Downs National Park, should prevail.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements and the landscape impact of such development. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of development and landscape impacts are considered in the evidence base, such as the Sustainability Appraisal.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required

SITE Ref: WES4 (FWLP), STC3 (WES4) (Reg 19) – Land to the west of the B2104, Hankham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 6	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 6

SITE Ref: WES4 (FWLP), STC3 (WES4) (Reg 19) – Land to the west of the B2104, Hankham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Westham Parish Council • Recently rejected at appeal for residential development • Unsuitable due to the proximity with the A27 trunk road and associated noise and air pollution • Impact on traffic • Suitability of access • Workshop use should be considered at this location	• Comments noted • Planning permission was refused in part due to its location outside of an existing designated development boundary and the proximity to the elevated A27 and amenities of future occupiers. It is considered that a redesign of the scheme, with a lower number of dwellings could alleviate the latter issue and the scheme is generally in a relatively sustainable location. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to	• Policy wording sets out expectations in terms of access, noise attenuation and vegetation to enclose and screen the development.

	address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Access and highway issues • Site has recently been refused for development on appeal • Noise and air pollution • Impact on traffic • Could be considered for a workshop space • Flood risk • Location near the Pevensey Levels	• Comment noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• Policy wording sets out expectations in terms of access, noise attenuation and vegetation to enclose and screen the development. Other policies within the Local Plan cover the Pevensey Levels catchment.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WES4 (FWLP), STC3 (WES4) (Reg 19) – Land to the west of the B2104, Hankham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a

SITE Ref: WES8 (FWLP), STC4 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land to the west of Stone Cross Garden Centre, Dittons Road, Stone Cross

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: WES8 (FWLP), STC4 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land to the west of Stone Cross Garden Centre, Dittons Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Marks & Spencer PLC • Object to the draft allocation for residential development. • Noted that site forms part of a current planning application for a new food hall at land north of Dittons Road, Stone Cross.	• Comments noted. • The site assessment and supporting background evidence supports the allocation of this site for housing.	• No change.

• Stated that allocating the site for 20 homes would be a missed opportunity given the identified retail need.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Support for policy for either residential or retail/employment use.	• Comments noted.	• No change

SITE Ref: WES2 (FWLP), STC5 (WES) (Reg 19) – Dittons Nursery, Dittons Road, Stone Cross

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WES2 (FWLP), STC5 (WES) (Reg 19) – Dittons Nursery, Dittons Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No response		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Westham Parish Council • Larger part of the site has already been developed with a care home and dwellings. • Currently a garden centre on site which provides local employment. • There is also designated ancient woodland on site. • Planning permission for 30 homes was refused in November 2023.	• The comments are noted. The site assessment has taken account of existing development within part of the site, the presence of the garden centre and its role in supporting local employment, and the potential presence of ancient woodland. Any future development proposal would need to demonstrate that impacts on employment uses, and environmental assets can be appropriately addressed. The previous refusal of planning permission for residential development is also acknowledged	• No change.

	and forms part of the planning history considered in the assessment.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to site allocation. • Concerns include access issues, loss of garden centre, concern for economy and employment, development south of A27 would be out of keeping with other development sites in Stone Cross and Westham. • Note that the site has had planning permission refused.	• The comments are noted. Concerns have been raised regarding site access, the potential loss of the existing garden centre and associated employment opportunities, and the suitability of development south of the A27 in relation to the character and pattern of development in Stone Cross and Westham. These matters have been considered as part of the site assessment. The previous refusal of planning permission on the site is also acknowledged and forms part of the planning history taken into account.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No responses received

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WES9 (FWLP), STC6 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land south of Hankham Road, Stone Cross

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No responses received.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WES9 (FWLP), STC6 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land south of Hankham Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a

SITE Ref: WSE3 (FWLP), STC7 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at Hazlebank, Rattle Road, Stone Cross

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 1	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:0**	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation – No response received.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WSE3 (FWLP), STC7 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at Hazlebank, Rattle Road, Stone Cross		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No response	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Mr Patrick Coffey obo Michael Lear • Support site allocation, but request yield to be increased to 12 (11 net dwellings) which would reflect the provision of planning application WD/2021/0102/MAJ.	• Comments noted. • Whilst the Council agrees that the principle of residential development on the site is acceptable and notes that the principle of development has previously been found acceptable through the planning	• Site name correction made.

• Inspector has previously had no issue with the principle of development. • A revised scheme has been lodged with the Council. • Amendment to name, should be 'Hazelbank' not 'Hazlebank'.	process, it does not consider that an increase in the site capacity is justified. • The housing yield identified in the site allocation has been informed by the Council's SHELAA assessment and subsequent site appraisal work. This assessment concluded that a higher density scheme would result in a cramped form of development that would fail to reflect the character of the site and its surroundings. As such, the Council considers that the allocated capacity of 8 dwellings remains appropriate and deliverable, while ensuring a satisfactory layout and living environment for future occupiers.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a

SITE Ref: OFR1 (FWLP), STW1 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Ramslye Farm / Spratsbrook Farm, South West of Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable. Site proposed as Option in FWLP.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 25	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 22

SITE Ref: OFR1 (FWLP), STW1 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Ramslye Farm / Spratsbrook Farm, South West of Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Concerned that WDC has not adequately assessed or planned for the cumulative impacts of the scale of growth from OFR1 and OFR2 together with the other 8 proposed allocations along the borough boundary. • Concerns raised regarding cross boundary infrastructure pressures from new residents on highways, healthcare, education, PRoW and wider community infrastructure. • Argue that infrastructure requirements and mitigation measures should be clearly identified.	• Concerns noted. • The Council has undertaken further assessment of the site, including consideration of landscape matters, infrastructure requirements and plan-making evidence. Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

• Concerned over lack of strategic masterplanning for sites in this area. • Concerned that developer contributions generated by development in Wealden would be received by WDC despite impacts being experienced within Tunbridge Wells and Kent • Consider that any development of OFR1 should be considered alongside the neighbouring allocation in Tunbridge Wells (AL/RTW16). • Suggest that if OFR1 is not developed, allocate land north of the access road as open space to support AL/RTW16 or consider parts of OFR1 and OFR2 as SANG provision.	• Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the sites on the edge of Tunbridge Wells within Wealden is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • WDC recognises the relationship between OFR1 and adjacent allocations within Tunbridge Wells and supports a coordinated approach to the planning and delivery of development across the administrative boundary. Site-specific policy requirements will seek to ensure appropriate connectivity, sustainable transport measures, green infrastructure provision and mitigation of site impacts. • With regard to developer contributions, the Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of development.	

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Frant Parish Council • Strongly objects to OFR1 and wider Frant allocations. • Considers there is insufficient justification for major development in the National Landscape and argues that the exceptional circumstances tests in the NPPF have not been met. • Argue that Wealden's site assessment methodology is flawed, inconsistent and non-transparent, with impacts on the High Weald being understated and housing delivery benefits overstated • Contend that the allocation forms part of a deliberate strategy to locate housing adjacent to Tunbridge Wells, using its infrastructure and services whilst helping Wealden meet housing targets • Argue that Wealden should explore alternative locations outside the National Landscape, including areas further south in the district and brownfield opportunities.	• Objections noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The Council has undertaken further assessment of the site, including consideration of landscape matters, infrastructure requirements and plan-making evidence. Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	requirements contained within the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the sites on the edge of Tunbridge Wells within Wealden is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The spatial strategy is as set out in the evidence base and includes consideration of sites adjacent to large sustainable settlements on the border of the District. • Additional sites have been considered both in and outside the National landscape, and on a range of sites including brownfield land, as set out in the evidence base.	

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Dandara Ltd / DHA Planning • Strongly support allocating OFR1 for development • Propose a residential-led scheme of approximately 350-400 dwellings, new community hub/facility, open space, green infrastructure, habitat creation, SuDS, recreation and landscape buffers • Development would be concentrated on the eastern part of the site adjacent to the A26 • Argues development can be accommodated without significant long-term harm to the High Weald National Landscape through appropriate mitigation. • OFR2 is in the same ownership. The promoter indicates a willingness to consider comprehensive planning of OFR1 and OFR2, including potentially shared access arrangements. • Request site capacity is increased from 300 to 400 dwellings.	• Support noted and promoters assessment / evidence base noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, including the site-specific assessment undertaken, and the landscape evidence base. • Whilst additional capacity is sought it is considered that 300 dwellings is an appropriate yield taking account of constraints, sensitivities, development on suitable eastern parts of the site only, and the need to incorporate mitigation measures.	• Include a site-specific allocation policy that reflects the opportunities and constraints of the site, the evidence bases and cohesive development across sites OFR1 and OFR2.
Knight Frank • Supports further growth south of Tunbridge Wells, including OFR1 because it is a sustainable, strategically located and potentially deliverable site adjoining Royal Tunbridge Wells, capable of helping address Wealden's substantial housing shortfall and contributing to a wider coordinated growth	• Support noted	• No change required.

strategy along the southern edge of Tunbridge Wells.		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>High Weald National Landscape</u> • Objects to OFR1/OFR2 as major development in the High Weald National Landscape. • Development would significantly erode the area's aesthetic and perceptual qualities; result in the loss of historic fieldscapes that positively contribute to local landscape character; conflict with High Weald Management Plan objectives and cause harm to adjoining ancient woodland. • When considered alongside FR5 and FR6, development of OFR1 and OFR2 would result in the substantial encroachment around Hargate Forest. This would effectively engulf and isolate Hargate Forest on both its eastern and western sides.	• Objection noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken, and the landscape evidence base. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required

	been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The impact on Hargate Forest has been considered and proposed allocations neighbouring this area are reduced in yield or site area as set out in the evidence base.	
Green Weald Alliance / Troy Planning and Design • GWA's position is that OFR1 and related South of Tunbridge Wells allocations should be given limited weight and reconsidered because: o The SA is not sufficiently robust. o Reasonable alternatives have not been properly assessed. o Development would occur within the High Weald National Landscape. o Important evidence remains incomplete. o Site selection and SHELAA assessments are inconsistent and inadequately justified. o Transport, public transport, education and healthcare infrastructure requirements remain uncertain. o Less harmful alternatives have not been demonstrated to have been fully	• Objection and concerns noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required

	explored before directing substantial growth to this nationally protected landscape.	• Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • The SHELAA assessment methodology has been applied consistently across sites, but may result in differing outcomes for sites geographically close to one another due to differing constraints or characteristics affecting the principle of development. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

The Woodland Trust • Objects to OFR1 where ancient woodland is included. • The allocation should be amended to ensure ancient woodland and veteran trees are fully protected, with development areas excluded from these habitats and suitable buffer zones incorporated into the site design.	• Objection and concerns noted. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change required.
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Strongly object to OFR1 as part of the wider group of allocations on the Tunbridge Wells border. • Concerns raised around infrastructure impacts (roads, schools, services in Tunbridge Wells); lack of sustainable transport options; potential for sites to come forward in a piecemeal fashion; the deliverability of the site (undeliverable in SHELAA/SA). • Request removal of OFR1 from the Local Plan until infrastructure impacts, mitigation, financing, and cross-boundary coordination issues have been satisfactorily resolved •	• Objection and concerns noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	• Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Local residents overwhelmingly object to OFR1, often alongside OFR2 and nearby FR allocations, citing harm to the High Weald National Landscape/AONB, loss of productive farmland, ancient woodland, wildlife habitats, historic field patterns and the setting of High Rocks Scheduled Monument.	• Comments and objections noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape, heritage and other constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure

• Common concerns include highway safety and congestion on the A26, Bunny Lane, Frant Road and surrounding rural lanes; poor road condition; accident history; and additional car-dependent journeys into Tunbridge Wells. • Residents raise repeated concerns about infrastructure capacity, particularly water supply, sewage/drainage, flooding at Sprats Brook, GP and hospital capacity, school places, dentists and reliance on Tunbridge Wells services rather than Wealden settlements. • Many object to the reclassification of OFR1 from previously unsuitable/undeliverable to "possible", arguing that no material change has occurred and that the consultation/evidence base is unclear or inconsistent. • Further objections relate to cumulative impact with FR1–FR10 and OFR2, perceived overdevelopment of Frant parish, erosion of rural character, air pollution, climate impacts, and the lack of meaningful cross-boundary planning with Tunbridge Wells.	of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape and heritage evidence. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • The site has been subject to an updated review to account for a changing context due to increased housing need, and updated evidence on matters such as landscape and heritage impact, as set out in the evidence base. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and	appropriate mitigation measures as required. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

SITE Ref: OFR2 (FWLP), STW2 (FR) (Reg 19) – Strawberry Hill Farm, Eridge Road

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable. Site proposed as Option in FWLP.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 16	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 13

SITE Ref: OFR2 (FWLP), STW2 (FR) (Reg 19) – Strawberry Hill Farm, Eridge Road		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	No response required	No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Concerned that WDC has not adequately assessed or planned for the cumulative impacts of the scale of growth from OFR2 and OFR1 together with the other 8 proposed allocations along the borough boundary. • Concerns raised regarding cross boundary infrastructure pressures from new residents on highways, healthcare, education, PRoW and wider community infrastructure.	• Concerns noted. • The Council has undertaken further assessment of the site, including consideration of landscape matters, infrastructure requirements and plan-making evidence. Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR1 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

• Argue that infrastructure requirements and mitigation measures should be clearly identified. • Concerned over lack of strategic masterplanning for sites in this area. • Concerned that developer contributions generated by development in Wealden would be received by WDC despite impacts being experienced within Tunbridge Wells and Kent.	requirements contained within the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the sites on the edge of Tunbridge Wells within Wealden is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • WDC recognises the relationship between OFR2 and adjacent allocations within Tunbridge Wells and supports a coordinated approach to the planning and delivery of development across the administrative boundary. Site-specific policy requirements will seek to ensure appropriate connectivity, sustainable transport measures, green infrastructure provision and mitigation of site impacts. • With regard to developer contributions, the Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary	

	to mitigate the impacts of development.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Frant Parish Council</u> • Strongly objects to OFR2 and wider Frant allocations. • Considers there is insufficient justification for major development in the National Landscape and argues that the exceptional circumstances tests in the NPPF have not been met. • Argue that Wealden's site assessment methodology is flawed, inconsistent and non-transparent, with impacts on the High Weald being understated and housing delivery benefits overstated • Contend that the allocation forms part of a deliberate strategy to locate housing adjacent to Tunbridge Wells, using its infrastructure and services whilst helping Wealden meet housing targets • Argue that Wealden should explore alternative locations outside the National Landscape, including areas further south in the district and brownfield opportunities.	• Objections noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The Council has undertaken further assessment of the site, including consideration of landscape matters, infrastructure requirements and plan-making evidence. Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR2 represents an appropriate and sustainable	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the sites on the edge of Tunbridge Wells within Wealden is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The spatial strategy is as set out in the evidence base and includes consideration of sites adjacent to large sustainable settlements on the border of the District. • Additional sites have been considered both in and outside the National landscape, and on a range	

	of sites including brownfield land, as set out in the evidence base.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Knight Frank</u> • Supports further growth south of Tunbridge Wells, including OFR2 because it is a sustainable, strategically located and potentially deliverable site adjoining Royal Tunbridge Wells, capable of helping address Wealden's substantial housing shortfall and contributing to a wider coordinated growth strategy along the southern edge of Tunbridge Wells.	• Support noted	• No change required.
<u>Dandara Ltd / DHA Planning</u> • Dandara notes that OFR2 is in the same land ownership as OFR1, although Dandara is not directly promoting OFR2 • Dandara states it would be willing to work collaboratively and comprehensively across both OFR1 and OFR2, ensuring that the needs of the Strawberry Hill Farm site are considered as part of future planning • State that a coordinated approach, potentially including a shared access from the A26, is supported to ensure comprehensive development, although both sites should remain capable of being delivered separately •	• Support noted	• Include a site-specific allocation policy that reflects the opportunities and constraints of the site, the evidence bases and cohesive development across sites OFR1 and OFR2.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Green Weald Alliance / Troy Planning and Design
 	
• GWA's position is that OFR2 and related South of Tunbridge Wells allocations should be given limited weight and reconsidered because:
  ○ The SA is not sufficiently robust.
  ○ Reasonable alternatives have not been properly assessed.
  ○ Development would occur within the High Weald National Landscape.
  ○ Important evidence remains incomplete.
  ○ Site selection and SHELAA assessments are inconsistent and inadequately justified.
  ○ Transport, public transport, education and healthcare infrastructure requirements remain uncertain.
  ○ Less harmful alternatives have not been demonstrated to have been fully explored before directing substantial growth to this nationally protected landscape.
	• Objection and concerns noted.
	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.
	• Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.
	• The SHELAA assessment methodology has been applied consistently across sites, but may result in differing outcomes for sites geographically close to one another
		• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required

	due to differing constraints or characteristics affecting the principle of development. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
High Weald National Landscape • Objects to OFR1/OFR2 as major development in the High Weald National Landscape. • Development would significantly erode the area's aesthetic and perceptual qualities; result in the loss of historic fieldscapes that positively contribute to local landscape character; conflict with High Weald Management Plan objectives and cause harm to adjoining ancient woodland.	• Objection noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures.

• When considered alongside FR5 and FR6, development of OFR1 and OFR2 would result in the substantial encroachment around Hargate Forest. This would effectively engulf and isolate Hargate Forest on both its eastern and western sides.	undertaken, and the landscape evidence base. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The impact on Hargate Forest has been considered and proposed allocations neighbouring this area are reduced in yield or site area as set out in the evidence base.	
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	• Objection and concerns noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure

• Strongly object to OFR2 as part of the wider group of allocations on the Tunbridge Wells border. • Concerns raised around infrastructure impacts (roads, schools, services in Tunbridge Wells); lack of sustainable transport options; potential for sites to come forward in a piecemeal fashion; the deliverability of the site (undeliverable in SHELAA/SA). • Request removal of OFR2 from the Local Plan until infrastructure impacts, mitigation, financing, and cross-boundary coordination issues have been satisfactorily resolved	address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFR2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure	development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Local residents overwhelmingly object to OFR2, often alongside OFR1 and nearby FR allocations, citing harm to the High Weald National Landscape/AONB, loss of productive farmland, ancient woodland, wildlife habitats, historic field patterns and the setting of High Rocks Scheduled Monument. • Common concerns include highway safety and congestion on the A26, Bunny Lane, Frant Road and surrounding rural lanes; poor road condition; accident history; and additional car-dependent journeys into Tunbridge Wells. • Residents raise repeated concerns about infrastructure capacity, particularly water supply, sewage/drainage, flooding at Sprats Brook, GP and hospital capacity, school places, dentists and reliance on Tunbridge Wells services rather than Wealden settlements. • Many object to the reclassification of OFR2 from previously unsuitable/undeliverable to “possible”, arguing that no material change	• Comments and objections noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the	• Include a site-specific allocation policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, resulting in a reduction in yield from 50 units to 35 on this site, noting landscape mitigation required. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

has occurred and that the consultation/evidence base is unclear or inconsistent. • Further objections relate to cumulative impact with FR1–FR10 and OFR1, perceived overdevelopment of Frant parish, erosion of rural character, air pollution, climate impacts, and the lack of meaningful cross-boundary planning with Tunbridge Wells.	Council considers that OFR2 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan. • The site has been subject to an updated review to account for a changing context due to increased housing need, and updated evidence on matters such as landscape and heritage impact, as set out in the evidence base. • The Council will continue to engage constructively with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Kent County Council and other relevant stakeholders through ongoing Duty to Cooperate discussions and planning application processes to identify and secure infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impacts of development. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

FR7 (FWLP), STW3 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land lying to the west side of Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR7 (FWLP), STW3 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land lying to the west side of Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Significant concerns regarding FR5, FR6 and FR7 due to their location within the High Weald National Landscape. • The sites should be considered cumulatively, particularly alongside FR2 and FR3. • Combined impact of 267 dwellings (FR5-7) on the National Landscape is a key concern	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. Site selection has been informed by landscape evidence, sustainability appraisal and housing requirements. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Challenges the robustness of the SHELAA conclusions, particularly the finding of only a "minor negative" landscape impact. • Cumulative effects of FR5, FR6 and FR7 have not been properly assessed • Questions consistency with previous appeal decisions (including Flower Pot Nursery) where smaller schemes were found harmful to the AONB • References to mitigation are vague and unsupported. • Question whether sufficient weight has been given to National Landscape protection and seeks greater transparency regarding cumulative development in the area.	• Objection noted. • The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and landscape and visual appraisal, where methodology has been applied consistently across sites. • The SA and other parts of the evidence base consider cumulative effects of development.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	• Refusals in the area have been noted, but were assessed on the basis of the detailed scheme submitted at application stage.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape Partnership • Object to allocation. • Development would represent a significant urban encroachment beyond the established Tunbridge Wells settlement edge into the protected landscape. • Argues the site contributes to the character, setting, historic field pattern and scenic quality of the High Weald. • Harms cannot be adequately mitigated • Development would conflict with the High Weald Management Plan and NPPF paragraphs relating to protected landscapes. • The FR allocations together should be regarded as "major development" in a National Landscape requiring exceptional circumstances and public interest justification.	• Concerns and objection noted. • The allocation has been informed by a proportionate evidence base, including landscape sensitivity and site assessment work. • While the site is recognised as having landscape sensitivities, the Council's assessment concludes that these do not preclude development in principle, subject to appropriate design, layout, landscaping and mitigation measures • The site adjoins the built-up area of Tunbridge Wells and has been assessed as part of a wider strategy that seeks to direct development towards sustainable locations with access to services, facilities and employment opportunities • Cumulative effects have been considered through the preparation of the Local Plan,	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	including cumulative assessment work in the SA and landscape evidence base. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context. • The site selection process has appropriately balanced environmental, social and economic considerations, including the need to meet identified development requirements.	
Local Residents • Object due to impacts on the High Weald National Landscape and proximity to Eridge Park SSSI	• Comments noted. • Issues are considered in the evidence base, as set out.	Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 45	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 40

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR7 (FWLP), STW3 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land lying to the west side of Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water: • FR7 may have limited sewerage capacity; occupation should be phased with required infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council: • Raised cumulative cross-boundary concerns and requested KCC/TWBC liaison on sustainable transport links.	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, TWBC: • Object due to reliance on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure, car dependency, congestion and lack of coordinated mitigation.	• Objection noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	• Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council: • Object due to excessive scale, HWNL harm, lack of exceptional circumstances, coalescence, infrastructure pressure and cumulative impacts.	• Objections noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable yield; and dwellings per hectare on this site, to ensure cohesive development across neighbouring sites and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy also identify	• Reduction in allocation numbers to reduce by 20 units, thus allocating for 70 dwellings rather than 90. This will ensure cohesive development across this and neighbouring sites, a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio, and adequate space for necessary mitigation.

	key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impacts of the sites are assessed in the landscape evidence base.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Knight Frank: • Support FR7 as a sustainable growth location and promote adjoining land, subject to further evidence.	• Support welcome	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape: • Object due to significant individual and cumulative harm to the HWNL and lack of exceptional circumstances.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised	• Reduction in allocation numbers to reduce by 20 units, thus allocating for 70 dwellings rather than 90. This will ensure cohesive development across this and neighbouring sites, a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio, and adequate space for necessary mitigation

	have resulted in a reassessment of suitable yield, and dwellings per hectare on this site, to ensure cohesive development across neighbouring sites and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy also identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impacts of the sites are assessed in the landscape evidence base.	
CPRE Sussex: • Object, stating FR7 and related allocations amount to major development in the National Landscape and should be withdrawn.	• Objection noted • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable yield, and dwellings per hectare on this site, to ensure	• Reduction in allocation numbers to reduce by 20 units, thus allocating for 70 dwellings rather than 90. This will ensure cohesive development across this and neighbouring sites, a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio, and adequate space for necessary mitigation

	cohesive development across neighbouring sites and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out.	
Green Weald Alliance / Troy Planning and Design: • Object that FR7 is unsound due to cumulative, masterplanning, transport, evidence and alternatives-testing. • Contend that there is no clear, area-specific and allocation-specific costed infrastructure package for the Frant / south of Tunbridge Wells sites.	• Objection noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and landscape evidence base. • Alternatives have been fully assessed through the SA process. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable yield, and dwellings per hectare on this site, to ensure cohesive development across neighbouring sites and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out.	• Reduction in allocation numbers to reduce by 20 units, thus allocating for 70 dwellings rather than 90. This will ensure cohesive development across this and neighbouring sites, a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio, and adequate space for necessary mitigation

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Local residents: • Object due to HWNL harm and lack of exceptional circumstances, • Object due to cumulative landscape impacts with other sites in the area • Traffic congestion and infrastructure pressure are a significant concern • Concerns about cross-boundary effects with TWBC • Concerns about the SHELAA/SA evidence and that it is inconsistent and underplays the impacts of development on the landscape. • Consider that there is not a close relationship with Tunbridge Wells and that the concept of the 20-minute neighbourhood would not apply. • To suggest that any significant number of residents would walk, cycle or even take the bus into the town is misleading.	• Objection noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable yield, and dwellings per hectare on this site, to ensure cohesive development across neighbouring sites and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The SHELAA has been applied consistently, btu reaches differing	• Reduction in allocation numbers to reduce by 20 units, thus allocating for 70 dwellings rather than 90. This will ensure cohesive development across this and neighbouring sites, a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio, and adequate space for necessary mitigation

	conclusions on differing sites due to differing constraints and characteristics. • The site adjoins the built-up area of Tunbridge Wells and has been assessed as part of a wider strategy that seeks to direct development towards sustainable locations with access to services, facilities and employment opportunities	

FR6 (FWLP), STW4 (FR) (Reg 19) – Pinewood Farm, Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR6 (FWLP), STW4 (FR) (Reg 19) – Pinewood Farm, Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • NE have significant concerns regarding FR6 due to location within High Weald National Landscape. • Advise that the impact is considered in combination with FR2 and FR3.	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. Site selection has been informed by landscape evidence, sustainability appraisal and housing requirements. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Object to the allocation of FR6 (Pinewood Farm) on the basis of its location within the High Weald National Landscape. • Scale of development proposed is not adequately reflected in the landscape sensitivity evidence, and that the site would result in significant harm to landscape character, open views, and the distinct rural setting of Frant Parish • Dispute conclusions that the site is well contained, has a close relationship with Tunbridge Wells, or would result in only limited landscape effects • Concerns expressed regarding the reliance on screening, containment and mitigation	• Objection noted. • The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and landscape and visual appraisal, where methodology has been applied consistently across sites. • The Sa and other parts of the evidence base consider cumulative effects of development.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

measures to justify development within a nationally designated landscape • Cumulative effects of development, including alongside nearby allocations, have not been adequately considered and that the assessment gives insufficient weight to the character and identity of Frant Parish in comparison with its relationship to Tunbridge Wells.	• The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Object to the allocation of FR9 on the basis of its location within the High Weald National Landscape and its contribution to the transition between the urban edge of Tunbridge Wells and the surrounding rural landscape • Development would represent an unjustified encroachment into the designated landscape, resulting in harm to its character, scenic quality, historic field patterns, settlement separation and natural beauty. • Concerns that cumulative impact of FR9 alongside other allocations in the Frant area will erode the distinction between the urban area and the National Landscape	• Concerns and objection noted. • The allocation has been informed by a proportionate evidence base, including landscape sensitivity and site assessment work. • While the site is recognised as having landscape sensitivities, the Council's assessment concludes that these do not preclude development in principle, subject to appropriate design, layout, landscaping and mitigation measures • The site adjoins the built-up area of Tunbridge Wells and has been assessed as part of a wider strategy that seeks to direct development towards sustainable	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

• The identified landscape impacts cannot be adequately mitigated and the allocation conflicts with national policy and the purposes of the High Weald National Landscape. • Proposal should be regarded as major development within a protected landscape and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to justify its allocation	locations with access to services, facilities and employment opportunities • Cumulative effects have been considered through the preparation of the Local Plan, including cumulative assessment work in the SA and landscape evidence base. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context. • The site selection process has appropriately balanced environmental, social and economic considerations, including the need to meet identified development requirements.	
Local Residents • Should be protecting and conserving High Weald National Landscape. • Site is close to the SSSI of Eridge Park	• Comments noted. • Issues are considered in the evidence base, as set out.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 49	**Support:** 4	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 44

FR6 (FWLP), STW4 (FR) (Reg 19) – Pinewood Farm, Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • States FR6 may have limited sewerage network capacity and requests policy wording to phase occupation with sewerage infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Requests that FR6 pedestrian and cycle link requirements include liaison with Kent County Council and Tunbridge Wells Borough Council on a sustainable transport strategy.	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Objects to FR6, citing major development in the High Weald National Landscape, flawed SHELAA assessment, landscape sensitivity, cumulative impacts with nearby FR sites and inconsistency with recent National Landscape refusals.	• Objections noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape	• Reduction in site area to address sensitivities on site, and subsequent change to allocation to reduce by 50 units, thus allocating for to 120 dwellings rather than 170. This will ensure better alignment between this site and development to the east side

	evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable site area; yield; and dwellings per hectare on this edge of settlement site, to ensure appropriate development and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy also identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impacts of the sites are assessed in the landscape evidence base. • The SHELAA has been reviewed, but sites will reach differing conclusions due to differing	of Frant Road, creating a consistent edge to built form, and allow a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio on this edge of site settlement, and adequate space for necessary mitigation.

	characteristics, site areas, constraints and proposals.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>Esquire Developments</u> • Supports FR6 • Consider Pinewood Farm suitable for 170 dwellings, notes a live 178-dwelling application, and suggests detailed wording on access, drainage, field boundaries, vegetation, development location and ecological buffers.	• Support welcomed • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable site area; yield; and dwellings per hectare on this edge of settlement site, to ensure appropriate development and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out.	• No change to increase yield as requested. Instead, propose a reduction in site area to address sensitivities on site, and subsequent change to allocation to reduce by 50 units, thus allocating for to 120 dwellings rather than 170. This will ensure better alignment between this site and development to the east side of Frant Road, creating a consistent edge to built form, and allow a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio on this edge of site settlement, and adequate space for necessary mitigation.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>High Weald National Landscape</u> • Objects to FR6 individually and cumulatively with nearby FR allocations, citing major development in the High Weald National Landscape and lack of exceptional circumstances.	• Objections noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which	• Reduction in site area to address sensitivities on site, and subsequent change to allocation to reduce by 50 units, thus allocating for to 120 dwellings rather than 170. This will ensure better alignment between this site and development to the east side of Frant Road, creating a consistent edge to built form, and allow a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio on this edge of site

	consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable site area; yield; and dwellings per hectare on this edge of settlement site, to ensure appropriate development and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy also identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impacts of the sites are assessed in the landscape evidence base.	settlement, and adequate space for necessary mitigation.
CPRE Sussex • Objects to FR6 due to its High Weald National Landscape location, Biodiversity Opportunity Area and Priority Habitat constraints, and cumulative impacts with nearby FR allocations.	• Objection noted – The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape, as well as existence of other constraints. The site allocation process has been	• Reduction in site area to address sensitivities on site, and subsequent change to allocation to reduce by 50 units, thus allocating for to 120 dwellings rather than 170. This will ensure better alignment between this site

	informed by evidence which considers both individual and cumulative effects. • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable site area; yield; and dwellings per hectare on this edge of settlement site, to ensure appropriate development and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy also identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impacts of the sites are assessed in the landscape evidence base.	and development to the east side of Frant Road, creating a consistent edge to built form, and allow a reduced dwelling per hectare ratio on this edge of site settlement, and adequate space for necessary mitigation.
<u>Sussex Ornithological Society</u> • Notes it has objected to the related FR6 planning application.	• Comment noted.	• No action required

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Representations object to the allocation of FR6 on the basis of its location within the High Weald National Landscape, with concerns that development would result in harm to landscape character, the rural setting south of Tunbridge Wells, biodiversity, tranquillity, dark skies and the historic landscape. • A number of respondents consider that, cumulatively with other proposed allocations in Frant Parish, the site would contribute to the erosion of the gap between settlements and the character of the parish • Concerns raised regarding infrastructure capacity, including water supply, wastewater, education and healthcare provision, together with the potential impacts on the local highway network, accessibility and sustainable transport options. • Some representations question the assessment of alternative sites and the extent to which the allocation relies on mitigation measures to address identified constraints within the National Landscape. • A small number of representations support the allocation, or further growth in this location, in recognition of housing needs and opportunities for coordinated development on the edge of Tunbridge Wells.	• Objections and support noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base • The updated evidence, specifically the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and issues raised have resulted in a reassessment of suitable site area; yield; and dwellings per hectare on this edge of settlement site, to ensure appropriate development and adequate space for mitigation. Reassessment has reduced the allocation as set out. • Sites in the area have been assessed consistently, with some identified as unsuitable due to particular constraints or characteristics.	• Reduction in site area and allocated dwellings numbers for reasons set out.

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR2 (FWLP), STW5 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land off Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 18	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 14

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR2 (FWLP), STW5 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land off Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Raise concerns regarding direct loss of the High Weald National Landscape. • Notes that FR2 and FR3, together with nearby allocations FR5, FR6 and FR7, represent a significant amount of development within a protected landscape. • Considers the allocations may be contrary to the provisions of the NPPF and Levelling-up and Regeneration Act regarding protected landscapes.	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. Site selection has been informed by landscape evidence, sustainability appraisal and housing requirements. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Objects to FR2 and FR3. • Considers the assessment of impacts on the High Weald National Landscape to underestimate the scale of harm.	• Objection noted. • The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate

• States that the sites form part of open countryside with significant views and that development would irreversibly alter landscape character. • Also questions the consistency and robustness of the SHELAA assessment process when compared with rejected sites	• The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and landscape and visual appraisal. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The SHELAA assessment forms one part of the evidence base used in site selection, and should be read in conjunction with subsequent work such as the Sustainability Appraisal and updated landscape evidence.	mitigation measures as required.

	• The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Esquire Developments & Tunbridge Wells RFC • Supports the allocation. • States the site is suitable, available and deliverable and could provide 100 dwellings within the first five years of the Plan period. • Considers the site to be a logical extension to the existing settlement, with acceptable landscape, ecological and transport impacts capable of mitigation. • Notes opportunities for active travel, sustainable transport, green infrastructure and housing delivery.	• Support welcomed.	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape Partnership • Object to FR2 and FR3 individually and cumulatively.	• Objection noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

• Considers development would extend the urban area into the High Weald National Landscape, eroding the distinction between urban and rural areas. • Argues the sites contribute significantly to landscape character, historic field patterns and scenic beauty and that impacts cannot be adequately mitigated. • Considers the allocations contrary to NPPF policies on protected landscapes and that they should not be allocated.	the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This	Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Local Residents • Object to development due to perceived harm to the High Weald National Landscape, loss of countryside and erosion of rural character • Concerns regarding increased traffic, congestion, highway safety and the need for junction and pedestrian improvements • Concern that local infrastructure, including schools, healthcare and utilities, lacks capacity to accommodate additional development • Concerns regarding water supply, drainage, sewerage capacity and potential flooding issues • Concerns regarding habitat loss and impacts on biodiversity and wildlife. • Concern that development-related traffic would increase noise and reduce air quality • Support the site allocation and seek flexibility in dwelling numbers and opportunities for coordinated development.	• Comments noted. • Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy	

	requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 49	**Support:** 4	**Neutral:** 7	**Object:** 38

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR2 (FWLP), STW5 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land off Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • FR2 may have limited sewerage network capacity; occupation should be phased with sewerage infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

• Objects to the cumulative impact of FR allocations on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure and requests clearer cross-boundary mitigation, contributions and liaison with KCC/TWBC.	boundary infrastructure will continue	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Object to FR2 and wider Frant growth due to National Landscape harm, lack of exceptional circumstances, cumulative impacts, infrastructure constraints and reliance on Tunbridge Wells services. • Raise concerns that the SHELAA/SA treat similar sites inconsistently and rely too heavily on mitigation and screening within the National Landscape.	• The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and sensitivity. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	• The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Esquire Developments • Supports FR2 for 100 dwellings as a logical edge-of-settlement site and seeks policy wording on access, coordination, flood risk, vegetation, screening and landscape sensitivity.	• Support welcomed • Policy FR2 was drafted based on landscape evidence, which has since been updated as set out in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026). That appraisal identifies sensitive development areas on this and the adjoining development site, both subject to a live planning application. Noting these areas, and the need to incorporate landscape mitigation across both, there will be differing areas of density/dwellings per hectare on each. The sites are therefore combined to ensure one cohesive development is delivered, with a yield of more dwellings across a larger site.	• Update to Policy to incorporate changes required, and set out landscape constraints, to ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.
Knight Frank • Supports further growth south of Tunbridge Wells and argues the FR1–FR9 corridor could form part of a wider coordinated growth area.	• Support welcomed	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

The High Weald National Landscape Unit • Objects to FR2 and nearby FR sites due to major cumulative harm to the High Weald National Landscape, settlement edge, historic fieldscapes, rural character, tranquillity and dark skies.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence,	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
CPRE Sussex • Objects to FR2 and nearby FR allocations as inappropriate cumulative major development within the High Weald National Landscape.	• Objection noted • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	• Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base. .	
Green Weald Alliance/Troy Planning • Objects to FR2 as unsound due to lack of exceptional circumstances, inconsistent evidence, no cumulative assessment, unresolved access and inadequate infrastructure evidence.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The allocation does not remove the requirement for future proposals to demonstrate that landscape, visual and environmental impacts have been appropriately addressed	
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors • Object to FR allocations and option sites on the Tunbridge Wells boundary due to infrastructure pressure, traffic impacts and lack of agreed mitigation with TWBC/KCC.	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation

	Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Engagement with neighbouring authorities continues	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Object to FR2 and nearby FR sites due to High Weald National Landscape harm and lack of exceptional circumstances. • Concern over harm to the rural setting, settlement edge, separation from Frant and cumulative landscape impact. • Highway concerns include congestion, unsafe junctions, rural lane pressure, construction traffic and car dependency. • Infrastructure concerns include water, sewerage, drainage, schools, health services and reliance on Tunbridge Wells/Kent. • Concern that FR2 conflicts with High Weald Management Plan objectives on landscape, biodiversity, dark skies and rural character. • Concern that SA/SHELAA rely on mitigation and screening, under-assess cumulative effects and inconsistently select FR2. • Queries the 100-dwelling capacity, lower-site sensitivity and unresolved access/deliverability constraints.	• Objections noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

• Some promoter/landowner comments support FR2 as a sustainable edge-of-settlement allocation with mitigation.	issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects.	

Allocation: FR9 (FWLP), STW5 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Tunbridge Wells Rugby Club and Chase Farm, Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable. Site proposed for allocation in FWLP only.

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 33	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 30

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR9 (FWLP), STW5 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Tunbridge Wells Rugby Club and Chase Farm, Frant Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Sport England • No objection, subject to equivalent or better replacement rugby facilities being secured before any loss at St Mark's.	• Comments noted.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
Southern Water • Requests sewerage phasing wording for FR9 due to potential local network capacity constraints.	• Comment noted. • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised
East Sussex County Council • Requests ancient woodland and priority habitat buffers, with deciduous woodland priority habitat protected and enhanced.	• Comment noted. • Criteria 3 of the policy addresses this issue. • Policies NE3 and NE4 cover woodland habitat.	• No action required

High Weald National Landscape • Strongly objects, citing major development in the National Landscape and harm to landscape character, dark skies, tranquillity and Chase Farm's rural setting.	• Objection noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Raises cross-boundary concerns on infrastructure, highways, education and sustainable transport; requests liaison with KCC and TWBC.	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Strongly objects to allocation of FR9. • There is insufficient evidence of need for a new sports hub at Chase Farm • The allocation appears intended to facilitate the relocation of Tunbridge Wells Rugby Club rather than being plan led. • Existing sports facility evidence points towards upgrading existing facilities rather than creating a new complex • Development would affect land within the High Weald National Landscape. • Alternative facilities and alternative locations are available.	• Objections noted • FR9 is intended to provide a policy framework for development including open space and sports provision. The allocation has been identified through the plan-making process and does not remove the requirement for future proposals to demonstrate compliance with national and local planning policies, including those relating to landscape protection, recreation need, environmental impacts, accessibility, and community benefit • The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and sensitivity.	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Esquire Developments	• Support welcomed • The site area noted in the site allocation policy relates to the northern parcel of land,	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is

• Supports FR9, but requests corrected site area of 20.7ha and seeks increased northern site capacity from 50 to 83 dwellings.	where housing development would be located, rather than entirety of the site area as submitted under the SHELAA. The Inset Maps identify both parcels of land and differing development/uses. • Yield of 50 dwellings was proposed based on landscape evidence, which has since been updated as set out in the Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026). That appraisal identifies sensitive development areas on this and the adjoining development site, both subject to a live planning application. Noting theses areas, and the need to incorporate landscape mitigation across both, there will be differing areas of density/dwellings per hectare on each. The sites are therefore combined to ensure one cohesive development is delivered, with a yield of more dwellings across a larger site.	directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.
Knight Frank • Supports the wider south of Tunbridge Wells growth corridor and seeks consideration of additional adjoining land for housing.	• Support welcomed	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Objects to FR9 due to National Landscape, ancient woodland and priority habitat impacts, including cumulative harm with nearby allocations.	• Objection noted • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site,

	Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base. •	to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.
The Woodland Trust • Should this site allocation go ahead we strongly support point 3 in policy FR9 requiring suitable buffers to Whitehill Wood from any development on the southern parcel of land (Chase Farm).	• Comment noted. • Site policy acknowledges the importance of protection Whitehill Wood ASNW at point 3 of the policy. • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No action required.
Sussex Ornithological Society • Objects to FR9 planning application and raises concerns about disturbance, lighting, habitat impacts and buffer adequacy.	• The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as Policy NE2 (Biodiversity Net Gain) for which ecological survey will contribute to demonstrate compliance with the policy, and Policy NE4 (Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees) which required a minimum buffer of 25m in	• No action required

	the absence site survey and detailed assessment.	
Green Weald Alliance / Troy Planning • Object to FR9 as unsound • Local Plan is not sufficiently evidenced to support the growth strategy south of Tunbridge Wells, including the proposed sports allocation at Chase Farm • Sustainability Appraisal and SHELAA are unreliable and important evidence remains incomplete • Concern that Chase Farm has not been subject to a sufficiently transparent and independent assessment - evidence insufficient to justify allocating the site for sports uses within the High Weald National Landscape. • FR9 appears intended to facilitate the reprovision of sports facilities displaced by development elsewhere • There is no area-specific infrastructure package for the Frant/south Tunbridge Wells allocations • Development Chase Farm would contribute to cumulative erosion of settlement separation, tranquillity, dark skies, historic field patterns and the wooded character of the High Weald National Landscape. • Proposed allocation policy relies too heavily on matters being resolved later through planning application.	• Objections noted • FR9 is intended to provide a strategic framework for sports and recreation provision and does not itself grant planning permission • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

• Insufficient engagement or agreed outcomes with Tunbridge Wells Borough Council, Natural England and relevant infrastructure providers.	• Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The allocation does not remove the requirement for future proposals to demonstrate that landscape, visual and environmental impacts have been appropriately addressed.	

Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Object due to reliance on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure, added traffic, Frant Road congestion and lack of coordinated mitigation.	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Engagement with neighbouring authorities continues	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Residents object to relocating the rugby club to Chase Farm, citing National Landscape harm and lack of need. • Key concerns include traffic, unsafe Bunny Lane/A267 access, Frant Road congestion and reliance on cars. • Residents raise pressure on schools, healthcare, social care, water supply and sewerage capacity as issues. • Many cite cumulative urbanisation with FR2, FR3, FR6 and FR7, harming landscape, dark skies, tranquillity and biodiversity. • Several say existing rugby facilities could be improved in situ or reprovided outside the National Landscape. • Residents question whether exceptional circumstances for major development in the National Landscape have been demonstrated.	• Objections noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. This has resulted in a combined allocation on this and a neighbouring site, to ensure cumulative issues are considered coherently and development is directed to only appropriate parts of the sites, with necessary mitigation measures achieved.

	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects.	

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR3 (FWLP), STW6 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 9	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 9

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR3 (FWLP), STW6 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Concern regarding the cumulative impact of FR2 and FR3 (alongside FR5, FR6 and FR7) resulting in the loss of High Weald National Landscape (AONB). • Consider allocation contrary to national policy protecting designated landscapes	• Comments noted. • The Council recognises the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. Site selection has been informed by landscape evidence, sustainability appraisal and housing requirements. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Objection to FR2 and FR3. • Argue that the assessment understates the impact on the High Weald National Landscape. • Considers that 130 dwellings across the two sites would fundamentally alter the character of the area and that there are	• Objection noted. • The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

inconsistencies in the site assessment process compared with rejected sites. • Considers mitigation would not adequately conserve the landscape.	evidence base including that on landscape character and landscape and visual appraisal, and cumulative impact. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for	

	the areas of the site and constraints identified.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape Partnership • Strong objection to FR3 and associated allocations. • Development would represent an unjustified encroachment into the High Weald National Landscape, erode the rural settlement edge, harm historic field patterns, scenic qualities and settlement separation. • The organisation considers the development to constitute major development in a protected landscape and that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.	• Objection noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including	• Update to Policy set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	

Local Residents
 	
• Object to FR3 due to:
  ○ Impact on High Weald National Landscape
  ○ Harm to wildlife and biodiversity
  ○ Lack of supporting infrastructure including schools, GPs, dentists and waste services
  ○ Insufficient water and drainage infrastructure
	• Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process.
	• The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects.
		• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

○ Traffic generation and highway safety concerns ○ Additional pressure on Tunbridge Wells and local services ○ Noise and air pollution ○ Ground conditions and water-logged soils.	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is	

	assessed that ‘severe’ impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 41	**Support:** 6	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 33

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR3 (FWLP), STW6 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Bayham Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • FR3 may have limited local sewerage capacity. • Requests occupation phasing linked to sewerage infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Notes FR3 capacity increased from 30 to 60 dwellings. • Requests coordinated access, green infrastructure and landscape mitigation across nearby allocations. • Raises cross-boundary infrastructure concerns involving KCC and TWBC.	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue. • Site allocation policies are drafted to ensure cohesion across sites.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Frant Parish Council • Objects to FR3 and wider Frant allocations due to scale of growth in the High Weald National Landscape. • Raises cumulative landscape, rural character, dark skies, biodiversity and settlement separation concerns. • Considers the evidence over-relies on mitigation/screening and is inconsistent with rejected nearby sites. • Raises road, active travel, water, drainage, education, health and deliverability concerns.	• The Council's site selection process has considered landscape sensitivity, sustainability objectives and site deliverability. • The site selection process itself has been informed by the evidence base including that on landscape character and sensitivity. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	• Site conclusions in the evidence base differ due to the differing constraints, site areas, characteristics and sensitivities of differing sites, which can occur even when sites are geographically close to one another. The reasons for each conclusion are as set out.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
ECE Planning • Supports FR3 as a sustainable edge-of-Tunbridge Wells site with some previously developed land. • Considers 60 dwellings deliverable through landscape-led design, retained vegetation, open space and pedestrian links. • States safe Bayham Road access and coordination with adjoining sites can be addressed through detailed design. • Considers SA impacts minor/uncertain and capable of mitigation.	• Support welcomed	• No action required
Knight Frank • Support FR3 as a logical growth location in Wealden. • Consider that a strategic approach to development south of Tunbridge Wells presents an opportunity to optimise development potential and secure high-quality, landscape-led growth consistent with the Local Plan's objectives.	• Support welcomed. • The wider area is not considered appropriate for further development beyond that identified, for the reasons set out it the evidence base. This evidence considers the differing constraints, site areas, characteristics and sensitivities of differing sites, which can	• No action required

• Considers that it is appropriate for the Council to consider wider land in this area as part of the alternative scenario at Regulation 19.	occur even when sites are geographically close to one another. The reasons for each conclusion are as set out.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>CPRE Sussex</u> • Objects to FR3 due to High Weald National Landscape impacts. • Identifies cumulative harm with nearby allocations FR2, FR6, FR7 and FR9. • Considers the combined development inappropriate major development within the National Landscape.	• Objection noted • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base.	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.
<u>High Weald National Landscape</u>	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and

• Objects to FR3 and nearby Frant allocations individually and cumulatively. • Considers the allocations would significantly harm the High Weald National Landscape and conflict with NPPF 189/190. • Raises concerns over urbanisation, historic field patterns, settlement separation, dark skies and tranquillity. • Considers major development/exceptional circumstances tests have not been met.	character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is	ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to FR3 alongside other Frant allocations. • Concerns include National Landscape harm, lack of exceptional circumstances, countryside loss, dark skies, biodiversity and rural character. • Raise cumulative traffic, service capacity and reliance on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure concerns. • Water supply, sewerage, drainage and flooding capacity are recurring issues. • Request removal of FR3 due to urban-edge expansion and cumulative harm with FR2 and nearby sites.	• Landscape impacts have been considered through the site assessment process. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need	• Update to Policy to set out landscape constraints, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. Additional criteria will also be included to secure appropriate mitigation measures as required.

	across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	

	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The draft allocation has been reviewed in light of representations received and updated evidence, resulting in changes to Policy as set out. This will ensure development is undertaken sensitively, mitigation is secured, and the quantum of development is appropriate for the areas of the site and constraints identified.	

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR1 (FWLP), STW7 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Benhall Mill Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR1 (FWLP), STW7 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Benhall Mill Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Site may require local wastewater network reinforcement to accommodate development. Development is not precluded provided occupation is phased alongside infrastructure upgrades. Concern that development ahead of infrastructure delivery could increase flood risk.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
Natural England • Site contains and adjoins priority habitat. Impacts on nationally important habitat should be avoided.	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan	Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

Sussex Wildlife Trust • Strong objection to allocation. Argue site lies entirely within a Local Wildlife Site (LWS) and development would result in significant habitat loss, contrary to NPPF and PPG. Questions ecological evidence supporting allocation, challenges Sustainability Appraisal conclusion of only "minor negative" biodiversity effects, and requests site deletion.	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. .
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Raises concerns regarding cumulative traffic impacts on Benhall Mill Road from recent and proposed developments. Notes congestion, verge damage, pressure on a narrow rural road network, and impacts associated with the Inspired Villages development. Also highlights perceived lack of supporting infrastructure (schools, GP provision) and concerns regarding urbanisation and environmental loss	• Comments noted • Cumulative impacts are addressed within the Sustainability Appraisal and Plan as a whole. • Supporting infrastructure will be addressed through engagement with the service providers.	• No action required.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Persimmon Homes South East • Questions whether the assumed capacity of 60 dwellings is achievable given ecological constraints and 20% BNG	• Welcome support. • Yield considered appropriate and was reached taking full account of the sites LWS status and the	• Update Policy to reduce quantum of development to ensure a deliverable scheme, but also noting the need for

requirement. Evidence suggests a 60-dwelling scheme could result in significant biodiversity loss, dormouse habitat impacts and reptile relocation issues. Suggests a smaller scheme of around 21 dwellings may be more realistic and environmentally acceptable. Also questions the need for an alternative access arrangement.	actual developable area. However, noting the reduction in likely yield rate proposed, and need to ensure allocations are deliverable, the allocation will be reduced to reflect updated proposals on site. • Policy requires access as set out by the Highway Authority, but wording can be adapted to ensure flexibility.	provision of smaller units as set out in policies within the Plan. • Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site. • Update criteria of Policy to ensure provision of safe access, rather than determining location of that access.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 26	**Support:** 2	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 24

FR1 (FWLP), STW7 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land at Benhall Mill Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • FR1 may have limited sewerage network capacity; occupation should be phased with sewerage infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised
Sussex Wildlife Trust	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary

• Objects as FR1 lies wholly within a Local Wildlife Site, with potential loss of designated habitat and insufficient ecological evidence.	site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan	buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, noting the reduction in proposed development. • .
East Sussex County Council • FR1 is a Local Wildlife Site, within the LNRS APIB and a Key Reptile Site; development needs robust ecological and protected species mitigation.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Local Wildlife Sites (Policy NE1). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, noting the reduction in proposed development • Amend policy to strengthen criteria and include a requirement to address site location within LNRS.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Requests liaison with KCC/TWBC on footpath and cycle links, and raises wider cumulative cross-boundary infrastructure concerns.	• Comment noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue	• No action required. • Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation.
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Persimmon Homes South East • Supports FR1 in principle but seeks review of yield and footpath surveillance wording due to Local Wildlife Site sensitivities.	• Welcome support. • Noting the reduction in likely yield proposed, and need to ensure allocations are deliverable, the allocation will be reduced to reflect updated proposals on site.	• No action required.

	• Surveillance wording is such that there is flexibility in how this is delivered.	
Knight Frank • Supports the wider FR1–FR9 growth corridor and promotes additional adjoining land for strategic growth.	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Objects because FR1 is a Local Wildlife Site and raises cumulative concerns with FR8 and wider south Tunbridge Wells growth.	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and in other parts of the evidence base, such as updated Landscape Appraisal. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process and assessment is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, noting the reduction in proposed development
Green Weald Alliance / Troy Planning and Design • Objects to FR1 as part of wider Frant growth, citing cumulative impacts on infrastructure,	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-	• No action required.

landscape, biodiversity, water supply and soundness.	specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal and in other parts of the evidence base, such as the Landscape Appraisal. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process and assessment is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents.	
Green Weald Alliance CIC • Objects to FR1–FR9 due to incomplete evidence, lack of cumulative assessment and unresolved cross-boundary, ecological and landscape impacts.	• Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan • Cumulative impacts are addressed within the Sustainability Appraisal and Plan as a whole and in other parts of the evidence base, such as the Landscape Appraisal. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process and assessment is set out	• No action required.

	in full in accompanying evidence base documents.	
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Object to FR1 and nearby allocations due to cumulative impacts on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure, traffic, schools and services.	• Objection noted – liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue. • Cumulative impacts are addressed within the Sustainability Appraisal and Plan as a whole and in other parts of the evidence base, such as the Landscape Appraisal. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process and assessment is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents.	Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to loss of greenfield land, Local Wildlife Site habitat and mature woodland. • Concerns include overlooking, privacy, boundary vegetation, informal access and unclear developable areas/buffers.	• Comments noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, noting the reduction in proposed development

• Infrastructure concerns focus on water supply, drainage, schools, healthcare and cumulative growth. • Highway concerns include congestion, rat-running, narrow lanes, road safety and verge damage.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Local Wildlife Sites (Policy NE1), and ensure an appropriate relationship with neighbouring development (Policy DE1). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Water supply, drainage, schools and healthcare capacity are recognised as key infrastructure considerations and will be addressed through engagement with the service providers. • Cumulative impacts are addressed within the Sustainability Appraisal and Plan as a whole and in other parts of the evidence base, such as the Landscape Appraisal. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport	

	issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that ‘severe’ impacts would arise.	

Allocation: FR8 (FWLP), STW8 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land to the east of Benhall Mill Road, Tunbridge Wells

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – N/A, site proposed for allocation in FWLP

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 26	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 23

SITE Ref: Allocation: FR8 (FWLP), STW8 (FR) (Reg 19) – Land to the east of Benhall Mill Road, Tunbridge Wells		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Raises wastewater capacity concerns and requests phasing of occupation with sewerage infrastructure delivery.	• Comment noted - Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
East Sussex County Council • The site supports significant areas of priority habitat deciduous woodland. As much as possible should be retained and any development should include a commitment to the production and long-term implementation of a woodland management plan.	• Comments noted. • Comment noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Tunbridge Wells Borough Council • Requests liaison with Kent County Council on cross-boundary footpath links.	• Comments noted.	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Frant Parish Council • Object due to overdevelopment when combined with existing and committed development in the Benhall Mill Road area. • Development will place substantial pressure on the surrounding rural road network • The area is poorly served by local facilities and is not a sustainable location for major housing growth • Development will be car dependent due to limited access to shops, healthcare, schools and public transport	• Objections and concerns noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at	• No action required

	these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Knight Frank • Support FR8 as part of a sustainable growth corridor and seek further land allocations.	• Support welcomed • Further allocations beyond those already identified are not deemed suitable in the area, for the reasons set out in the evidence base.	• No change required
Inspired Villages Group • Seeks policy wording on amenity, design transition and landscape buffers with its adjoining consented scheme.	• Comments noted. • Site benefits from a site specific allocation policy, and nay development will have to comply with other policies in the Plan in terms of design, amenity and landscape requirements.	• No change required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object due to landscape sensitivity, presence of priority woodland habitat and cumulative impacts with FR1.	• Objection noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

	• Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the SA and landscape evidence base.	
Pantiles and Park Ward Councillors, TWBC Object due to cumulative impacts on Tunbridge Wells infrastructure, traffic, schools and services.	• Objection note - liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Cumulative impact of the FR sites is assessed in the SA and landscape evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• Strengthen references to cross-boundary infrastructure mitigation
Green Weald Alliance • FR8 should be assessed cumulatively with other FR sites rather than individually • Development at FR8 would contribute to urban expansion into the High Weald National Landscape and the erosion of the rural gap between Tunbridge Wells and Frant • The area is sensitive due to its historic field patterns, wooded character, tranquillity, dark skies and role in maintaining landscape separation between settlements • Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that development at FR8 and the surrounding allocations can be	• Objection noted – The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding landscape character and the sensitivity of the High Weald National Landscape. The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment, Landscape	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

accommodated without significant harm to National Landscape purposes • Questions whether the necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support growth, including cumulative impacts from FR8 and neighbouring allocations, are deliverable and viable.	and Visual Appraisal (2026) and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Local residents object to FR8, often alongside FR1 and other Frant allocations, due to overdevelopment, increased traffic and use of Benhall Mill Road/Hawkenbury Road/Dundale Road as rat-runs. • Concerns include narrow lanes, muddy/damaged verges, poor visibility at junctions, commuter congestion, construction traffic impacts, road safety and lack of passing places. • Residents raise concerns about pressure on water supply, sewerage, schools, GP surgeries and Tunbridge Wells services, and consider that infrastructure should be secured before development proceeds. • Landscape and ecological concerns include loss of remaining green land, impact on woodland, wildlife and the setting of the High Weald National Landscape. • A small number of comments support housing in principle or support growth in this corridor, but generally subject to infrastructure, access and environmental constraints being addressed.	• Objections and concerns noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements including to Tunbridge Wells immediately north of the sites noted. Development is required to meet housing need across all parts of the District and in each of the five Housing Market Areas, meaning site selection has had to be carefully informed and balanced. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken, and updated landscape evidence. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines	• Update to the site allocation policy to set out constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

	their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	

SITE Ref: UCK10 (FWLP), UCK1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Uckfield Police Station, New Town, High Street, Uckfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: UCK10 (FWLP), UCK1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Uckfield Police Station, New Town, High Street, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	• An updated Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the proposed submission Local Plan	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: UCK10 (FWLP), UCK1 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Uckfield Police Station, New Town, High Street, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Uckfield Town Council • The existing buildings currently on the site should be retained. • This facility was an important part of the community and the existing buildings added character to the area with their Victorian design.	• The comments are noted. Any redevelopment proposal will be informed by an assessment of their character, condition and potential contribution to the scheme, alongside the need to make efficient use of the site and deliver a high-quality design.	• No change.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a

SITE Ref: FF5 (FWLP), UCK4 (FF) (Reg 19) – Land at Bird in Eye (North), Bird in Eye

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – N/A, as site proposed for allocation in FWP

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 22	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 19

SITE Ref: FF5 (FWLP), UCK4 (FF) (Reg 19) – Land at Bird in Eye (North), Bird in Eye		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Request clarification that the pedestrian/cycle route refers to the Framfield Road junction with New Town. • Advise that shared footway/cycleway provision on Bird in Eye Hill may be required if Bird in Eye South is not delivered. • Request suitable and appropriate buffers to Spring Barn Shaw ancient woodland, with larger buffers potentially required for major residential development.	• Comments and advice noted. • Whilst the request for the pedestrian/cycle route to avoid the Framfield Road junction with Bird in Eye Hill is made, this will need to be considered alongside other needs such as provision of shared footway/cycleway if Bird in Eye South is not delivered; deliverability of the north/south connection on site across the railway line; and the location of the site and the desired route for future occupiers to access services/facilities. A comprehensive Sustainable Transport Strategy will consider all issues in a holistic	• Amend wording of site allocation policy FF5 to require submission of a Sustainable Transport Strategy that considers all pedestrian/cycle connectivity across the site and in the wider area.

	manner, thus address the matters raised. • Criteria 4 of the policy requires suitable buffers to and setting back from Spring Barn Shaw AW and Policy NE4 seeks to protect AW. • The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	
Southern Water • Identify that FF5 may have limited local sewerage network capacity. • Request wording requiring occupation of development to be phased to align with delivery of sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider.	• Comment noted – Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the issue raised.
Network Rail • Request policy wording to secure sufficient fencing and boundary treatments to maintain railway safety and prevent trespass. • Request that development should not increase surface water drainage onto the railway and that drainage solutions should not be located within 20m of the railway.	• Comments noted. • The layout and boundary treatments proposed in development will be subject to a detailed planning application, which will consider the matters raised, and which will be subject with consultation with Network Rail.	• Amend policy to address strategic issue of proximity of development and provision of a suitable development in proximity of the railway line, but with specific details to be considered at planning application stage.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments recorded.		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Council	• Objections noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key	• No change required

• Object to FF5, alongside other Uckfield-area allocations, due to cumulative scale of growth, infrastructure pressure, highway impacts, settlement gap concerns, environmental harm and perceived lack of transparency in the level of growth concentrated around Uckfield.	constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Martin Grant Land • Support the allocation of FF5 for up to 215 dwellings • The site is considered a sustainable extension to Uckfield, situated adjacent to the existing development boundary. • Development would support the Council's objective of creating 20-minute neighbourhoods, with a bus stop within 400 metres and many local facilities accessible on foot. • The site could make an early contribution to housing supply • An on-site Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) can be provided.	• Support welcomed • Proposals for development noted, including quantum of development, delivery rates ans provision of SANG • The position on the use of the Network Rail underpass and connectivity between north/south parts of the site is noted, seeking delivery as a wider infrastructure project funded through CIL rather than a requirement of this development alone. Whilst this link may not be required solely for provision of this site and future occupiers, the site does enable	• Amend wording of site allocation policy FF5 to omit Criteria 7 as stands (avoiding junction for pedestrian/cycle route), and replace with a new criteria seeking submission of a Sustainable Transport Strategy that considers all pedestrian/cycle connectivity across the site and in the wider area.

• Request to review the allocation boundary, as the draft allocation includes land beyond what is necessary to deliver the site's objectives. • While supporting the aspiration for a future railway crossing and wider connectivity improvements, these should be pursued as a Council infrastructure project (potentially funded through CIL and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan), rather than being a requirement of the FF5 allocation itself. • Has not been possible to secure use of the existing underpass with Network Rail. • Object to criteria 7 which states that pedestrian and cycle routes should avoid the Framfield Road junction - junction provides the most direct and logical route into Uckfield town centre and this is supported by previous appeal decisions and discussions with ESCC Highways.	facilitation and provision of that link and its use would be related to this and neighbouring development, enabling future occupiers of the site(s) to access services and facilities in the wider area. The development should therefore facilitate and directly contribute towards that provision via suitable mechanisms, even if not proving that link in full. The wording of Policy FF5 will be amended to seek a comprehensive Sustainable Transport Strategy will consider all connectivity issues in a holistic manner, thus addressing the issue raised. • Position noted on the location of pedestrian/cycle routes, noting how the matter is also related to the north/south connection noted above, and delivery of wider footway works from development nearby. The matter will be addressed through submission of a Sustainable Transport Strategy to consider issues in a holistic manner. •	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE	• Objections noted.	• Update to the site allocation policy FF5 to better illustrate constraints

• Object to the site's unsustainable countryside location and ecological impacts. • The site is not genuinely adjacent to the existing settlement, apart from a small northern section connected near the railway line • It represents an encroachment into open countryside • The site poses a significant risk to adjacent Ancient Woodland - would undermine it's integrity and setting, potential deterioration and long-term ecological harm • The site lies within a recognised Biodiversity Opportunity Area, making its protection and enhancement particularly important. • Call for removal of FF5 before Reg 19 Plan.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The site allocation process has been informed by landscape evidence, including the Landscape Sensitivity Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, which consider both individual and cumulative effects. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed.
The Woodland Trust • Objects to FF5 because the site includes Spring Barn Shaw Ancient Woodland, an irreplaceable habitat. Recommend that the	• Objection noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy	• Update to the site allocation policy FF5 to better illustrate constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas to ensure

allocation boundary be amended to exclude the woodland and strongly supports the requirement for substantial protective buffer zones between any development and the ancient woodland to prevent ecological harm.	requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Criteria 5 of the policy requires a suitable buffer to the woodland.	development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong objection to FF5 on the grounds that the site is considered unsustainable, constrained by flooding, landscape, biodiversity and access issues, likely to worsen traffic congestion and infrastructure pressures (schools, healthcare, sewerage and wastewater), and inconsistent with maintaining Uckfield's rural setting and environmental qualities. • Several respondents request that FF5 be removed from the Local Plan allocation.	• Objections noted. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• Update to the site allocation policy FF5 to better illustrate constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site, and incorporates landscape mitigation and enhancements where needed.

	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	

SITE Ref: OFF5 (FLWP), UCK3 (FF) – Land at Hempstead Lane, Uckfield

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

This site was not promoted at Regulation 18

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: OFF5 (FLWP), UCK3 (FF) – Land at Hempstead Lane, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	No response required	No change required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Turley for Martin Grant Homes • Agrees that OFF5 is available and achievable but disputes conclusion that it is not suitable or deliverable.	• The consideration of OFF5 for allocation forms part of the Council's strategy for meeting housing and other development needs in sustainable locations while seeking to minimise impacts on	• The Council has chosen to allocate the site and a site-specific policy for the allocation has been added to the Plan (UCK3) (FF) that reflects the constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure

• Argue that all constraints identified in the SHELAA can be addressed through further technical work and design • State that there are no in-principal barriers to residential development • Request that the SHELAA assessment be amended and the site classified as deliverable, rather than "not deliverable or developable	environmental and landscape assets. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFF5 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Do not object to development in principle but request site-specific policy requirements to ensure: o Spring Barn Shaw ancient woodland is excluded from developable area;	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy	• The Council has chosen to allocate the site and a site-specific policy for the allocation has been added to the Plan (UCK3) (FF) that reflects the constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure

○ Adequate buffers and ecological safeguards are included for Spring Barn Shaw and the adjacent Ancient Woodland to the north; ○ Surveys and protection measures are secured for ancient and veteran trees; and ○ Habitat connectivity is maintained and indirect impacts on woodland are avoided.	NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • Following a review of reasonable alternatives, the technical evidence and consultation responses, the Council considers that OFF5 represents an appropriate and sustainable allocation subject to the policy requirements contained within the Local Plan.	development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to OFF5 as a speculative option site rather than a formal allocation, arguing that previous SHELAA evidence found the site unsuitable. • Key concerns relate to poor access and connectivity, highway capacity, sustainable transport, infrastructure, flood risk, landscape sensitivity, heritage impacts and ecological constraints including ancient woodland. • Residents consider that no new evidence has been provided to overcome these constraints and request that OFF5 is excluded unless it can be shown to be suitable, sustainable and deliverable. **Manor Park & Hempstead Fields Residents Association**	• Concerns and objections noted. • Should OFF5 be allocated, any future development proposal would be required to demonstrate that safe and suitable access can be achieved and that any impacts on the highway network can be appropriately mitigated. East Sussex County Council, as Local Highway Authority, would be consulted throughout the process. • Flood risk is a key consideration in the assessment of all development options and the SFRA deals with this issue for sites. Future development proposals would be required to demonstrate that they	• The Council has chosen to allocate the site and a site-specific policy for the allocation has been added to the Plan (UCK3) (FF) that reflects the constraints, designations, and necessary buffer areas and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

• Concerns over highway capacity and access arrangements for OFF5 if allocated. Existing roads in the area are at capacity and congested • Request that any allocation specifically prevents vehicular access through Manor Park and Hempstead Fields – due to road capacity issues. • Concerns over suitability / safety of Hempstead Lane for any access (cars, pedestrians, cyclists) – no footways, limited passing opportunities, poor visibility and sharp bends, hedgerows and ditches restrict widening opportunities. • Concerned about flood risk – site lies in a known flood plain • Concern regarding impacts on habitats and wildlife within the site and the adjacent ancient woodland, Views Wood • Doubt expressed that mitigation measures could adequately compensate for losses or deliver biodiversity gains. • Concern that, when considered alongside other developments, OFF5 would contribute to cumulative impacts on flood resilience; ecological networks; and local environmental character.	would not increase flood risk on-site or elsewhere and would incorporate sustainable drainage measures where appropriate • Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4), biodiversity (Policy NE1) and landscape (Policy NE6 and NE7). The plan should be read as a whole, and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • The cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA).	

SITE Ref: UCK9 (FWLP), UCK4 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land rear of Oakley Court, Selby Road, Uckfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: UCK9 (FWLP), UCK4 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land rear of Oakley Court, Selby Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Uckfield Town Council • Objected to draft policy, however no specific details provided.	• Objection noted.	• No change required.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	No response required.	No change proposed.

SITE Ref: FF2 (FWLP), UCK6 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Land off Eastbourne Road

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: FF2 (FWLP), UCK6 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Land off Eastbourne Road		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • This allocation contains both nationally important priority habitat and irreplaceable ancient woodland. • The allocation has therefore direct and direct impacts to irreplaceable and nationally important habitats which must be avoided.	• The ecological sensitivities of the site, including priority habitat and ancient woodland, are recognised. The site allocation boundary will be distinguished from the developable area, and development would be directed away from areas of ecological constraint. Relevant policies of the Local Plan provide protection for ancient woodland, priority habitats and biodiversity, and any future proposal would be required to demonstrate compliance with these requirements.	• No change.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• None		

Town/Parish Councils	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Potential flood risk and drainage concerns due to the site's relationship with the adjacent flood zone. • Potential impacts on nearby ancient woodland. • Further assessment of the site's environmental and ecological impacts is required.	• Flood risk, drainage and the site's proximity to ancient woodland are recognised as important considerations. The site allocation boundary will be distinguished from the developable area, and relevant environmental and ecological constraints will inform the location and design of development. Any proposal would be required to comply with relevant Local Plan policies relating to flood risk, biodiversity and the protection of ancient woodland.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: FF2 (FWLP), UCK6 (FF) (EH) (Reg 19) – Land off Eastbourne Road		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Object to draft policy. • Raise concerns about the scale and transparency of growth proposed around Uckfield, Maresfield, Buxted, Framfield and Little Horsted. • Considers that this would place unacceptable pressure on already constrained infrastructure and would represent an excessive concentration of development in this part of the district. • Concerns about settlement gaps, overdevelopment, highways, infrastructure, heritage, landscape, nature reserves, ancient woodland and SSSI harm.	• Comments noted. • The scale and distribution of growth has been informed by the Council's evidence base and the assessment of reasonable development options. The Council recognises concerns regarding infrastructure capacity and the cumulative concentration of development; these matters have been considered through the Local Plan, supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan and Sustainability Appraisal. Highway, landscape, heritage and ecological constraints, including impacts on settlement character,	• No change.

	designated sites and ancient woodland, are addressed through relevant policies of the Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **None**		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• **None**		

Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents objected to the policy, raising concerns about loss of habitat, waterlogging and flooding, potential impacts on ancient woodland, distance from Uckfield and likely car dependency. • Comments also referred to existing congestion on Eastbourne Road, unsafe conditions for cyclists, inadequate sewage infrastructure, stretched water resources and wider cumulative pressure from development around Uckfield. No resident names have been included.	• Comments noted. • The Council acknowledges concerns regarding habitat and ancient woodland, flood risk and drainage, accessibility and highway impacts. These constraints are identified through the evidence base and are addressed through relevant policies within the Plan. Concerns regarding water supply and sewerage capacity are also noted, with infrastructure requirements arising from growth considered through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • The cumulative impacts of development have been	• No change.

	considered through the Sustainability Appraisal.	

SITE Ref: UCK4 (FWLP), UCK7 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Sunview, 46 New Road, Ridgewood, Uckfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: UCK4 (FWLP), UCK7 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Sunview, 46 New Road, Ridgewood, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • This this allocation is surrounded by nationally important priority habitat and impacts must be avoided. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	• The developable area will be distinguished from the site boundary in order to identify the developable areas where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • An updated Habitats Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	• No change

Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Impact on services • Impact on infrastructure.	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding pressure on local services and infrastructure. Infrastructure required to support planned growth is identified through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, with necessary improvements and contributions to be secured through the planning process where appropriate.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: UCK4 (FWLP), UCK7 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Sunview, 46 New Road, Ridgewood, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Uckfield Town Council • Concern that 30 dwellings would increase traffic pressures on New Road, which is narrow, experiences on-street parking and is already used as a cut-through. • Request that the indicative housing yield be reduced to 15 dwellings or fewer. • Concern about impacts on the adjacent allotments, including noise, additional traffic, road runoff and pollution. • Potential impacts on Millennium Green, the adjoining watercourse, habitats and root protection areas (RPAs). • Concern regarding the gradient/topography of the site and its implications for development.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding traffic and access on New Road, impacts on neighbouring allotments, drainage, biodiversity and the site's topography. These constraints have been considered through the site assessment process and are appropriately addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. • The request to reduce the indicative housing yield is noted; however, the Council considers the proposed yield appropriate, subject to detailed assessment and design at planning application stage.	• No change

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: UCK7 (FWLP), UCK8 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Cress Farm, 20 Lewes Road, Ridgwood, Uckfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: UCK7 (FWLP), UCK8 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Cress Farm, 20 Lewes Road, Ridgwood, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Southern Water • Advises that existing sewerage infrastructure crosses the site and must be accommodated within the development layout. • An appropriate easement should be maintained free from buildings and substantial tree planting, which may influence the developable area or require infrastructure diversion. • Request that the site allocation includes policy wording requiring continued access to sewerage infrastructure for future maintenance and upgrading.	• Comment noted. • This issue has been considered in the site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, where design and layout will be considered in detail. Policy INF4 within the Local Plan does consider utilities and will need to be complied with.	• No change
Natural England	• An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published	• No change

• The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Impact on services • Impact on infrastructure.	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding pressure on local services and infrastructure. Infrastructure required to support planned growth is identified through the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan, with necessary improvements and contributions to be secured through the planning process where appropriate.	• No change

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: UCK7 (FWLP), UCK8 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Cress Farm, 20 Lewes Road, Ridgwood, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Uckfield Town Council • The site is recognised as previously developed land and its redevelopment would effectively represent infill development. • Query regarding the proposed 8 dwelling yield, with the landowner reportedly indicating that 6 dwellings had been agreed. • Concern regarding the narrow access to Cress Farm, despite improvements having already been made to part of the access serving recent development. • Concerns regarding access onto Lewes Road, visibility splays and existing traffic movements. • Concern regarding the relationship with existing and recently constructed neighbouring properties, including the close	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding access, visibility, traffic impacts and the relationship with neighbouring development. These matters are addressed through relevant policies of the Plan. • The comments regarding the indicative housing yield are noted; however, the Council considers the proposed yield appropriate, subject to detailed assessment and design at planning application stage.	• No change.

proximity of development at Ridgewood Place. • Potential impacts on the nearby village stores were also raised.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: UCK6 (FWLP), UCK9 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 5	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: UCK6 (FWLP), UCK9 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA	• Comment noted. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as NE5 Ashdown Forest SPA. • A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken to support the latest version of the Local Plan	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Devine Homes PLC • We are in full support of this with reference to UCK6 for a yield of around 55 units of which Devine Homes has an interest.	• Support welcomed. • The yield has been calculated based on site area, constraints and potential density, thus will remain as set out	• No change required

• The site may yield more than 55 units	based on these characteristics. Should a greater yield provide possible whilst still complying with all policies in the Plan, this will be considered on merit at the planning application stage.	
Other consultee bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object • Proposed new sites are mainly greenfield. • Developments will be car dependent resulting in congestion. • Impact of noise pollution. • Impact on wildlife	• Objection noted. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as NE1 Biodiversity, geodiversity and Nature Recovery and NE11 Noise Pollution	• No change required

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: UCK6 (FWLP), UCK9 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
East Sussex County Council • Requirement 1 should be amended to exclude use of the dedicated bus/sustainable transport access track for general vehicular access • Development should support and enhance active travel and connectivity in line with wider comments on public rights of way, walking, cycling and public transport provision • All site allocations should be supported by an Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA) and Ecological Constraints and Opportunities Plan (ECOP) to ensure biodiversity considerations are embedded within development proposals.	• Comments noted. • Update to requirement 1 of the site allocation policy UCK6 to address comments. • The plan should be read as a whole. The development must also comply with other policies in the plan, such as NE1 Biodiversity, Geodiversity and Nature Recovery; INF1 Infrastructure provision, delivery and funding and INF2 Active and Sustainable Travel.	Update to requirement 1 of the site allocation policy UCK6 to exclude vehicular access from the dedicated bus/sustainable transport access track.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Uckfield Town Council • Concerns raised over access still • Concerns were raised on the proximity to existing housing on Lewes Road. Could there be	• Policy UCK6 (1) requires provision of suitable access in liaison with the Highway Authority. Any development must comply with this	No change required

a green buffer provided and a possible 20m gap. If access came off Red Clover Road, there would be further safety concerns during construction.	policy and other policies in the Plan when read as a whole • Development will be subject to detailed consideration at planning application stage, which will require a suitable layout and location of development, having regard to neighbouring and future occupiers privacy and amenity.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to allocation of UCK6 as its development would contribute to the overdevelopment of greenfield land around Uckfield • Would result in the permanent loss of farmland, open space, and the rural character of the Low Weald • UCK6 currently serves as an important wildlife buffer. Development would further fragment habitats and accelerate biodiversity loss. • The site contains established tree-lined corridors that provide habitat, screening, and ecological connectivity. All mature trees should be fully retained and protected. • Bats are understood to use the existing tree-lined corridor linking adjacent property and UCK6 for navigation and foraging. Removal or	• Objections noted • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No change required

disruption of this corridor could negatively affect a protected species • The proposed allocation of 55 dwellings is too dense for the site's size, character, and topography. • Site won't deliver housing for local need. • The cumulative impact of this allocation with existing and approved development in Uckfield on schools, GP services, roads, water supply, and sewage infrastructure has not been adequately assessed. • Further development will exacerbate traffic congestion in and around Uckfield. • There is concern that development on UCK6 would further urbanise a prominent countryside setting and damage local landscape character. • Due to the site's elevated topography, there are concerns about overlooking and loss of privacy for neighbouring properties.	• Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA). • Cumulative impact of the Uckfield sites is assessed in the landscape evidence base and SA. • Development will be subject to detailed consideration at planning application stage, which will require a suitable layout and location of development, having regard to neighbouring and future occupiers privacy and amenity.	

SITE Ref: UCK1 (FWLP), UCK10 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: UCK1 (FWLP), UCK10 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • The allocation site contains nationally important priority habitat and is surrounded by significant blocks of irreplaceable ancient woodland. • The site lies within the zone of influence for Ashdown Forest SPA.	• The developable area will be distinguished from the site boundary in order to identify the developable areas where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan. • An updated Habitats Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	• No change
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: UCK1 (FWLP), UCK10 (UCK) (Reg 19) – Land at Thorncrest, Lewes Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Parts of the boundaries of these sites are adjacent to an area ancient woodland. • Request a buffer zone between this area and any development on the site.	• The developable area will be distinguished from the site boundary in order to identify the developable areas where residential development will be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No change.
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Object to allocation due to its location within the Ashdown Forest SPA Zone of Influence. • Concern that the scale and cumulative effect of development proposed around Uckfield could adversely affect Ashdown Forest and its internationally important habitats. • Consider that the allocation should be assessed in combination with the other proposed allocations, including potential recreational pressure, increased traffic and associated air, light and noise pollution. • Concern that development around Uckfield could result in habitat fragmentation and reduced ecological connectivity, including	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the potential individual and cumulative effects of development on Ashdown Forest, including recreational pressure, traffic, pollution and ecological connectivity. An updated Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken to support the submission version of the Local Plan and considers the potential effects of the Plan on internationally designated sites. Relevant ecological constraints and mitigation requirements are also addressed through site-	• No change

impacts on wildlife corridors linking Ashdown Forest with the wider landscape. • Raise concern that the proposed level of development has not been supported by an updated Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and appropriate mitigation, including SANG provision.	specific requirements and other policies within the Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: Question 4 (Reg 18(1)), LH1 (FWLP), UCK11 (LH) – Land at Owlsbury Farm, Lewes Road, Uckfield

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 755	**Support:** 5	**Neutral:** 67	**Object:** 683

Question 4: Land West of Uckfield, Owlsbury		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Separation from Uckfield • Would require the provision of significant connections in particular for non-car traffic • Access from the A22 and the A26 will be required • A full transport assessment and modelling will be required • Impact on the landscape and associated mitigations	• Comments noted	• Policy required to include policy criteria in relation to connectivity, highway improvements and the need for a sustainable transport strategy, as well as requirements on landscape and other issues.
Network Rail • Would encourage the inclusion of improved pedestrian and cycle route over the A22 to connect with Uckfield and provide access to the station • The inclusion of a mobility hub within the site would be supported	• Comments noted	• Policy required to include policy criteria in relation to connectivity, and highway improvements.

South East Water • Would need to consider the water supply infrastructure required to support the development • Strategic site would need to be delivered at a high level of water efficiency and with sustainable drainage – policy wording will be required	• Comments noted • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Any development will be required to comply with other policies in the Plan, including those relating to efficiency standards. The Plan should be read as a whole.	• No change required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Lewes District Council • Concerns about the impact on the highway network • Note that further work is needed • Need to ensure that cross boundary implications are assessed and considered	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements such as Uckfield. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations.	• No change required

	• Liaison with neighbouring LPAs on cross-boundary infrastructure will continue.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Danehill Parish Council • Disproportionate scale of proposed development • Housing numbers have increased since the previous consultation with limited information in relation to infrastructure • Impact on the environment and the existing infrastructure • Impacts would outweigh benefits • Conflict with the NPPF and the vision and objectives of the Plan	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, heritage assets	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	and protected environmental constraints.	
East Hoathly with Halland Parish Council • Geographical and physical separation from Uckfield • Unsuitable infrastructure • Impact on the environment • Conflict with the vision of the plan	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Heathfield & Waldron Parish Council • Further scrutiny should be given to such proposal	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site	• No change required

	suitability, as set out in the evidence base.	
Horam Parish Council • Poor location due to impact on the landscape	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including work to assess site suitability and landscape impact, as set out in the evidence base.	• No change required
Isfield Parish Council • Lack of masterplanning to integrate proposals to settlement and infrastructure provision • Engagement with community is needed to discuss settlement growth • Incoherent growth to Uckfield • Disproportionate proposed population growth for Uckfield and surrounding area • Lack of connectivity with the town centre • Highway constraint • Substantial adverse impact on the environment	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, protected	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	environmental constraints, and need for highway improvements. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Laughton Parish Council • Unnecessary considering unimplemented permissions • Impacts on the highway network	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, with that need identified through use of the Standard Method calculation, as set out. Unimplemented permissions are accounted for in the Plan, forming the Commitments element of planned provision, again as set out. • Development in the area will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations.	• No change necessary
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Object to the proposal • Impacts on the environment	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and

	work to assess site suitability and landscape impact, as set out in the evidence base such as such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Mayfield and Five Ashes Parish Council • This should be further investigated as a well design new settlement could be advantageous	• Comments noted and welcomed. • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site suitability, as set out in the evidence base.	• No change necessary
Rotherfield Parish Council • No comment	• Noted	• No change necessary
Uckfield Town Council • Further considerations would be need in relation to the SANG • Greater buffer would be expected from woodlands and green corridors • All forms of infrastructure should be considered • Character and density of housing should reflect the local area and topography of the site • Affordable housing policy requirements should be met • Adequate parking provision should be planned for • Employment should be provided on site • Impacts on heritage and non-heritage assets should be considered	• Comments noted. • The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, protected environmental constraints, need for associated on site infrastructure and development, and need for highway improvements. • Any development will need to comply with other policies in the Plan, including those requiring affordable housing requirements and on site parking provision. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
B Yond Homes Limited • Object to the proposal beyond the A22 which forms a clear defensible boundary and would be distanced from services and facilities • Impact on the landscape	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken and assessment of landscape issues.	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, connectivity requirements, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Fairfax Properties • Potential to include housing to meet the housing need for the area • The Council's assessment of this strategic site is too granular for a potential garden community and focusses on issues that are not considered to be material at this early stage	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including assessment of key strategic issues. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• No change necessary.
Grosvenor Property UK Limited	• The site was assessed ahead of Regulation 18(1) as set out in the	• No change necessary.

• An allocation of this scale should have been assessed ahead of the regulation 18 consultation • Unclear as to why Land at West of Uckfield has been taken forward for consideration in the Draft Plan, whilst North West Hailsham has not • Both site could be allocated considering the unmet need in the area.	evidence base, and representations sought, as now summarised. • Sites have been assessed as set out in the evidence base, with differing outcomes on differing sites due to differing constraints, characteristics and issues. These issues are summarised in evidence, such as in the Sustainability Appraisal Strategic Site Assessments, setting out differences between sites and conclusions reached.	
South West Strategic Developments • Lack of information to fully comment on the proposal • Further information needs to be provided in particular in relation to viability • Significant infrastructure provision will be required • An allocation of this scale will be necessary to meet the housing need	• Comments noted and support welcomed • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site suitability, as set out in the evidence base. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• No change necessary.
Real Select Ltd • Agree that Uckfield has the potential to accommodate further development • If such site is considered alternatives site in and around Uckfield should be considered	• Comments noted • Sites have been assessed as set out in the evidence base, with differing outcomes on differing sites due to differing constraints, characteristics and issues. These issues are summarised in evidence, such as in the Sustainability Appraisal Strategic Site Assessments, setting out	• No change necessary.

	differences between sites and conclusions reached.	
Richborough • The identification of this site as a potential allocation shows an inconsistent approach considering alternative identified within the SHELAA • There is no justification for how this locational sustainability element of the assessment has been addressed and therefore it isn't clear why the same approach hasn't been taken in respect of land west of Polegate • Fail to identify a range of active travel connections across the A22	• Comments noted • Sites have been assessed as set out in the evidence base, with differing outcomes on differing sites due to differing constraints, characteristics and issues. These issues are summarised in evidence, such as in the Sustainability Appraisal Strategic Site Assessments, setting out differences between sites and conclusions reached.	• No change necessary.
Vistry Group **Reinar Properties Limited** • It is clear that further sites are needed for inclusion in the emerging plan • No identification of the proposed yield • The site is considered unsuitable in the SHELAA • The inclusion of significant sites is likely to slow down the delivery rate	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site suitability, as set out in the evidence base.	• No change necessary.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Brighton and Hove Buses • The site could not realistically be served by diverting existing bus routes • It is important that a development of this scale provides a frequent and high quality bus service from early till late,	• Comments noted • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan. Other on site provision, including connectivity across the A22, will be secured through site specific allocation policy	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, connectivity requirements, and ensure development suitable in delivery.

seven days a week with high quality supporting infrastructure • Timing for the delivery of the infrastructure will need to be considered before it is self-sustaining.	and assessed in detail (considering days/times/layout issues) at planning application stage.	
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Concerns about impacts on Ashdown Forest's connectivity to the south and indirect impacts on the Forest	• The Plan is subject to updated Habitat Regulations Assessment as set out.	• No change necessary
CPRE Sussex **The Working Group Against Over Development** • Not supportive of the proposal • Lack of masterplanning to integrate proposals to settlement and infrastructure provision • Engagement with community is needed to discuss settlement growth • Incoherent growth to Uckfield • Disproportionate proposed population growth for Uckfield and surrounding area • Lack of connectivity with the town centre • Highway constraint • Substantial adverse impact on the environment	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	landscape setting, protected environmental constraints, and need for highway improvements. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Dicker Residents Association • Would make sense in combination with the re-opening of the Uckfield to Lewes	• Comments noted • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• No change necessary
Forest Row Local CBS Limited • Failure to plan appropriately for Uckfield • Site not well integrated to Uckfield • Development at this location would significantly increase the population count • Lack of suitable infrastructure • Concerns over the environmental impacts of the proposal • Undermine the vision of the draft Local Plan for a sustainable future	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.

	• The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, protected environmental constraints, and need for highway improvements. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Piltdown Friends and Residents Association • No need for this scale development at this location • Strained infrastructure at Uckfield • Detached from the town • Environmental constraints • Loss of greenfield land	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site.
Sussex Ornithological Society • Object to the proposed	• The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and

• Impact on landscape • The site meets one of the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site	development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, and ecological and environmental designations. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on ecological areas. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan	ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Lack of ecological details • Concerned about the prospect of large-scale development occurring west of the A22 • Need protection of wildlife corridors, including in relation to recent records	• The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, and ecological and environmental designations. • Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on ecological areas. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
The Woodland Trust • Object to the inclusion of ancient woodland within the site boundary • Suitable buffer zone should be designated around ancient woodland	• The site allocation Policy notes key issues to address in site development, including sensitivity to landscape setting, and ecological and environmental designations.	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site

• Ancient Tree Inventory should be completed for any proposed allocation	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on ecological areas. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan	
Uckfield Chamber of Commerce • Appropriate infrastructure should be delivered alongside new residential development • Object to the proposal which is disconnected from the town and could impact on quality of life and well-being of the town	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1 settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken.	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, connectivity requirements, and ensure development suitable in delivery.

	• Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	
Village Concerns • No comment on site in the plan outside the parish • Disappointing that insufficient work was carried out to make a decision on the proposal	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site suitability, as set out in the evidence base.	• No change necessary
Wealden Food Partnership • Object to the proposal as an allocation • Loss of agricultural land • Add pressure on existing infrastructure around Uckfield • Further consultation should be carried out before decision takes place	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including updated work to assess the site suitability, as set out in the evidence base. • The site is subject to further consultation through the Local Plan process. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan	• No change necessary
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• The majority of residents objected, citing the scale and location of development, its extension of Uckfield beyond the A22, poor integration with the town, potential coalescence and impacts on countryside, landscape, agricultural land, biodiversity, floodplains, heritage and quality of life.	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements as part of the spatial strategy, as set out. Uckfield is identified as a Type 1	

• Concerns were raised over insufficient infrastructure, services, amenities and sustainable transport, the lack of a comprehensive masterplan and whether the proposal could achieve a well-connected 20-minute neighbourhood. Necessary infrastructure, employment, education, healthcare, affordable housing, parking and improved connectivity were sought. • Residents questioned the strategic justification and need for the allocation, including its consistency with national policy and the Local Plan vision, identified SHELAA constraints, and whether existing permissions and other developments had been fully considered. • Alternative approaches were suggested, including brownfield development, higher densities, smaller sites, alternative locations including 1110/3120 and a wider distribution of growth. Concerns were also raised that the allocation could be driven by housing targets, A22 improvements or proposals at Ashdown Business Park rather than a comprehensive strategy for Uckfield. • Some residents supported the allocation, considering Uckfield an accessible and sustainable location for	settlement, of the highest category, being a town that offers extensive services and facilities and bus and train connections. Noting the need for adequate connectivity with the town, as required by policy, the site represents an extension to a large existing settlement. The process for selecting and assessing the site is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Sustainability Appraisal, including the site specific assessment undertaken. • The Council recognises the level of local concern regarding the scale of development, settlement character, infrastructure capacity, traffic, public transport, connectivity, water and sewerage capacity, landscape, biodiversity and impacts on heritage. These issues have been considered through further evidence, masterplanning and policy refinement. Any future planning application would need to demonstrate how site-specific impacts are	

growth that could reduce pressure on villages, support affordable housing and potentially improve the town's viability and wider transport infrastructure, including the Lewes-Uckfield rail link. Support was generally dependent on appropriate infrastructure, sustainable connections and effective integration with the town.	mitigated, including infrastructure delivery, access, drainage, biodiversity, landscape and active travel provision. • The Council has carried out a detailed site assessment to identify all deliverable or developable options, including assessment of smaller sites and those on brownfield land. Other sites are deemed unsuitable for the reasons set out. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Cumulative impact of the site and issues of coalescence are assessed in the evidence base, specifically the Sustainability Appraisal.	

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 654	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 9	**Object:** 644

SITE Ref: LH1 (FWLP), UCK11 (LH) – Land at Owlsbury Farm, Lewes Road, Uckfield

Statutory Consultees	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
East Sussex County Council • Requirement 3 should include 'along' the A22 • Requirement 5 should include a requirement for a Sustainable Transport Strategy. • Requirement 11 should include a reference to enhancement of PRoWs where requirement (including protection from flooding) • Outstanding issues reason by the highway authority in relation to the live application on the site calling into question the acceptability of the proposal in terms of accessibility and impact upon the highway network • Multiple Ancient Woodland parcels and main river within the site	• Comments noted	• Amended the policy to address issues raised
National Grid Electricity Transmission • The site is crossed by 400kV Bolney–Ninfield overhead transmission lines. • Suggested wording: "The development will include a strategy for responding to the NGET Overhead Cable Route present within the site which demonstrates how the NGET Design Guide and Principles have been applied at the masterplanning stage and how the impact of the assets has been reduced through good design."	• Comment noted. Transmission infrastructure constraints will be addressed through masterplanning.	• Amend policy wording to address requirement

Network Rail • Requirement 3 should make reference to Uckfield station and include the following: “Provide safe and suitable routes for pedestrians and cyclists across / over the A22 to facilitate connectivity to Uckfield town centre and the railway station.” • Support requirement 4 • Scheme should provide suitable fencing and boundary treatment ahead of a future rail link to ensure the safety of future occupiers	• Comments noted	• Amend policy wording to address requirement
Southern Water • Site within 500m of operation wastewater treatment works and should include the following policy wording: "*The layout of development for any site allocation with 500m of an operational wastewater treatment works should be informed by an odour assessment to be undertaken in consultation with statutory wastewater operator for the works*." • Site may have limited local network capacity, and phasing of development may therefore be needed alongside network reinforcement prior to occupation of the total number of dwellings indicated in each policy. Include the following wording: "*Occupation of development will be phased to align with the delivery of*	• Comments noted • Sewerage capacity is recognised as a key infrastructure consideration and will be addressed through engagement with the service provider. Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and Infrastructure Delivery Plan • Issues of layout of development to address site constraints, including odour and other issues, will be considered at detailed application stage.	• Amend policy to include a requirement to address the phasing issue raised

sewerage infrastructure, in consultation with the service provider."		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Arlington Parish Council • Housing should be considered as properties in Ridgewood are not selling • Development should be inward facing to limit need for travelling by car regularly	• Comments noted	• Policy required to set out constraints and designations, and ensure development is directed to only suitable parts of the site
Buxted Parish Council • Object to the allocation • Inappropriate location for development of this scale	• Comments noted	• No action required
Fletching Parish Council • Object to the allocation which should be removed • Significant objections from residents and stakeholder via the local plan process and the planning application • Proposal contradicts the findings of the SHELAA • Site affected by flood risk • Insufficient ecological information • Proposed allocations despite unresolved issued identified in the Sustainability Appraisal	• Comments noted	• No action required

• Breach of the A22 urban boundary of Uckfield • Significant scale of the proposed development which would alter the spatial strategy of the district • Lack of integration with Uckfield • Car dependent development • Lack of suitable infrastructure to accommodate further development • Impact on environment and biodiversity		
Isfield Parish Council • Object to the allocation • Site previously rejected for development • Substantial public objection • Breach of the A22 boundary to Uckfield which would result in a car dependant development • Site at risk of flooding • Limited infrastructure capacity to accommodate development • Loss of productive agricultural land • Impacts on the village feel of Isfield and hamlet of Little Horsted	• Comments noted	• No action required
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Object to the allocation • Supportive of the response by Fletching Parish Council	• Comments noted	• No action required
Maresfield Parish Council		

• Maintain objection from first Regulation 18 consultation	• Comments noted	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Fairfax Acquisition Limited • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
CPRE Sussex • Object to the allocation • Objection on the planning application remains relevant • Proposal against the Draft Local Plan as a whole, and relevant paragraphs of the NPPF • Sprawl beyond the Uckfield Bypass • Entirely unsustainable location.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
Railfuture Ltd • Advocate for greater concentration of development around rail station to maximise investment in improved route and service capacity	• Comment noted	• No action required
Sussex Ornithological Society • Landscape west of the A22 is a bird-rich rural area • Site meets one of the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site • Site adjoins one of the Priority Areas in the Sussex Wildlife Trust Strategy for nature recovery	• Comments noted	• No action required

Sussex Wildlife Trust • Object to the allocation • concerns about the prospect of large-scale development occurring to the west of the A22. • Impact on the River Uck wildlife corridor • Preliminary ecological appraisal should e required before progressing the site further • Significant encroachment into the River Ouse floodplain • Insufficient additionality in terms of the planning balance • Adjacent to ancient woodland or Local Wildlife Sites and the need for strong natural environment protections, including biodiversity, flood risk and farmland matters.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on ecological areas. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• No action required
The Woodland Trust • Site contains multiple areas of ancient woodland, • Point 1 of the policy should be strengthened with a requirement for a specialist ancient woodland management and restoration plan, including suitable buffers, provision of SANGs and mapping of individual ancient & veteran trees across the site.	•	
Conservators of Ashdown Forest • Object to the allocation		

• Impacts on the Ashdown Forest and more general environmental concerns such as landscape connectivity, irreplaceable habitats and ancient woodland, hydrological harm and flood risk • Unsuitable and ineffective SANG • Unreliable HRA evidence • Site does not accord with the 20-minute neighbourhood principle and would hamper Uckfield's potential to become one. • Breach of settlement pattern and coalescence • Impacts on infrastructure	• An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan	• No action required
Dicker Residents Association • Owlsbury could be a key factor only if linked to the proposed reopening of the Uckfield to Brighton line with its own station.	• Comment noted	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Strong objection to the scale and location of the allocation, with 1,500 dwellings considered excessive and development beyond the A22 resulting in urbanisation, poor integration with Uckfield and limited benefits to the town centre. • Concerns regarding the cumulative impact on infrastructure and transport, including roads, congestion, road	• Comments noted. The issues raised by local residents are acknowledged and have been considered as part of the ongoing assessment of the site and the wider spatial strategy.	• No action required

safety, schools, healthcare, utilities, drainage, water/wastewater capacity and car dependency, particularly given the non-delivery of some existing permissions. • Environmental, landscape and heritage concerns included flooding, loss of farmland, biodiversity, ancient woodland, Local Wildlife Sites, Ashdown Forest, habitats and landscape character, heritage impacts and the effectiveness of mitigation such as SANG. • Some considered the allocation unsound, unjustified, undeliverable and contrary to sustainable development principles, although some support/neutral comments were received regarding housing need and wider plan matters. Safeguarding of the historic Uckfield-Lewes railway route was also requested.		

SITE Ref: WAD1 (FWLP), WAD1 (WAD) (Reg 19) – Land at Windmill House, Windmill Lane, Wadhurst

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Total: 4	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: WAD1 (FWLP), WAD1 (WAD) (Reg 19) – Land at Windmill House, Windmill Lane, Wadhurst		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Natural England • Site is immediately adjacent to/within the High Weald AONB. • If progressed, the allocation must demonstrate how impacts on this nationally important landscape would be fully mitigated.	• Objection noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • The site has been assessed through the landscape evidence work which supports the Plan. • The determination of whether development constitutes major development in a National Landscape is a matter of planning judgment, taking account of the proposal in question and its context.	• No changes required
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

No Response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Boakes Land Projects • Supports inclusion of WAD1 as a draft allocation, citing the SHELAA summary. • Considers the site well contained, with no views in or out from the rural High Weald National Landscape and sustainably located. • States that pre-application material submitted to the Council included a detailed LVIA, ecology reports and scheme drawings supporting 20 policy-compliant dwellings.	• Support noted. • The submitted technical information, including landscape, ecology and scheme material, considered alongside the Council's evidence base. The site's capacity and suitability remain subject to the resolution of landscape, ecological, design and site-specific constraints.	• No changes required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Does not object to the allocation in principle but considers that a site-specific policy is required. • Policy should address the appropriate extent of built development to avoid adverse impacts on woodland to the south. • Existing trees, pond, boundary hedgerows and the avenue of trees along Windmill Lane should be retained. • The allocation and development boundary should exclude Priority Habitat in the southern part of the site. • Built development should respond to settlement pattern and character, using existing trees and the pond as positive place-making features and carefully considering frontage to Windmill Lane.	• Specific reference is made to the need to retain, protect and enhance specific features on the site. Other policies in the plan consider the impacts of proposed development. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• Specific site policy now included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Specific references are made to the need to retain, protect and enhance the site's mature vegetation, priority habitat deciduous woodland, tree avenue, in-field trees, tree clumps and historic field boundaries at the site.

• The final number of dwellings should be informed by these site considerations; 20 dwellings may be too many given identified constraints and opportunities.		
Other Comments	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No Response	n/a	n/a

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: WAD1 (FWLP), WAD1 (WAD) (Reg 19) – Land at Windmill House, Windmill Lane, Wadhurst		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Wadhurst Parish Council • Noted that the site is proposed for 20 dwellings and considered this to be a marginal judgement. • Raised concerns about landscape sensitivity, tree preservation orders, developable area, and the need for careful design and mitigation. • Highlighted that development proposals would need to meet relevant national planning policy requirements. • Also commented on wider Wadhurst site assessment matters, including corrections to settlement distances, station description, and environmental designations.	• Specific reference is made to the need to retain, protect and enhance specific features on the site. Other policies in the plan consider the impacts of proposed development. The plan should be read as a whole and proposals will be required to comply with all relevant policies in the plan.	• Specific site policy now included in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. Specific references are made to the need to retain, protect and enhance the site's mature vegetation, priority habitat deciduous woodland, tree avenue, in-field trees, tree clumps and historic field boundaries at the site.

Site Promoters	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No comments received	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Local resident • Objected to relying on WAD1 as the only allocation in Wadhurst. • Stated that the site has appeared in previous allocations and raised concerns that it may not be deliverable due to land ownership and restrictive covenant issues. • Suggested that other more viable sites should be allocated to deliver housing within the plan period. • Commented that additional housing could support local services, including schools, leisure facilities and shops. • Raised wider concerns about limited or absent allocations in Mayfield and Rotherfield and the long-term sustainability of those villages.	• Comments noted. • Deliverability, site availability and the suitability of alternative sites are considered through the site assessment process and wider settlement strategy. Comments relating to Mayfield and Rotherfield are wider Local Plan matters rather than comments specific to WAD1.	• No changes required.

SITE Ref: WES1 (FWLP), WES1 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to 125 Rattle Road, Westham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 4	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 4

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: WES1 (FWLP), WES1 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land adjacent to 125 Rattle Road, Westham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
No Response	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Westham Parish Council • Object to site allocation due to the loss of rural green gap between settlements and obstruction of views across Rattle Stream. • Concern of flooding of the road near the stream culvert which has had experience of flooding.	• The comments are noted. Concerns relating to loss of the rural gap between settlements, flood risk and surface water drainage, and highway safety have been considered. These matters would require detailed assessment through any future planning	• No change.

• Wider drainage issues and increased run off may place further pressure on watercourses and exacerbating flooding issues downstream in Langley. • Proposed access point would be located near a bend and downhill approach to Rattle Stream where vehicle speed can increase, raises concerns about road safety.	application, including consultation with relevant technical consultees.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
No response	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to site allocation. • Concerns include impact of flooding and surface water run-off, highway safety, access and traffic. • Site is also located on the rural green gap between settlements.	• The comments are noted. Concerns relating to loss of the rural gap between settlements, flood risk and surface water drainage, and highway safety have been considered. These matters would require detailed assessment through any future planning application, including consultation with relevant technical consultees.	• No change.

SITE Ref: WES7 (FWLP), WES2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at Peelings Lane, Westham

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation -

Total: 53	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 49

SITE Ref: WES7 (FWLP), WES2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at Peelings Lane, Westham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Allocation**
Natural England • Allocation directly adjacent to Pevensey Levels SAC/Ramsar • Additional information is required to ensure that impacts can be avoided and to demonstrate that the sites that are taken forward are those which have minimal or no environmental impact	• The Council further developed relevant policies in the Plan which should be read as a whole.	• No action required
Southern Water • Southern Water's infrastructure crosses the site. An easement width of 6 metres or more, depending on pipe size/depth, would be required • Site may require network reinforcement, which should be addressed in the policy wording and future planning conditions, to ensure occupation is phased with the delivery of the works needed	• This issue has been considered in site assessment. The issue must be addressed further at planning application stage, but adequate space exists on the site to address the constraint and still deliver development identified.	• No further action required – allocation/yield takes account of this constraint • Amend policy to include phasing requirement for network reinforcement
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

Pevensey Parish Council • Object to the allocation which should be removed • Issues with achieving access • Impact on local road network • Reliance on the private car • Impact on the Pevensey Levels SSSI, SAC, Ramsar and Biodiversity Opportunity Area • Impact on landscape, character and appearance of the area • Impact on heritage	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • The cumulative impact of development and landscape impacts are considered in the evidence base, such as the Sustainability Appraisal. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• See policy wording.
Westham Parish Council • Object to the allocation • Extension of the development boundary into the countryside • Impact on landscape and biodiversity • Change in local character • Impact on traffic	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• See policy wording.
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Bellway Strategic • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required

Other Consultee Bodies	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
Clarity Ecoworks • Object to the allocation • Significant area of the site at high risk of flooding • Proximity with the Pevensey Levels SSSI and the allocation does not align with the Council's conservation duties • Proximity with the Pevensey Levels SAC/Ramsar • Loss of Grade 3 agricultural land • Site bordered by hedgerows	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• See policy wording
CPRE Sussex • Site projects significantly into the countryside breaching the natural line of Westham • Contest the Sustainable Appraisal scoring for the site	• Comments noted • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
Peelings Lane Group • Object to the allocation • Impact on landscape, local character and setting • Historically refused planning permission for residential development • Insufficient water infrastructure provision • Areas of the site at high risk of flooding • Proximity with Pevensey Levels SSSI/Ramsar/SAC • Loss of quality agricultural land	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No action required
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Concerns over the proximity of the site with Pevensey Levels SAC with connections via	• Comments noted • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published	• No action required

ditches and lack of information on the ecological value of the site • The sustainability credentials for the site are based on the provision of a significantly higher quantum and associated mitigations although the site is allocation for a limited quantum which may not provide the same level of mitigations	alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	
The Working Group Against Development • Site projects significantly into the countryside breaching the natural line of Westham • Contest the Sustainable Appraisal scoring for the site	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Environmental impacts including flood risk, surface water runoff, groundwater protection, agricultural land loss, biodiversity loss, wildlife impacts, tree loss and removal of ancient hedgerows. • Impact on Pevensey Levels (SSSI, SAC and Ramsar sites), including concerns about water supply, water quality, pollution, grazing, wetland habitats and protected species. • Protected species concerns, including Great Crested Newts, Fen Raft Spider, dragonflies, aquatic beetles, hedgehogs, foxes and breeding buzzards.	• The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways	• See policy wording.

• Landscape and visual impacts, including harm to rural views, countryside character and local landscape quality. • Loss of rural character and concerns about the urbanisation of Westham and Peelings Lane. • Historic environment impacts, including effects on the conservation area, Peelings Lane as a Roman road, and the 1066 historic route. • Need for archaeological investigations because of the site's historical significance. • Traffic and highway concerns, including increased congestion, higher vehicle use, construction traffic, road safety issues and cumulative impacts from other developments. • Peelings Lane impacts, including concerns over traffic, safety, urbanisation and effects on a popular route for walkers and cyclists. • Access concerns, including suitability of site access arrangements. • Insufficient infrastructure and services, particularly sewage and wastewater capacity, schools, GP surgeries, dentists, public transport and other local facilities. • Public transport concerns, including limited bus services, inaccurate accessibility assumptions and reliance on private cars. • Noise, air and light pollution affecting residents and the wider environment. • Loss of green space and green infrastructure, including publicly accessible open space and deep-soil habitats. • Health and wellbeing impacts on existing residents.	movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise. • The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan. • Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal	

• Flood risk and drainage concerns, including questions about the effectiveness and long-term maintenance of SuDS, particularly on clay soils. • Water quality and pollution concerns, including potential effects on local watercourses, the Pevensey Levels and coastal waters. • Concerns over biodiversity net gain (BNG) and whether proposed BNG targets can be achieved, justified and enforced. • Employment concerns, including the site's suitability for employment uses and likely increases in commuting. • Housing need concerns, with some respondents questioning whether development is necessary in this location. • Cumulative impact concerns, particularly when considered alongside existing, approved and proposed developments in Westham, Hailsham, Eastbourne and Rother. • Previous appeal decisions, with references to earlier refusals based on landscape and character impacts and concerns that these remain relevant. • Requests for additional facilities, such as children's play areas and clearer requirements for community infrastructure. • Retention of existing features, including two existing dwellings, important trees and hedgerows. • Requests for stronger policy protection for the Pevensey Levels SSSI, SAC and Ramsar sites within the Local Plan.		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 31	**Support:** 3	**Neutral:** 2	**Object:** 26

SITE Ref: WES7 (FWLP), WES2 (WES) (Reg 19) – Land at Peelings Lane, Westham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
East Sussex County Council • Requested highway measures to restrict development-related vehicular access onto Peelings Lane, as it is unsuitable for such traffic.	• Comments noted.	• Specific policy wording has been added in respect of the expectations in relation to highway access. Amend policy to require highway measures restricting development-related vehicular access onto Peelings Lane.
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Pevensey Parish Council • Object to the allocation • Impact on highway safety and network with increased traffic • Impact on local character • Loss of farmland • Risk of flooding and insufficient drainage • Impact on and lack of infrastructure and services • Unsuitable location and overdevelopment	• Comments noted • The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy and supporting	• No action required

	Infrastructure Delivery Plan within the Local Plan. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Bellway Homes Strategic / DHA Planning • Supportive of the allocation • deliverable site for about 150 homes, close to Westham services and public transport. Considered the site suitable, available and unconstrained, with landscape, heritage, ecology, flood risk and transport matters capable of mitigation through the outline application.	• Welcome support	• No action required
Hempstead Farm Limited • Supportive of the allocation	• Welcome support	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Clarity Ecoworks • Object to allocation due to alleged mapping/evidence errors, including groundwater vulnerability, Biodiversity Opportunity Area, Priority Habitat and flood zone issues.	• Comments noted. • Mapping has been updated. • An update Habitat Regulation Assessment has been published alongside the submission version of the Local Plan.	• See policy wording.

• Calls for a 400m–1km Pevensey Levels/tributary buffer to address hydrology, pollution, SuDS limitations, wildlife impacts, wetland bird protection and community wellbeing.		
CPRE Sussex • Objected to the allocation • Open countryside development not genuinely adjacent to the settlement. • Impacts on the Pevensey Levels SAC/SSSI/Ramsar, Martin's Ditch hydrological connection • Landscape sensitivity, light pollution, views towards the Levels • Need to widen Peelings Lane.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• No action required
Friends of Peelings Lane • Objected to the allocation • Unclear what the proposal is • Impact on landscape and heritage • Unsuitable proposed access • Insufficient infrastructure capacity • Loss of area value by local community • Suggest alternative scoring for the assessment of the site included within the Sustainability Appraisal • Impact on biodiversity and wildlife	• Comments noted – The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken.	• No action required
Sussex Wildlife Trust • Concerned about proximity and hydrological links to the Pevensey Levels SAC via ditches, and the lack of ecological information on the site itself.	• The evidence base and proposed site allocation policy identify key constraints for the site which are addressed via site-specific policy requirements and/or within other policies within the Plan.	• Policy wording included in respect of TPOs, mature vegetation, tree belts and hedgerows

• Holding objection to application WD/2025/2269/MAO due to potential hydrological impacts.	• Site allocation policy notes key considerations on the site and how they should be dealt with alongside development. Any development will be required to conform with other policies in the Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents objected to the allocation • Loss of Peelings Lane's rural character and recreational value • Proximity and harm to the Pevensey Levels SAC/Ramsar/SSSI, wildlife and biodiversity impacts • Flood risk/drainage • Sewage and water quality concerns • Traffic/highway safety • Impacts on local infrastructure and services • Heritage/landscape impacts including Pevensey Castle views • Cumulative development around Westham/Stone Cross. • Supportive of the comments provided by Natural England during the first Regulation 18 consultation	• Comments noted - The Council carried out significant assessment work to identify land to address its housing need, including the need for extension to sustainable settlements. The process is set out in full in accompanying evidence base documents, such as the updated heritage evidence and HRA, the Spatial Strategy topic paper and Sustainability Appraisal, including the site-specific assessment undertaken. • Development of this size will inevitably generate an increase in highways movements. The Plan is accompanied by a Strategic Transport Study which models planned growth and determines their impact on the transport network. It has not identified significant or severe transport issues in relation to this site at these locations. National Planning Policy is clear that schemes can only be refused where it is assessed that 'severe' impacts would arise.	• See policy wording.

	• Cumulative impact of the Plan is assessed as part of the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal.	

SITE Ref: WIL1 (FWLP), WIL1 (WJ) (Reg 19) – Land at Mornings Mill Farm, Willingdon

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, site not proposed until Focused Local Plan stage.

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: WIL1 (FWLP), WIL1 (WJ) (Reg 19) – Land at Mornings Mill Farm, Willingdon		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Willingdon and Jevington Liberal Democrats • Raised concerns about reliance on access from the A2270 and the need for highways mitigation and supporting infrastructure. • Considered that additional congestion could increase rat-running through Willingdon, particularly at school times. • Noted that the allocation straddles the 1066 Walk and may follow the line of a Roman road.	• Comments noted. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No change.

• Suggested the area may be better retained for amenity land or potentially cemetery provision.		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Moorfields Advisory Limited • Support the draft allocation • Propose that the site could accommodate a higher density, noting the adjacent Mornings Mill development and suggesting a yield closer to approximately 95 dwellings. • Requested flexibility within policy wording so that higher quantum developments can come forward where appropriate. • Suggested that land currently identified for the medical centre could also be allocated for residential development if released, potentially accommodating around 20 dwellings.	• Comments noted. • Following assessment of the site and its identified constraints, the Council considers that the proposed quantum of development remains appropriate and does not propose to increase the indicative yield. The suggestion to allocate land identified for the medical centre for additional residential development is also noted; however, no change to the allocation is proposed at this stage.	• No change.
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	n/a	n/a
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Raised concerns that the land is low-lying/marshy and may function as a floodplain. • Objected to further housing without sufficient infrastructure, including school places, highway improvements, pedestrian crossing provision, employment opportunities and local services. • Emphasised the importance of protecting the Willingdon environment and ensuring homes are built on appropriate land.	• Comments noted. • Infrastructure required to meet growth is set out in policy within the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan.	• No change

D. Housing Options Sites

This presents the Housing Options that were presented at the Focused Local Plan (2026) stage. Some of these sites are progressing to proposed site allocations, and these can be found in the site allocations section. There were a number of instances where no representations were received on certain Housing Option sites. This relates to the following sites:

OHA1, OHA2, OHA4, OHE1, OHE2, OHE3, OHE4, OWI1 and OFF4.

SITE Ref: Allocation: OARL1 – Land to the north-west of Hempstead Lane, Hailsham

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total: 0	Support: 0	Neutral: 0	Object: 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 27	Support: 2	Neutral: 1	Object: 24

SITE Ref: Allocation: OARL1 – Land to the north-west of Hempstead Lane, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Arlington Parish Council • Objects to OARL1 and highlights that the site is located within Arlington Parish rather than Hailsham, requesting that its naming is corrected. • Considers the development would be poorly connected to Hailsham, separated by the A22 and therefore substantially car-dependent. • Raises significant concerns about existing and future flood risk, including downstream effects on Arlington and Alfriston.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges that the site is located within Arlington Parish and notes concerns regarding the scale of development, accessibility to Hailsham, car dependency and the capacity of the surrounding road network. Concerns regarding flood risk and potential downstream impacts on Arlington and Alfriston are also recognised. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OARL1 has not been	• No change

• Considers the proposed scale of growth disproportionate to the rural parish and existing infrastructure. • Also raises concerns about whether proposed housing would genuinely meet the needs of younger people for affordable homes.	taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Berwick Parish Council • Objects on the basis that development of OARL1 could exacerbate flooding along the River Cuckmere and downstream towards Alfriston.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the potential for development at OARL1 to exacerbate flood risk along the River Cuckmere, including potential downstream effects towards Alfriston. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Wealden Local Plan.	• No change
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Strongly objects to OARL1. • Raises concerns about A22, Boship Roundabout and rural lane congestion, together with limited public transport and active travel connections. • Considers the site severed from Hailsham by the A22 and inconsistent with the 20-minute neighbourhood concept. • Concern regarding loss of greenfield land, biodiversity and rural landscape character. • Raises significant flood risk and drainage concerns associated with the River Cuckmere.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding highway capacity and congestion, limited sustainable transport connections, flood risk associated with the River Cuckmere, loss of greenfield land and biodiversity, and pressure on healthcare, education and utility infrastructure. The concerns regarding the site's separation from Hailsham by the A22 and its compatibility with sustainable travel objectives are also noted. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options	• No change

• Considers healthcare, schools, utilities and other infrastructure insufficient to support the development. • Requests removal of OARL1 from the option sites.	considered, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Hailsham Town Council • Does not support OARL1 on the evidence currently available and considers further assessment necessary. • Questions whether reasonable spatial alternatives and different distributions of growth have been sufficiently assessed. • Considers the Sustainability Appraisal gives insufficient weight to the site's dependence on Hailsham for services and facilities. • Raises concerns regarding existing A22 and Hailsham traffic pressures, together with the site's poor connectivity to the town. • Questions the SA scoring for green infrastructure, biodiversity and transport. • Considers further evidence is required before determining whether OARL1 represents an appropriate option.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the adequacy of the evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, the site's relationship and connectivity with Hailsham, reliance on the town's services and facilities, and potential impacts on the A22 and wider highway network. The comments regarding the need to consider reasonable spatial alternatives and cumulative impacts are also noted. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Cochrane Strategic Development Limited / Stantec UK Limited • Supports OARL1 and requests its formal allocation for up to 2,500 dwellings. • Considers the site suitable, available, deliverable and sustainably located, and	• Support and comments noted. The Council acknowledges Cochrane Strategic Development Limited's promotion of OARL1 for a strategic development of up to 2,500 dwellings and the additional evidence submitted regarding housing delivery, access and	• No change

capable of making a substantial contribution towards housing and affordable housing needs. • Disagrees with the SHELAA and Sustainability Appraisal conclusions relating to highways, landscape, flood risk and deliverability. • Considers access can be provided from the A22, supported by new pedestrian/cycle connections, public transport improvements and a strategic crossing of the A22. • Considers impacts on the A22 and Boship Roundabout can be addressed through planned improvements, sustainable transport and additional mitigation. • States that development can be located outside areas of flood risk, supported by a comprehensive drainage strategy and crossings of the River Cuckmere. • Considers landscape impacts, including views from the South Downs National Park, capable of mitigation through masterplanning, planting and green infrastructure. • Proposes a mixed-use neighbourhood with education, health, community, recreation and local facilities, alongside substantial green and blue infrastructure. • Requests that the Hailsham development boundary is extended to include the site	connectivity, highways, flood risk, drainage, landscape, infrastructure and deliverability. The request to formally allocate the site and amend the development boundary is also noted. Following further assessment of the site, its identified constraints and reasonable development options, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. • The Council does not consider the additional evidence sufficient to overcome the identified constraints and justify the allocation of either OARL1 or the wider site. This is shown within the evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal process, which considers that there is no proven access or transport assessment confirming the site will not cause severe transport impacts, connectivity across the A22, flood risk issues and heritage constraints,	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u>	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the Woodland's Trust concerns regarding,	• No change

• Raises concerns that OARL1 contains Hempstead Farm Shaw ancient woodland. • Requests that ancient woodland is excluded from areas proposed for development and appropriately buffered. • Seeks protection from pollution, encroachment, fragmentation and disturbance, together with maintenance of ecological connectivity.	ecological constraints and Ancient Woodland. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Dicker Residents Association • Strongly objects to OARL1, principally due to flood risk and climate change. • Highlights existing flooding along the River Cuckmere and potential downstream effects on Arlington, Alfriston and other communities. • Concern that development and land raising could displace floodwater elsewhere. • Raises concerns regarding A22/Boship • Roundabout capacity and traffic generation. • Considers the site would be car-dependent and poorly connected to Hailsham. • Raises concerns about effects on the rural landscape, wildlife, historic buildings and views from the South Downs National Park. • Requests that the site is not taken forward.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding flood risk and climate change, including potential downstream impacts along the River Cuckmere, highway capacity and congestion, car dependency, landscape and biodiversity impacts, infrastructure provision and the setting and character of Upper Dicker and the South Downs National Park. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change
Hailsham Community Land Trust • Does not object to housing growth in principle but raises significant concerns regarding the scale and extent of OARL1.	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding wastewater capacity, water quality, flood risk, landscape character, infrastructure provision and settlement separation. The	• No change

• Concern about wastewater infrastructure, water quality and potential effects on the River Cuckmere and Arlington Reservoir. • Raises concerns regarding flood risk and infrastructure capacity. Considers a more balanced distribution of housing growth should be investigated. • Suggests that, if OARL1 is taken forward, development should be restricted to land east of the River Cuckmere, with the river forming a firm western boundary. • Considers the Cuckmere corridor should be retained as strategic green infrastructure, providing biodiversity, flood attenuation, recreation and a landscape buffer. • Considers a reduced allocation would better protect the separation between Hailsham and Upper Dicker and reduce infrastructure pressures	suggestion to retain the River Cuckmere corridor as strategic green infrastructure is also noted. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.	
Cllr Wilson • Objects to OARL1, considering its scale and location fundamentally unsustainable. • Considers the site poorly related to Hailsham because it is severed from the town by the A22, resulting in car dependency and difficulties achieving active travel connections. • Raises significant concerns about A22 capacity, Boship Roundabout and cumulative traffic impacts from development throughout the wider corridor. • Concern about landscape impacts, coalescence with Upper Dicker and effects on views from the South Downs National Park.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the concerns regarding the scale and sustainability of development, highway capacity and cumulative traffic impacts on the A22, flood risk, infrastructure provision, landscape and biodiversity, ancient woodland, agricultural land, heritage impacts and potential coalescence with Upper Dicker. Concerns regarding the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Delivery Plan are also noted. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, OARL1 has	• No change

• Raises concerns regarding ancient woodland, biodiversity, the River Cuckmere ecological corridor and flood risk. • Highlights existing sewage and water supply pressures. • Raises concerns regarding loss of agricultural land and impacts on heritage assets. • Questions whether the Sustainability Appraisal and Infrastructure Delivery Plan adequately assess the development and whether necessary infrastructure is funded and deliverable.	not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Green Weald Alliance CIC • References OARL1 principally as a potential alternative to major housing allocations within the High Weald National Landscape. • Considers sites such as OARL1 demonstrate the availability of potential housing options outside the National Landscape, which should be properly assessed before allocating substantial development within protected landscapes.	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges comments regarding the need to consider reasonable alternatives to development within the High Weald National Landscape, including OARL1. The Council has considered a range of reasonable development options through the plan-making process and Sustainability Appraisal. • Following further assessment of the site and its identified constraints, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change
On the Go - Polegate High Street Shop • Considers OARL1 has the potential to accommodate a substantial amount of	• Comments noted. The Council acknowledges the potential contribution that OARL1 could make towards meeting housing	• No change

housing and contribute towards meeting the District's housing requirement. • Acknowledges significant constraints, particularly A22/A27 congestion and infrastructure requirements. • Considers any necessary mitigation should be fully funded and secured through the development before permission is granted.	needs, alongside the concerns raised regarding highway capacity on the A22/A27 and the need for appropriate infrastructure and mitigation to support development. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents predominantly object to OARL1, considering development of the proposed scale to be inappropriate and unsustainable in this rural location. • Significant concerns are raised regarding flood risk associated with the River Cuckmere, surface water and groundwater, including the potential for development to displace or worsen flooding downstream. • Concerns regarding traffic, highway capacity and safety, particularly on the A22, Boship Roundabout, Coldharbour Road and surrounding rural lanes, with fears of increased congestion and rat-running. • The site is considered poorly connected to Hailsham and highly car-dependent, particularly due to the A22 acting as a barrier to walking and cycling. • Concern that existing water, wastewater, electricity, healthcare, education and other infrastructure is insufficient to support development of this scale and that necessary improvements may not be delivered alongside housing.	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the scale and sustainability of development at OARL1, including flood risk associated with the River Cuckmere, highway capacity and traffic impacts on the A22 and surrounding road network, the site's accessibility and reliance on private car travel, infrastructure capacity, impacts on agricultural land, biodiversity, ancient woodland and the wider Cuckmere Valley, effects on landscape character and heritage assets, and the potential for coalescence between Hailsham and Upper Dicker. Concerns regarding the retention of the River Cuckmere as a natural development boundary and suggestions that development should instead be directed to more sustainable or brownfield locations are also noted. Following further assessment of the site, its	• No change

• Concern regarding loss of countryside, agricultural land, biodiversity and wildlife habitats, including ancient woodland, hedgerows and the ecological importance of the Cuckmere Valley. • Residents raise concerns regarding landscape and heritage impacts, including effects on the rural setting of Upper Dicker, Michelham Priory and views from the South Downs National Park. • Concern that development would lead to urban sprawl and coalescence between Hailsham and Upper Dicker, eroding the separate identity and rural character of surrounding settlements. • Some respondents consider the River Cuckmere should provide a firm boundary to development, with the river corridor retained for green infrastructure, biodiversity, recreation and flood management. • Several respondents request that brownfield and more sustainable urban locations are prioritised, or that the scale of OARL1 is substantially reduced or the site removed from further consideration.	constraints and reasonable development options, OARL1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	

SITE Ref: OBE1 (FWLP) – Land East of Station Road, Berwick Station

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 5

SITE Ref: OBE1 (FWLP) – Land East of Station Road, Berwick Station		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

Local Residents	WDC Response	Proposed Changes to Policy
• Object due to concerns that development would harm the rural and linear character of Berwick and extend built development beyond the established settlement pattern. • Raise highway and access safety concerns associated with Station Road, particularly traffic speeds, existing accident concerns and the nearby Station Road/Common Lane/Chilver Bridge Road junction. • Concern that additional dwellings would increase traffic movements and highway safety risks. • Raise concerns regarding flood risk and drainage, including previous flooding associated with the nearby watercourse. • Concern about loss of biodiversity and impacts on wildlife and habitat, including notable and protected species. • Raise concerns regarding the site's relationship with the South Downs National Park, dark skies and nearby Arlington Reservoir SSSI/Nature Reserve.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding highway safety and access, flood risk and drainage, biodiversity, settlement character and potential impacts on the South Downs National Park and dark skies, all of which would have been subject to further assessment as required. However, following further assessment of the site and engagement on reasonable development options, OBE1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan as access has not been proven to be suitable/available/achievable.	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

SITE Ref: OBU1 (FWLP) – Land at Taylors Shaw, Framfield Road, Buxted

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	Support: 0	Neutral: 2	Object: 0

SITE Ref: OBU1 (FWLP) – Land at Taylors Shaw, Framfield Road, Buxted		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils		
Buxted Parish Council • Land at Taylors Shaw includes a border with ancient woodland. The land could be developed but cut off prior to the ancient woodland preserving a nature reserve, or	• Comments noted and would have been subject to further assessment. However, following further assessment of the site and engagement on reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan as	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

the land closest to the ancient woodland be used as a green burial site (as there are none allocated within the local plan).	access has not been proven to be suitable/available/achievable.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Objects to ancient woodland areas being included within sites allocated as suitable for development. • Site allocation contains ancient woodland and requests site allocations be reviewed to exclude ancient woodland from development sites and to buffer adjacent ancient woodland in line with Policy NE4.	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole, and would have been applicable if the site were not unsuitable for rother reasons.	• Site omitted for reasons set out
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: OCR1 - Land north of Stone Cross Road at Alderbrook, Crowborough

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 1	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 0

SITE Ref: OCR1 - Land north of Stone Cross Road at Alderbrook, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
The Woodland Trust • Site is adjacent to ancient woodland at Alice Bright Lane Gill and requests that site	• Site boundaries should be distinguished from site developable areas where development should be directed to. Other policies in the	• Site omitted for reasons set out.

allocations are reviewed to avoid harm to ancient woodland and provide appropriate buffers.	plan control the impacts of proposed development on areas such as Ancient Woodland (Policy NE4). The plan should be read as a whole and would have been considered as required. However, following further assessment of the site and engagement on reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan as access has not been proven to be suitable/available/achievable.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: Option Site OEH1 – Land at Laughton Park Farm, East Hoathly, Halland and Laughton

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 164	**Support:** 7	**Neutral:** 3	**Object:** 154

SITE Ref: Option Site OEH1 – Land at Laughton Park Farm, East Hoathly, Halland and Laughton		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Lewes District Council • Concerned over the option site due to likely impacts on communities close to the proposed new settlement and on the highway network. • Request early notification if the allocation is pursued so that site-specific implications can be discussed.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the potential impacts of the proposed allocation on nearby communities and the local highway network. The request for early engagement and notification should the site be progressed through the Local Plan process was also noted. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the allocation	• No action required

	has not been taken forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Chalvington with Ripe Parish Council • Strongly objects to the option site due to the scale of development, rural character and landscape harm, infrastructure deficiencies, highway impacts, environmental/ecological harm, water supply, wastewater, flood risk and deliverability concerns.	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the scale of development proposed, its potential effects on the rural character and landscape of the area, infrastructure capacity, highway impacts, biodiversity and ecological interests, water supply and wastewater infrastructure, flood risk, and the overall deliverability of the site. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No action required
Laughton Parish Council • Objection to the option site citing conflict with the spatial strategy, lack of evidence, transport and infrastructure constraints, flood risk, water/wastewater issues, ecological and heritage impacts, agricultural land loss, scale, coalescence and impacts on community character.	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the compatibility of the site with the spatial strategy, the evidence supporting its promotion, transport and infrastructure constraints, flood risk, water supply and wastewater capacity, impacts on biodiversity, heritage assets and agricultural land, the scale of development proposed, the potential for coalescence between settlements, and effects on the character of existing communities. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as	• No action required

	an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Little Horsted Parish Council • Objection to the option site and wider growth south of Ashdown Forest, raising concerns about overdevelopment, A22/A26 impacts, cumulative development, Low Weald landscape harm, settlement gaps, infrastructure capacity, heritage, ecological networks and the Ashdown Forest 7km zone of influence.	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding the scale of development proposed and wider growth south of Ashdown Forest, including potential impacts on the A22 and A26 road network, cumulative development pressures, the character and landscape of the Low Weald, the retention of settlement gaps, infrastructure capacity, heritage assets, biodiversity and ecological networks, and effects relating to the Ashdown Forest 7km zone of influence. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No action required
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
South West Strategic Developments • Supportive of giving further consideration to the option site • Provides a full review of the Sustainability Appraisal assessment carried out for the site	• The Council welcomes support for the further consideration of the site and notes the detailed review of the Sustainability Appraisal assessment submitted in response. The comments have been taken into account alongside the wider evidence base and site assessment work undertaken by the Council. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options,	• No action required

	the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Hesmonds Stud Ltd • Notes a longer-term opportunity to consider land at Laughton Park Farm together with land north of East Hoathly, with potential mutual dependency of services, facilities and sustainable transport.	• The Council notes the suggestion that land at Laughton Park Farm could be considered as part of a longer-term development opportunity alongside land to the north of East Hoathly, including the potential for shared services, facilities and sustainable transport infrastructure. The comments have been considered as part of the Council's assessment of reasonable development options. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No action required
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Community Project Ltd • Objection to the option site due to concerns about transport, flood risk, biodiversity, heritage, water infrastructure, and conflict with the plan's own spatial strategy • Cannot proceed to Reg 19 without a New Growth Point Options Study	• The Council acknowledges the concerns raised regarding transport impacts, flood risk, biodiversity, heritage assets, water supply and wastewater infrastructure, and the extent to which the site aligns with the spatial strategy set out in the Local Plan. These matters have been considered as part of the Council's assessment of the site and the wider evidence base. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options,	• No action required

	the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Green Weald Alliance CIC • Identifies site as an alternative to the allocations south of Tunbridge Wells	• Comment noted	• No action required
Village Concerns • Objection to the option site • The scale of development would be unsustainable, overwhelm local communities, worsen A22 congestion and car dependency, and place unacceptable pressure on infrastructure. • Concerns about Park Corner Heath SSSI, East Hoathly Waste Water Treatment Works, sewage discharges, water infrastructure, public transport, active travel, education, sports/recreation facilities, employment, farmland, landscape, heritage and the lack of a planning-led masterplan.	• The Council acknowledges objections to the site and concerns regarding the scale and sustainability of development, including its potential effects on local communities, congestion on the A22, reliance on private car travel, and pressures on existing infrastructure and services. Concerns relating to impacts on Park Corner Heath SSSI, wastewater and water infrastructure, sewage discharges, public transport and active travel provision, education, sports and recreation facilities, employment opportunities, agricultural land, landscape character, heritage assets, and the absence of a comprehensive planning-led masterplan are also noted. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, it has been decided that the allocation should not be taken forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No action required
The Woodland Trust • Objects to the inclusion of ancient woodland within development sites.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the inclusion of ancient woodland within or adjacent to	• No action required

• Site contains Bog Shaw, is adjacent to other ancient woodland and contains veteran oak trees. It requests that ancient woodland is excluded from allocations and buffered in line with policy.	potential development sites, including the presence of Bog Shaw, nearby areas of ancient woodland and veteran oak trees. The Council also notes requests that ancient woodland be excluded from development areas and protected through appropriate buffer zones in accordance with national and local planning policy. These matters have been considered as part of the site's assessment, including its environmental constraints and potential impacts on irreplaceable habitats. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Sussex Butterfly Conservation • Raises concerns about impacts on Rowland Wood/Park Corner Heath nature reserve, including visitor pressure, hydrology, light pollution, noise, litter, traffic emissions and pets.	• The Council acknowledges concerns regarding the potential impacts of development on Rowland Wood and Park Corner Heath Nature Reserve, including increased recreational pressure, changes to hydrology, light pollution, noise disturbance, littering and traffic-related emissions. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, the allocation has not been taken forward in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No action required
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**

• Strong objection from local residents to OEH1/Laughton Park Farm, generally requesting that the site is removed from further consideration. • Concerns that the proposal would create a new settlement of up to 4,441 homes plus 30,000 sq m employment floorspace in an isolated rural location, overwhelming Halland, East Hoathly and Laughton and causing coalescence. • Frequent objections cite conflict with draft Policies SS1 and SS2, as the site lies outside development boundaries and is poorly related to the settlement hierarchy. • Transport objections focus on lack of rail access, limited bus services, no safe walking/cycling routes, reliance on private cars, congestion on the A22/B2192 and narrow rural lanes, rat-running and cumulative impacts with East Hoathly, Ringmer, Ridgewood and Owlsbury proposals. • Infrastructure concerns include inadequate water supply, water stress, lack of wastewater capacity, sewage spills at Halland and East Hoathly treatment works, limited healthcare/school capacity, unreliable utilities and lack of funded infrastructure delivery. • Environmental concerns include harm to ancient woodland, Park Corner Heath SSSI, protected species, hedgerows, dark skies, biodiversity corridors, landscape character, the Low Weald, South Downs National Park setting and loss of agricultural/carbon-storing land.	• The Council acknowledges the significant concerns raised regarding the scale of development proposed at OEH1/Laughton Park Farm, including the potential creation of a substantial new settlement in a rural location and its effects on the character and identity of Halland, East Hoathly and Laughton, including concerns regarding coalescence. Concerns have also been raised regarding the site's relationship to the spatial strategy and settlement hierarchy, transport accessibility, reliance on private car travel, impacts on the highway network, and cumulative effects arising from other proposed developments in the area. The Council further notes concerns relating to infrastructure provision, including water supply, wastewater treatment, healthcare, education, utilities and the delivery of supporting infrastructure. • These matters have been considered as part of the Council's assessment of the site and the wider evidence base. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, OEH1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan	• No action required

• Residents also raise flood risk, surface water and groundwater concerns, including the need for Sequential/Exception Tests and assessment of impacts on the River Ouse drinking water safeguard zone. • Heritage objections refer to the Terrible Down battlefield, Mount Wood Scheduled Monument, Grade II listed buildings, historic farmsteads and public rights of way. • Several responses argue that the evidence base is incomplete, with missing transport, heritage, landscape, biodiversity, flood risk, infrastructure, viability and cumulative impact assessments.		

SITE Ref: OFF1 – Land at High Cross Farm, Eastbourne Road, Uckfield

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 5	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 3

SITE Ref: OFF1 – Land at High Cross Farm, Eastbourne Road, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Objects to OFF1, considering it to represent further development outside Uckfield's appropriate settlement boundary.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges Little Horsted Parish Meeting's concerns regarding highway capacity, cumulative traffic impacts, landscape and heritage	• No change

• Raises concerns regarding highway and cumulative traffic impacts, including the A22/A26 and potential rat-running through surrounding rural areas. • Considers the site unsustainable and visually prominent within the Low Weald landscape. • Raises concerns regarding cumulative environmental and heritage impacts, including effects on priority habitats, watercourses and wet woodland.	effects, ecological constraints and the relationship of the site with Uckfield's settlement boundary. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>High Cross Investments (2023) Ltd</u> • Supports the allocation of OFF1 and requests that the Council reconsider the wider potential of Land at High Cross Farm based on additional technical evidence submitted with the representation. • Considers OFF1 capable of delivering approximately 88 to 90 dwellings as a standalone development but promotes a wider scheme of up to 448 dwellings incorporating adjoining land, together with community infrastructure. • States that updated technical work demonstrates that previously identified constraints relating to access, flood risk, drainage, ecology, ancient woodland, landscape and accessibility can be satisfactorily addressed. • Considers the site suitable, available and achievable, with vehicular access from the	• Support and comments noted. The additional technical evidence submitted by High Cross Investments (2023) Ltd in support of OFF1, including matters relating to access, drainage, ecology, masterplanning and deliverability, is acknowledged. The request to increase the extent and capacity of the site, including the wider land at High Cross Farm, is also noted. • However, following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan. The Council does not consider the additional evidence sufficient to overcome the identified constraints and justify allocation of either OFF1 or the wider site. This is shown within the evidence base and	• No change

A22/Eastbourne Road and improved public transport connectivity. • Promotes a wider package of community infrastructure, including a GP surgery, early years facility, neighbourhood centre, bus route and recreation provision, which it argues would improve the sustainability of a larger scheme. • States that ancient woodland would be retained with buffers, the Ridgewood Stream corridor enhanced and Biodiversity Net Gain provided. • Considers that the Council's Sustainability Appraisal should be reassessed in light of the additional technical evidence submitted and argues that the site's sustainability performance is better than currently assessed.	Sustainability Appraisal process and specifically states that there is no proven access/connectivity and landscape harm.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Raises concerns regarding the proximity of OFF1 to New Grant Plantation/Oldmill Wood ancient woodland. • Requests that development avoids harm to ancient woodland and provides an appropriate buffer between development and the woodland, protecting it from pollution, encroachment, fragmentation and disturbance. • Also advocates protection of ecological connectivity and appropriate	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the Woodland's Trust concerns regarding, ecological constraints and Ancient Woodland. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change

surveys/protection where ancient or veteran trees are present.		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Residents object to OFF1, raising concerns regarding flooding and waterlogging, impacts on Ridgewood Stream, biodiversity, ancient woodland and priority habitats, and loss of agricultural land and the historic rural landscape. • The site is considered poorly connected to Uckfield and likely to result in car-dependent development, exacerbating existing traffic pressures on Eastbourne Road and the wider road network. • Concerns are also raised about water and sewerage capacity, the loss of the green gap between Uckfield and Framfield, ecological connectivity, and further expansion of Uckfield into the countryside. • Residents request that OFF1 is not taken forward for development and remains outside the Uckfield development boundary.	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding flood risk and drainage, biodiversity and ancient woodland, landscape and settlement character, highway impacts, car dependency and infrastructure capacity. • Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF1 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.	• No change

SITE Ref: Allocation: OFF2 – Croft House, Eastbourne Road

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total: 0	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 0	**Object:** 0

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: OFF2 – Croft House, Eastbourne Road		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Objects to OFF2, raising the same concerns identified for OFF1. • Considers the site to represent further development outside the appropriate Uckfield	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges Little Horsted Parish Meeting's concerns regarding cumulative highway impacts, landscape and settlement character, sustainability, ecological	• No change.

settlement boundary and contribute to overdevelopment south of Ashdown Forest. • Raises concerns regarding cumulative highway impacts, particularly on the A22/A26 and surrounding road network, including increased rat-running and highway safety issues. • Concern regarding landscape and visual impacts on the Low Weald, together with cumulative effects on the rural character of Uckfield and surrounding parishes. • Raises concerns regarding priority habitats, watercourses and wet woodland, as well as wider environmental and heritage impacts. • Considers the site unsustainable and requests that it is excluded from further consideration.	constraints and the relationship of OFF2 with Uckfield's settlement boundary. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OFF2 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Raises concerns regarding the proximity of OFF2 to New Grant Plantation/Oldmill Wood ancient woodland. • Requests that development avoids harm to ancient woodland and provides an appropriate buffer to protect it from pollution, encroachment, habitat fragmentation and disturbance.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the Woodland's Trust concerns regarding, ecological constraints and Ancient Woodland. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF2 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change

• Also seeks protection of ecological connectivity and appropriate protection where ancient or veteran trees may be present.		

SITE Ref: Allocation: OFF3 – Land adjacent to Croft House, Eastbourne Road

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total:	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: Allocation: OFF3 – Land adjacent to Croft House, Eastbourne Road		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Little Horsted Parish Meeting • Objects to OFF3 and requests that the site is excluded from further consideration. • Considers the site to represent development outside the appropriate Uckfield settlement	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges Little Horsted Parish Meeting's concerns regarding cumulative highway impacts, landscape and settlement character, ecological constraints,	• No change

boundary and contribute to overdevelopment south of Ashdown Forest. • Raises concerns regarding cumulative highway impacts, particularly on the A22/A26 and surrounding rural road network, including potential rat-running and highway safety. • Concern regarding landscape and visual impacts on the Low Weald, together with cumulative impacts on the character and setting of Uckfield and surrounding parishes. • Raises concerns regarding impacts on priority habitats, watercourses and wet woodland, as well as wider environmental and heritage impacts. • Considers the site to be unsustainable and that cumulative infrastructure and environmental impacts have not been adequately assessed.	sustainability and the relationship of OFF3 with Uckfield's development boundary. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options considered, OFF3 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None	No Response	No Response
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Raises concerns regarding the proximity of OFF3 to New Grant Plantation/Oldmill Wood ancient woodland. • Requests an appropriate buffer between development and the ancient woodland to protect it from pollution, encroachment, fragmentation and disturbance. • Seeks protection of ecological connectivity and appropriate surveys and root protection	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the Woodland's Trust concerns regarding, ecological constraints and Ancient Woodland. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF3 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	• No change

measures where ancient or veteran trees may be present.		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

SITE Ref: OFF8 – Hempstead Farm, Uckfield

Wealden Local Plan – Regulation 18 Consultation

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Total:	**Support:**	**Neutral:**	**Object:**

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 1	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: OFF8 – Hempstead Farm, Uckfield		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
DHA Planning, for Hempstead Farm Ltd	• The Council notes support for the allocation of option OFF8 and notes the representations submitted regarding the site's sustainability,	• No change

• Supports allocation of OFF8, arguing it is sustainable, deliverable and needed to help address the Plan's housing shortfall. • The promoter states the site could deliver around 200 homes and/or extra care accommodation, improved rugby facilities, flood management and biodiversity benefits. • Submitted evidence is said to address access, viability, landscape, heritage and flood risk constraints.	deliverability and potential contribution towards meeting housing needs. The Council also notes the promoter's proposals for the delivery of housing and/or extra care accommodation, improvements to rugby facilities, flood management measures and biodiversity enhancements, together with the supporting evidence provided in relation to access, viability, landscape, heritage and flood risk considerations. These matters have been considered as part of the Council's assessment of reasonable development options. Following further assessment of the site, its constraints and reasonable development options, OFF8 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan. This is primarily due to flood risk, heritage and landscape harm.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
<u>The Woodland Trust</u> • Notes OFF8 is adjacent to, and may contain parts of, Views Wood. • Requests boundary review, exclusion of ancient woodland, suitable buffers in line with Policy NE4 and surveys for ancient/veteran trees.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the Woodland's Trust concerns regarding, ecological constraints and Ancient Woodland. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF8 has not been taken	• No change

	forward as an allocation in the Regulation 19 Local Plan.	
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to OFF8 due to flood risk, access constraints across the River Uck, landscape impact and encroachment into countryside. • Concerns are also raised about loss/reprovision of rugby facilities, heritage impacts, deliverability and whether the suggested 200-dwelling yield is justified. • Objectors argue the site conflicts with the SHELAA conclusion that it is not deliverable or developable and should be removed from further consideration.	• Objections noted. The Council acknowledges concerns regarding flood risk, access, landscape and heritage impacts, recreation provision and the deliverability and capacity of the site. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, OFF8 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan.	• No change

SITE Ref: OHA5 (FWLP) – Mushroom Farm, Saltmarsh Lane, Downash, Hailsham

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation - Not applicable, option presented in Focused Wealden Local Plan only

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 3	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 2

SITE Ref: OHA5 (FWLP) – Mushroom Farm, Saltmarsh Lane, Downash, Hailsham		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Hailsham Town Council • Object to OHA5 and consider there is insufficient evidence to justify taking the site forward. • Consider the site to be in a poor and unsustainable location, detached from Hailsham and unlikely to support the Local Plan's aspirations for a 20-minute neighbourhood.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the concerns regarding the site's accessibility, highway impacts, flood risk and relationship with the Pevensey Levels catchment. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, including the lack of evidenced suitable access; issues of flood risk;	• Site removed for reasons set out.

• Raise significant highway and accessibility concerns, noting that Saltmarsh Lane is a narrow rural road without footways and that surrounding routes are already under pressure from development. • The Sustainability Appraisal identifies transport and access as a major negative, with a number of other effects remaining uncertain. • Raise concerns regarding the site's proximity to areas at risk of flooding and the Pevensey Levels Hydrological Catchment. • Consider that the main benefit identified is the delivery of approximately 400 homes, which is insufficient to outweigh the site's accessibility, transport and environmental constraints. • More broadly, question the robustness of the Sustainability Appraisal and consideration of reasonable spatial alternatives, and consider that further assessment is required before option sites are progressed.	and harm to Scheduled Ancient Monument; OHA5 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan, as set out in the evidence base.	
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Green Weald Alliance • Identifies OHA5 as a potential alternative location for 400 dwellings outside the High Weald National Landscape, which should be properly considered before allocating major development within the designated landscape. • Considers that OHA5, alongside other option sites around Hailsham, demonstrates that	• Comments noted. The Council has undertaken further assessment of potential development sites and reasonable alternatives, including options both inside and outside of the High Weald National Landscape. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, including the lack of evidenced	• Site removed for reasons set out

there may be reasonable alternatives capable of accommodating housing growth outside the National Landscape. • Argues that these alternative options have not yet been sufficiently assessed, particularly when considering whether exceptional circumstances exist to justify major development within the High Weald National Landscape. • Requests a more robust assessment of reasonable alternatives and their comparative environmental impacts before development is directed towards sensitive National Landscape sites.	suitable access; issues of flood risk; and harm to Scheduled Ancient Monument; OHA5 has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan, as set out in the evidence base. • The selection of sites in the Local Plan has been informed by the Council's evidence base and Sustainability Appraisal, including consideration of reasonable alternatives.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Local Residents	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
• Object to OHA5 due to the site's archaeological and historic significance, including the presence of a Scheduled Monument comprising a medieval farmstead, associated building platforms and possible historic salt-working features. • Consider that these heritage constraints should be recognised in the site assessment and weigh against development. • Also consider the site too distant from Hailsham town centre and services to represent a sustainable location for development of the proposed scale.	• Objection noted. The Council acknowledges the archaeological and heritage significance of the site, together with concerns regarding its accessibility and relationship with Hailsham. Following further assessment of the site and reasonable development options, including the lack of evidenced suitable access; issues of flood risk; and harm to Scheduled Ancient Monument; OHA5 has not been taken forward as an allocation in	• Site removed for reasons set out

• Request that OHA5 is rejected as a development option.	the Local Plan, as set out in the evidence base.	

SITE Ref: ORO1 (FWLP) – Orchard Farm (formerly), Tubwell Lane, Crowborough

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

Number of comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation – Not applicable, site option proposed in Focused Wealden Local Plan

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Total: 2	**Support:** 0	**Neutral:** 1	**Object:** 1

SITE Ref: ORO1 (FWLP) – Orchard Farm (formerly), Tubwell Lane, Crowborough		
Statutory Consultees	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Town/Parish Councils	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		
Site Promoters	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
Genesis Town Planning, on behalf of Sigma Strategic Land • Notes option site is listed as a Rotherfield Parish option site but is located on the southern edge of Crowborough.	• Comment noted. The Council confirms that the option site is located within Rotherfield Parish, although it is situated adjacent to the southern edge of Crowborough. Its identification as a Rotherfield	• No change

• Promotes another site to replace ORO1.	Parish option site is therefore correct. • Other sites have been assessed as set out in the evidence base and concluded as Suitable/Unsuitable for the reasons noted.	
Other Consultee Bodies	**WDC Response**	**Proposed Changes to Policy**
High Weald National Landscape • Objects option site due to harm to the High Weald National Landscape. • Site forms part of a medieval field system with historic field boundaries. • Access from Hadlow Down Road would affect a sunken routeway and conflict with Management Plan objectives.	• Objection noted. The landscape and heritage concerns raised are acknowledged, and alongside access issues, were the reason for the site being presented as an option only in the Focused Wealden Local Plan and may have been considered further. However, following further assessment of the site and engagement on reasonable development options, the site has not been taken forward as an allocation in the Local Plan as access has not been proven to be suitable/available/achievable, and landscape concerns are noted.	• Site omitted for reasons set out.
Local Residents	• **WDC Response**	• **Proposed Changes to Policy**
None		

E. Omission Sites

Wealden Local Plan – Omission Sites

WDC Response to the Regulation 18 Consultations

The sites set out below, known as omission sites, which were submitted to the Council through the Regulation 18 (1) and (2) consultations. These sites have been considered for their development potential as part of the Local Plan process. All sites listed below have not progressed to become allocations within the Local Plan for the reasons set out in the respective evidence base documents, including, but not limited to, the Strategic Housing and Employment Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA), and the Sustainability Appraisal, Landscape and Visual Appraisal (2026) and the Heritage Impact Assessment (2026), where applicable.

Comments received

Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan Consultation

Reg18 (1) Not Progressed		
Town/Parish Councils	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
Pevensey Parish Council	106/3200	• Considered that the rejected small site at Wallsend Road should be allocated to support Pevensey's vitality and local housing need. Although in Flood Zone 3, the Parish Council considered coastal protection and appropriate design could justify a small scheme.
Westham Parish Council and others	109/1620	• Questioned the recorded permission status and raised concerns about landscape sensitivity, flooding, views towards Pevensey Castle and traffic impacts. The site was described as potentially the least harmful larger option because it is contained by the A22 and recent housing.
Westham Parish Council and others	221/3360	• Objected to employment development at Fairfield Farm because of flood risk, landscape and heritage sensitivity, agricultural land loss, traffic risks and harm to tourism and views of Pevensey Castle.
Westham Parish Council and others	675/3360	• Considered the site unsuitable because it would harm Hankham's rural character and nearby listed buildings, while local roads, footways and services were inadequate.

Westham Parish Council and others	1187/3280	• Requested that development should not take vehicle access from Hailsham Road and raised additional traffic, wildlife and environmental concerns.
Batcheller Monkhouse and others	934/1790	• Promoted Land at Six Acre Field for housing, disputing conclusions on isolation, access to services and landscape harm. Cited nearby housing, a footpath connection, boundary screening and short-to-medium-term deliverability.
Batcheller Monkhouse and others	935/2020	• Promoted land west of Stonebridge Lane, arguing it was not isolated, had pedestrian links to services and could mitigate effects on the nearby listed building through planting, separation and buffers.
Signature Prime Property / Kitewood Estates	1228/1840	• Proposed redevelopment of Saxon Court Nursing Home for about 30 dwellings. Cited brownfield status, access to Buxted services and rail, existing access, limited constraints and opportunities for affordable housing, transport improvements and biodiversity gain.
Landstrom Group Ltd	972/3170	• Argued that sites outside the National Landscape and Local Wildlife Sites, including this site, should be prioritised. • Requested allocation for 24 dwellings and improved access to the Working Men's Club, citing availability, a live application and the need to exhaust less sensitive housing options.
Reinar Properties Ltd, Savills	846/1310	• Promoted a 23-home extension within Hailsham's built-up area, citing secured access through adjacent consented development, previous allocation history and completed drainage, ecology, biodiversity and transport work.
Ceres Property	100/1310	• Challenged errors in the assessment of Oaklands, arguing the site adjoined the development boundary, access was available through the consented site and proposed built areas avoided designated ancient woodland and priority habitat.
Elms and Willis Ltd	931/1310	• Requested reassessment through the sustainability appraisal, disputing landscape effects and citing coordinated development with neighbouring land, lower site levels and potential connectivity to the Cuckoo Trail.

Anwyl Land	696/1310	• Promoted comprehensive development of the combined Summer Hill Lane parcels, citing access, Flood Zone 1, retained field boundaries, biodiversity gain, heritage buffers and mixed housing including a retirement village.
Anwyl Land	697/1310	• Promoted comprehensive development of the combined Summer Hill Lane parcels, arguing coordinated masterplanning could resolve constraints and provide connections to the Cuckoo Trail.
Anwyl Land	701/1310	• Promoted comprehensive development of the combined Summer Hill Lane parcels, with landscape mitigation, biodiversity gain, access and a mixed housing offer.
Grosvenor Property UK Ltd	805/1310	• Promoted North West Hailsham for up to 2,500 homes and supporting facilities, disputing isolation, landscape and transport conclusions and proposing landscape-led mitigation, wetland parkland and active-travel links.
Grosvenor Property UK Ltd	806/1310	• Promoted North West Hailsham as part of a strategic mixed-use neighbourhood capable of delivering housing, infrastructure, green space and transport mitigation.
Grosvenor Property UK Ltd	807/1310	• Promoted North West Hailsham, challenging the SHELAA and sustainability appraisal and arguing a masterplanned extension could manage landscape, heritage and transport effects.
Grosvenor Property UK Ltd	825/1310	• Promoted the whole North West Hailsham site for a sustainable 20-minute neighbourhood with up to 2,500 homes, community infrastructure and extensive green and blue infrastructure.
ECE Planning and Sedas Strategic Land	1117/1310	• Requested reconsideration of Land North of Amberstone Road for about 32 dwellings, arguing landscape, access, drainage and ecology matters could be mitigated and the site was available and deliverable.
Diane Aldridge on behalf of others	1082/3000	• Supported HEL1 but requested inclusion of land behind Flint Cottage to create a more logical comprehensive site and contribute additional housing.

Harvey and Sons (Lewes) Ltd	185/3040	• Requested allocation of previously promoted land at Isfield alongside other omitted sites, arguing development could avoid designated biodiversity, heritage and flood-risk harm.
Batcheller Monkhouse on behalf of others	779/3220	• Objected to omission of the Heathfield and Waldron site, disputing the SHELAA and arguing it was adjacent to the settlement, available and capable of mitigation and early delivery.
Parker Dann on behalf of others	259/1210	• Challenged conclusions on settlement relationship, landscape, heritage, highways and ecology, arguing mitigation and reassessment could enable a meaningful contribution to Heathfield's housing supply.
Greenhayes Planning	659/3090	• Proposed allocation of the garden-centre site for up to 45 homes, citing previously developed land, accessibility, suitable access and the ability to address landscape, drainage, ecology and amenity.
Hertfordshire Holdings, Tor and Co	780/3100	• Promoted residential development east of the A22, citing proximity to Hailsham, strategic road access, green space, walking and cycling links and mitigation of landscape, ecology and flood risk.
Rodway Planning Consultancy Ltd	1210/3120	• Requested allocation of Land at Marshals, arguing a live application and technical evidence demonstrated access, landscape, ecology, drainage, heritage and design constraints could be resolved.
Simply Planning	372/3170	• Requested inclusion within Ninfield's settlement boundary, disputing landscape and access concerns and arguing the site was suitable, available, achievable and deliverable.
Dowsett Mayhew Planning Partnership on behalf of others	1185/3230	• Promoted Church Farm, arguing heritage, landscape, access and sustainability effects could be addressed through scale, layout, separation, landscaping and technical design.
Dowsett Mayhew Planning Partnership on behalf of others	1186/3230	• Promoted land east of Church Farm, arguing heritage, landscape and highway concerns could be mitigated and the site could make a proportionate housing contribution.
Deanland Wood Park Ltd	1085/3230	• Proposed a strategic mixed-use extension to the existing park-home village, arguing its scale and established community could

		support housing, services, employment, infrastructure and environmental mitigation.
Sigma Strategic Land, Genesis Town Planning	1139/3250	• Requested allocation of Court Farm for up to 75 dwellings and open space, disputing SHELAA conclusions and proposing landscape, drainage, access, biodiversity, amenity and heritage mitigation.
Real Select Ltd	400/1410	• Requested reconsideration for 380 to 570 dwellings, arguing adjacent permitted development changed the site's relationship to Uckfield and enabled connectivity, open space and a neighbourhood centre.
Croudace Homes Ltd	002/1410	• Promoted Bird in Eye Farm for about 235 dwellings through a reduced revised scheme addressing ancient woodland, heritage, highways, drainage, open space and ecological concerns.
Stantec	137/1410	• Requested reconsideration of Downlands Farm for at least 300 homes, arguing access, ancient woodland and landscape effects could be mitigated at a sustainable main-town location.
The Styles Lane Partnership	1211/3300	• Requested inclusion within Wadhurst's development boundary, arguing the site could provide housing and help deliver a medical centre as part of a comprehensive proposal.
The Styles Lane Partnership	1212/3300	• Requested inclusion with site 1211/3300 as a comprehensive proposal, reducing reliance on uncertain windfall delivery and supporting a medical centre.
Harvey and Sons (Lewes) Ltd	248/1820	• Requested reconsideration and allocation of Boreham Street alongside other promoted sites, arguing development could avoid designated environmental, heritage and flood-risk harm.
Local Residents	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
Local Resident	156/1840	• Suggested allocation of a small sustainable site adjoining the A272 at Pound Green, citing previous favourable sustainability assessment and potential contribution to Buxted's housing provision.

Local Resident	1154/1840	• Suggested allocation of a second small sustainable site adjoining the A272 at Pound Green, citing previous favourable assessment and potential housing delivery.
Local Resident	690/2050	• Supported housing allocation, arguing the land contained redundant recreational facilities, was overlooked by housing, had three possible accesses and could support Hadlow Down and nearby Buxted services.
Local Resident	710/2040	• Suggested alternative development locations at Groombridge and Withyham to avoid landscape, amenity, congestion and highway concerns associated with proposed allocations. • Suggested a smaller scheme of about 10 to 15 bungalows or chalet bungalows and comparison with alternative land before pursuing the full WIT1 allocation.
Local Resident	1227/3280	• Supported use of Pylon Field for a parish council office and community space, citing parish council and primary school support.
Local Resident	707/3400	• Suggested about 10 dwellings, a village hall and additional parking through a modest scheme designed to avoid harm to Withyham Conservation Area.
Other Consultee Bodies	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
No comments		

Focused Local Plan Consultation

Reg18 (2) Not Progressed		
Neighbouring/Other Local Authorities	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**

Lewes District Council	996/1950	• Identified major access barriers linked to ancient woodland and requested cross-boundary engagement if the strategic option was progressed.
Town/Parish Councils	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
Buxted Parish Council	042/1840	• Suggested extending development onto the site if Lower Totease Farm proceeded, while questioning inconsistent access conclusions and proposing woodland protection or green burial use.
Buxted Parish Council	113/1990	• Challenged factual information on pedestrian access but maintained that Willow Sawmills was unsuitable for housing or business development.
Frant Parish Council	444/1610	• Questioned why this site was discounted for rural landscape harm while nearby sites on the same approach to Tunbridge Wells were advanced.
Frant Parish Council	446/1610	• Questioned rejection for High Weald landscape harm despite proximity to existing Tunbridge Wells housing and apparent inconsistency with nearby allocations.
Wadhurst Parish Council	584/3330	• Questioned why a site assessed as rejected or unsuitable remained a possible site and challenged changes to the sustainability appraisal scoring.
Frant Parish Council	599/2030	• Cited the site's rejection as evidence of inconsistent treatment of settlement pattern, landscape, conservation and accessibility constraints.
Frant Parish Council	1108/1610	• Questioned inconsistent discounting compared with nearby allocated sites in the same sensitive High Weald landscape.
Buxted Parish Council	1247/1840	• Objected because development would urbanise the semi-rural landscape, affect biodiversity and increase flooding, traffic and highway-safety risks on narrow Limes Lane.
Site Promoters	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
Lewis and Co	372/3170	• Promoted a reduced 20 to 30 dwelling scheme south of Catsfield Road, arguing revised density, layout, access,

		planting and topography responses could address previous refusal and appeal concerns.
Catesby Strategic Land Limited on behalf of others	020/1990	• Promoted Coopers Green for housing, citing a live application, officer support and changed surrounding development, while challenging SHELAA conclusions on rural character, landscape and heritage.
Lewis and Co Planning / Arlington Stadium	044/1310	• Promoted the brownfield stadium for residential, commercial or mixed use, citing established access, low landscape sensitivity and proximity to employment. • Argued additional housing allocations were required and the stadium represented a sustainable brownfield opportunity with good road access. • Requested inclusion for housing, commercial or mixed use because of sustainability, established access and limited landscape effects.
Marrons	137/1410	• Promoted Downlands Farm despite prior access, sustainability and ancient woodland concerns, proposing a revised masterplan, expanded buffers, green infrastructure and sustainable travel links.
Fernham Homes Operations Limited	152/1110	• Requested proper assessment for an extra-care use, arguing the proposal differed from general housing near Ashdown Forest and could meet identified care needs.
Harvey and Son (Lewes) Ltd, Walsingham Planning	184/3110	• Argued the Magham Down land should have been considered as an appropriate housing allocation. • Promoted housing, disputing the relevance of former private playing-field use and arguing a sensitive design could address rural character and views. • Argued additional allocations and broader consideration of smaller settlements were required to meet housing need.
Newlyn Investments Limited	209/2020	• Promoted a smaller western parcel adjoining existing development, arguing landscape, heritage and settlement-edge concerns could be mitigated.

Parker Dann	258/1210	• Challenged the negative SHELAA assessment and argued the Burwash Road site was suitable for housing despite landscape concerns and could respond to positive pre-application advice.

Local Residents	**SHELAA Reference**	**Comments**
Local Resident	578/1210	• Objected to future housing because of rural character, unsafe and inadequate access, accident history and previous refusals and dismissed appeals.
Local Resident	710/2040	• Noted rejection for landscape impact but argued the site was more sustainable than another included Groombridge site because of access to services and public transport.