

Regulation 16 Responses:

Organisation/ Respondee	Comment subject or Section of NNDP	NNDP Para	Consultee's Suggested Amendment	Parish Council/Steering Group's Consideration of amendments to NNDP
1 John Cheshire	I agree with all policies in this Neighbourhood Plan. Ninfield has been subjected to large scale and unsustainable development over the last decade partly due to a lack of a Local Plan at District level. Developers have made several speculative applications for estates (all on greenfield sites) and 3 have been successful despite the very limited infrastructure here. It is essential that local policies prevail and steer the type of development we have been given, away from large estates on farmland (comprised of mainly large houses), to small pockets of infill/conversion with small dwellings of the type we need most. 2 schemes like this have been built and are supported by the community.			Noted
2 Coal Authority	The Coal Authority have no comments to make regarding planning applications or planning policies in areas which lie outside of the coalfield and therefore we will not provide a formal response to any consultations received. You can check if you are a coalfield Authority here.			Noted
3 Kaye Crittall	Fully support the plan. There have been a number of consultations and opportunities for us to input			Noted

	to the plan, thus reflecting a well-researched document, fairly reflecting resident's comments.			
4 Wendy Dawkins	<p>I support the Ninfield Neighbourhood plan 16. I have concerns over too much development too quickly for the following reasons: Already have large number of new builds - need to let these bed in first and see how local services are affected</p> <p>Safety: traffic & pedestrians - no pathways or space to introduce more. No safe walkway to schools, shop, surgery from these new sites</p> <p>Surface water drainage problems as have occurred in Manchester Road. The road surfaces are already breaking up with heavy traffic to and from building sites. Potential problems with insufficient electricity - no gas in village It is impossible not to use car for work etc as there is only a very limited bus service. School over-subscribed There is only satellite GP surgery This is not a question of not wanting properties for LOCAL people - just that those already approved are way over the capacity for the village.</p> <p>Environmentally & ecologically, erosion of areas for local wildlife, no stipulations made for "green" energy to any new build.</p>			Noted. The PC have repeatedly highlighted all of the issues raised with the WDC Planning Committee South.
5 ESCC Public Health	Following on from the Reg 14 Consultation, we can see that many of our previous points have now been incorporated into the Reg 16 version, and anything outstanding we do not feel is significant or appropriate to raise as an objection at this stage of the plan.			Noted
5 ESCC Highways	We agree with the updates that have been included, but to ensure that the plan is in		Include "wheeling" to	Noted

	alignment with current government transport guidance, when referring to walking and cycling, please include wheeling – i.e. walking, wheeling and cycling, to capture the use of mobility scooters and wheelchairs as part of active travel networks. This is as recommended by Active Travel England, who are the Government’s agency managing the allocation of funding and advice, alongside the performance management of local authorities in regards to active travel.		capture mobility scooters and wheelchairs.	
	Car ownership and car use. We advise that mention should be made of the opportunities for the increasing opportunities for the use of vehicles with cleaner fuels over the lifetime of the plan – i.e. Electric Vehicles and other fuel technologies as they come forward	185	Mention increasing opportunities for the use of vehicles with cleaner fuels	Electric vehicles are referred to in N2, para 169, N15, the Transport and Access Objective TA01 and para 204. We acknowledge that other clean fuels for vehicles are not mentioned but this is due to the very low profile these technologies currently have together with limited/no guidance available.
	Policy N17 – Safer and more sustainable travel – ‘Development proposals should aim to promote sustainable travel’. We suggest including the word ‘enable’ rather than ‘promote’.	N17	Use ‘enable’ rather than promote	Noted
	We note the aspirations contained within the NP to improve safety and tackle speeding. We agree with the statement that addressing these issues sit outside of the neighbourhood plan. We welcome the chance to comment on any detailed/			Noted

	specific road safety proposals as and when individual planning applications are put forward.			
6 Gladman	3.2.2 As currently drafted, Gladman consider that a number of policies within the NDP present unnecessary duplication of both national policy requirements and guidance set out in local authority guidance documents			The Ninfield NDP has been drafted over an extended period and with extensive consultation. The issue of duplication of national/district policy has not been raised by WDC, Rother DC, ESCC or any other body. It is important to remember that this NDP is for the Ninfield Community not only planning professionals so we felt it important to include context and some background, wherever possible, to make it more accessible.
	3.3.1: Gladman have significant concerns regarding Policy N7 and specifically the proposed designation of LG6c 'Bexhill Road Verges, (Molly's Corner), Bexhill Road'. It is considered that the evidence base supporting Policy N7 does not provide a robust justification to the allocation of LG6.			See below
	3.3.2: Firstly, Gladman highlight that it is not in the remit of the neighbourhood plan to determine planning applications as this is the sole responsibility of the local planning authority and recommend that reference to 'planning permission			An important aim of the Parish Council and the NDP is to protect the wildlife and ecology of the parish, hence the LGS policy N7. This aim

	will not be permitted' is deleted from the policy wording. In addition, stating that 'very special circumstances' are required to justify permission is more restrictive than national planning policy and is more akin to the requirements justifying amendments to Green Belt boundaries.			should be taken into consideration when deciding future planning applications. It will be the responsibility of the LPA to balance the need for development against the need to protect the designated LGS.
	3.3.3: In order to designate land as LGS, the Parish Council must be able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the Framework. 1 NPPF (2023) Paragraph 16(f) The Framework makes clear at §101 that the role of local communities seeking to designate land as LGS should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development: "The designation of land as Local Green Space through local and neighbourhood plans allows communities to identify and protect green areas of particular importance to them. Designating land as Local Green Space should be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes, jobs and other essential services. Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated, and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period."			LGS designation was based on robust evidence gathered from the community by way of the Questionnaire and several drop in events. Residents value the "green gateway" that LG6c provides.
	3.3.4: Further guidance is provided at §102 of the Framework which sets out three tests that must			We believe the designated LGS meet these criteria.

	be met for the designation LGS, stating: “The Local Green Space designation should only be used where the green space is: a) in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves; b) demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreational value (including as a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and c) local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.”			The rich flora is particularly valued.
	3.3.5: Gladman contend that the Local Green Spaces Report (January 2023) does not provide proportionate, appropriate or robust evidence as required by the PPG to designate such land. Failure to demonstrate how each designation meets the tests set out at §102 is contrary to the requirements of national policy and guidance and is therefore inconsistent with basis condition (a).			We have set out how each LGS meets the criteria.
	3.3.6: The Local Green Spaces Report (January 2023) assesses the proposed designation under reference LG6c) and considers it in Table 4 to be demonstrably special to the local community in regard to ‘beauty’, ‘history’ and ‘wildlife’. Further detail is provided from page 42 of the report including a description of the site where it is noted: “The verges here are another example of a residual fragment of an ancient meadow, previously used for grazing stock which is rich in wildflower species (Tithe Map 1844). There is a rural feel to this area despite the adjacent A269			

	<p>main road and it forms a green gateway to the village. A wide range of species include Cuckoo Flower/Milkmaids (<i>Cardamine pratensis</i>), Wood Anemone (<i>Anemone nemorosa</i>), Early-purple Orchid (<i>Orchis mascula</i>), Sheep's Sorrel (<i>Rumex acetosella</i>) and Bluebell (<i>Hyacinthoides non-scripta</i>). The verges provide a green gateway into the village from the eastern part of the parish. The line of mature trees forming a narrow strip of woodland running along the eastern side of the A269 Bexhill Road enhance the green character of the area and will be valuable screen to mask the large estate of housing currently under construction. The cut through from the main road to Lower Street is the old land (the principal route to Bexhill before the "bypass" was built). The banks are steep and species rich with a canopy of mature trees above and it retains a country lane character. The verges are owned by East Sussex County Council and managed by Ninfield Parish Council. A new initiative is underway to enhance the range of wildflower species in this and other verges."</p>			
	<p>3.3.7: It is considered that the site description and assessment is not reflective of all the areas included within LG6 and therefore all the areas included do not meet the tests of the Framework.</p>			<p>LG6c does have a variety of micro areas within it that differ from each other. The strip of woodland bordering the new development under construction at Ingrams Farm was far more dense and richer in species until</p>

				the developer “stripped out” much of the undergrowth. This action caused dismay and anger in the community. It is hoped that the density will develop and improve over time.
	3.3.8: The Parish Council is aware that Gladman Developments has interest in the land to the west of Bexhill Road which was granted outline planning permission for up to 65 dwellings in September 2022. The site lies directly adjacent to the proposed LG6, and it must be noted that a proposed new pedestrian access and improvements will run through LG6. The development will include a pedestrian access point at the very north-eastern corner of the site and a new footway along the site frontage of Bexhill Road. To the north, the footway will extend to the B2095 Lower Street/A269 Bexhill Road junction with provisions to enable pedestrians to cross onto the existing footpath on the east side of Bexhill Road. 2 Planning Application Reference: WD/2021/2454/MAO			Where access has already been approved prior to the Regulation 16, the intention of the policy is to ensure there is no detrimental impact on the LGS beyond the access already approved. At present the site referred to is approved at outline stage only with all matters reserved except for the main access. This developer’s detailed proposals have not yet been fully approved by the LPA.
	3.3.10: The Ecological Impact Assessment produced as part of the planning application highlighted that the boundaries to the south and north of the site had the greatest ecological interest and the scheme allows scope for habitat buffers to be provided to minimise development edge effects. It was also considered that the			The officer decision clearly states that no trees or hedgerows shall be felled, reduced, pruned or destroyed without the written consent of the LPA. The hedgerow around the whole

	eastern boundary hedgerow is species-poor. In addition, there are considered to be no arboricultural constraints to development as confirmed within the Arboricultural Survey Report which supported the application.			site is very well established (many decades old), is mainly category B and has been well maintained.
	3.3.11: Therefore, it is unclear why this element of the verge is proposed to be included within LG6 when it does not demonstrate arboricultural or ecological significance and there is currently limited wildlife species present.			LG6c forms a green gateway on the approach to the village from the east.
	3.3.12: The wording of Policy N7 is unclear in what types of development it is seeking to restrict. However, Local Green Space 6 (LG6) and its relationship with the permitted application's pedestrian access conflicts with the Neighbourhood Plan's Policy N17 which seeks to promote sustainable travel but increasing the attractiveness of Figure 1 - Proposed location for pedestrian access in the north east of the site. walking, cycling and use of public transport. Criteria 1 and 2 seek for new development to provide safe public footpath connections to existing public routes and where no such routes exist provision should be delivered as part of proposals.			<p>There are questions as to how the proposed new footpath and bus stop will be accommodated on the development side of the Bexhill Road without excavation into the bank and complete removal of a well-established hedgerow. Currently the verge is too narrow.</p> <p>Agree that new developments should provide 'safe public footpath connections to existing public routes.</p>
	3.3.13: Gladman reiterate that the LG6c should be deleted from the NNP as it is not justified by robust evidence, conflicts with the approved			Outline permission only and much of LG6c is unaffected by this permission.

	planning application for residential development (WD/2021/2454/MAO) and does not meet the basic conditions			
7 David Godden	<p>We are opposed to our properties at Moor Hall Farm, Ninfield; namely Moor Hall Farmhouse, barns and converted buildings being included on the Non-Designated Heritage Assets list for Ninfield. NNDP page 64, supporting file L - Landscape page 52 and various other places within the report. Contrary to the statement that all owners of NDHA's were written to on 1st December 2022 drawing their attention to their property being on the local listing (NNDP Community Consultation number 26 page 15 and supporting file C - Consultation Statement letter on page 74), we did not receive a letter, otherwise we would have responded during the consultation period stating our opposition. The first we knew of our properties being included was on reading the very extensive plan in September 2023. Our buildings have been re-roofed and converted into dwellings over the years, the first in 1959 and the last in 2018. They originally formed part of the farm buildings associated with Moor Hall Manor (demolished in the 1990's) but other buildings within the original complex and not in our ownership have not been included. The single storey buildings are no longer readily recognisable as cowsheds, used for milking and the barns, which had a variety of uses over the years have been extensively altered to accommodate their various transitions. We can see no advantage to</p>			<p>Letters were hand delivered to each property on the list. In addition, there were ample opportunities to look at the Plan and it's supporting documents during the consultation period.</p> <p>Many buildings on the NDHA list have been modified, extended and brought up to the standard for modern living. These changes were considered against the criteria we set. Where it was considered that the original character had been retained and the criteria were met, these properties were locally listed.</p>

	our properties being included on the NDHA list for Ninfield.			
8 Bloomfields/Godden	We submit this formal response to the Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan (NNP) Regulation 16 Consultation, specifically in connection with land within Ms Godden's ownership, which remains drafted to form part of Local Green Space allocation site LG3, labelled as 'Church Wood and fields'. The land within Ms Godden's ownership is shown in Appendix 1 to this response.			See below
	It is important to note that Ms Godden was unaware that the Parish Council had progressed to Regulation 16 stage and has had no dialogue with or been contacted by the Parish Council following the previous representations lodged in regard to the NNP Regulation 14 Consultation.			Regular progress updates were provided to all residents in the local press and the Parish News as well as on social media. The Parish Council responded to the Regulation 14 comments from Ms Godden, these appear in our Consultation Statement.
	We remain of the view that the land within Ms Godden's ownership does not fulfil the relevant criteria for inclusion as a Local Green Space (as part of LG3) and in this regard we attach at Appendix 2, the initial response in full (Regulation 14 Consultation). However, we wish to comment further detail below as to why the land within Ms Godden's ownership specially should be omitted from LG3.			
	It is acknowledged that Church Wood which forms part of the wider LG3 site, is ancient woodland and in this regard is a valuable natural asset.			Ms Godden's land forms an integral part of the setting of Church Wood (a Local

	<p>Furthermore, that the adjoining fields (Upper and Lower Church Fields) between the woodland and public right of way (NIN/4/1) and St Mary the Virgin Church, which have well used historic routes adjacent to and/or through, help to form part of the setting to both the woodland and the listed Church, as well as providing longer landscape views towards the South Downs. Consequently, their inclusion has merit. However, the land within Ms Godden's ownership is private agricultural land, which is, and will continue to be used for agricultural practices. Moreover, this private agricultural land has no direct public access, and in this regard we cannot understand why this has been taken forward as part of site allocation LG3 by the Parish Council.</p>			<p>Nature Reserve) and integrates this into the wider landscape. The land in Ms Godden's ownership is agricultural and forms an important buffer between the wood and the housing along the High Street. Walkers using the footpath mentioned enjoy the rural vista with fields on either side.</p>
	<p>Reference has been made to other larger LGS in some other NDPs (for example, a 50 hectare LGS in nearby Crowhurst). Whilst this is noted, the parcel of land in the Crowhurst NDP is a nature reserve and consequently has high richness of wildlife and the inclusion of a Nature Reserve is logical. The same level of wildlife richness cannot be attributed to Ms Godden's land or the wider draft LG3 site.</p>			<p>There is wildlife present across the entire LG3 site, including the fields within Ms Godden's ownership, with meadow grasses and flowers. Farmland birds including doves, pheasants and owls are present indicating a thriving fauna and flora.</p>
	<p>In light of the above comments, and the initial Regulation 14 response, the land specifically withing Ms Godden's ownership does not fulfil any of the relevant criteria for inclusion as Local Open Space and the land indicated within Appendix 1 should be omitted from LG3.</p>			<p>Disagree for reasons stated</p>

9 Linda Goldsmith	I agree will the content of this comprehensive submission which, if approved will hopefully stop future speculative large scale development proposals such as those already passed in recent years. Our lovely RURAL village has already been overdeveloped out of all proportion to requirements and with almost no increase in infrastructure. I believe that this draft neighbourhood plan seeks to put forward a much more common sense approach.			Noted
10 Robin Goldsmith	I have read much of this regulation 16 local plan which I think is excellent, I can find nothing to disagree within it and the small team of local volunteers who have spent countless hours in its preparation are to be congratulated. I agree with the matters as set out in the forward of this draft neighbourhood development plan. I fully agree with the aims and aspirations contained within it as well as the policy documents. I hope that, if approved, it will stop future large scale and out of character speculative developments within our village such as we have had in recent years. The plan quite rightly places emphasis on improvements to local connectivity and reducing car dependency by encouraging walking, cycling and use of public transport. Improvements are sorely needed in Ninfield as there are no direct path from here to any of our neighbouring villages. walking or cycling on any the main roads connecting our villages is so dangerous that many here will not take the risk. An increase in local employment opportunity together with genuinely			Noted

	affordable housing, as pointed out in this plan, will also reduce car use. I find our rural village to be a great place to live which will be enhanced for the future if this plan is approved			
11 Historic England	We do not consider it necessary for Historic England to provide detailed comments at this time. We would refer you to previous comments submitted at Regulation 14 stage, (which we have attached in terms of completeness) and for any further information to our detailed advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into a neighbourhood plan, which can be found here:			Noted
12 Christine Hoad	I support this Neighbourhood Plan because the integrity of a village and its unique characteristics need to be protected. I also support the concern about infrastructure being overloaded and this should be a major consideration with any future development applications.			Noted
13 Ian Moffat	This is a well thought out plan that attempts to balance the needs of the community with the greater needs of the District. Much development has already taken place and this plan addresses the need to ensure that any future development fits in to the existing environment and is not simply a bolt on addition without thought to design, structure and layout. One of the great advantages of living in a village environment is the community, therefore it is important that the wishes of that community are taken on board when any planning decisions are made. This local plan helps to identify those needs and provide guidance to			Noted

	future planners. I fully support the plan and hope that it will be adopted. It has been a long time in the making and much thought seems to have been put into the various aspects of it to ensure that it meets the basic conditions of Reg 16.			
14 Keith Morgan	I wish to support the Vision, objectives and all the policies in the draft Ninfield NDP as well as supporting the draft Design Guide appended to the NDP. I believe the text in the NDP and its appendices and the supporting background documents provide ample justification to support the NDP and Design Guide as drafted.			Noted
15 National Gas	Proposed sites crossed or in close proximity to National Gas Transmission assets: An assessment has been carried out with respect to National Gas Transmission's assets which include high-pressure gas pipelines and other infrastructure. National Gas Transmission has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area.			Noted
16 National Grid	Proposed development sites crossed or in close proximity to NGET assets: An assessment has been carried out with respect to NGET assets which include high voltage electricity assets and other electricity infrastructure. NGET has identified that no assets are currently affected by proposed allocations within the Neighbourhood Plan area			Noted
17 National Highways	Many thanks for consulting National Highways on the Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan. We have reviewed the submitted documents and would		No mention made of DfT Circular 10/22	Consider including this reference.

	<p>make the following comments. The continued reference to sustainable travel is welcomed and it is acknowledged that Ninfield has concerns about poor public transport links and limited local transport services. Any improvement to cycle infrastructure, bus services and links to rail services would reduce the need to travel by car and thus lessen the need to use the Strategic Road Network. It is noted in the Transport Policies section that whilst the NPPF has been referenced, there is no reference to DfT Circular 01/22, which should, moving forwards, be the baseline for all Transport Statements/ Transport Assessments. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to comments on the Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan, and please continue to send any updates and consultations to planningse@nationalhighways.co.uk.</p>			
18 Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on this draft neighbourhood plan.			Noted
19 Stephen & Sally Parry	<p>We are very pleased with and supportive of the Neighbourhood Plan produced by Ninfield. We feel strongly that the green spaces in Ninfield should be preserved as outlined in the Plan. It is important that residents have plenty of space outside their houses to exercise themselves as well as their pets. Existing scenic views and particular topography should be protected. Church Wood is of particular interest to residents as well as the land that surrounds it. The Village Society works hard to maintain this beautiful community</p>			Noted

	<p>asset for the enjoyment and well-being of Ninfield residents.</p> <p>We are particularly keen that any new housing should be equipped with sustainable sources of energy for heating (air-source heat-pumps) and water heating as well with solar panels and rain water harvesting.</p> <p>Infrastructure in Ninfield is relatively good for the size of the current community. However, development in the future must take into account the increase in numbers of new residents and make plans accordingly for new infrastructure i.e. educational, medical, transport, shops etc.</p> <p>It is essential that the flood risk and drainage elements in the Plan be adhered to, during construction and for the life of the development.</p> <p>Dark skies are a feature of Ninfield and should remain so.</p>			
20 Vicky Payne	<p>I want to congratulate those involved in the gargantuan task of putting together the plan, and yet as I read through the many pages, I see that it is already out of date. The 'Carmen Fields@ development has not been built using materials which fit in to the existing built landscape, and 20 acre field is no longer for sale, but sold and with planning permission for 60 houses. The proposed 'green space' behind Sparkes Gardens is an unusable bramble patch and there are plans circulating which show this under housing too, along with further land behind Manchester Road. Whilst it is lovely to read about village views, it must be heartbreaking for those in Sparkes</p>			<p>Planning issues affecting Ninfield are fast moving and constantly evolving. Applications and developers come and go leaving behind an almost incomprehensible array of documents on the WDC planning portal. Things will by nature become out of date fairly rapidly.</p> <p>The views selected are 'public' in the sense that they can be enjoyed from a</p>

	<p>Gardens to know they have lost their view, but Carmen Fields now get to enjoy it. I rather object to the access to my land being considered a 'public view', though I am sure it is less inviting to all but the nosey parkers now the estate is so clearly visible behind the hedge. Furthermore, I am shocked that my house xxx is down as 'locally listed' when we specifically stated we had no interest in the house being listed in any way as half of it is of modern construction and the rest has been significantly altered. We have been unfairly denied the right to improve our home because to do so would not be 'in keeping' despite the monstrosity now almost opposite.</p> <p>In essence I agree with the plan and have no desire to delay it any further, even though it scuppers my desire for a small dwelling with a view just outside the development boundary, and yet it seems pointless to be ratifying something which is too little too late? Maybe in supporting it I can stop Ninfield disappearing totally under shitty orange and grey boxes?</p>			<p>publicly accessible view point.</p> <p>Local listing is a consideration when planning applications are assessed. This does not entail a blanket ban on all improvements/changes.</p> <p>Many listed dwellings on the Historic England database have had alterations and changes made to them. WDC remain the PLA and they make all decisions related to planning.</p> <p>We agree that much of the housing currently under construction is totally out of character with the local vernacular.</p>
21 Angela Reid	This is a thoroughly well researched plan and there has been extensive consultation in the village. I wholeheartedly support its content.			Noted
22 RDC	The policy highlights the character of the Moorhall Stream Valley and Catsfield/Watermill Stream Valley as being valued landscapes. The third paragraph sets out that 'public views over the landscape... will be safeguarded from detracting by obtrusive or incongruous development.' Both	N6 ALVL	Request clarification on potential implications of this policy (N6) on	We would welcome more consultation between WDC and Rother DC when considering planning applications. Indeed, this should be essential where a

	<p>areas sit close to the Rother district boundary and therefore these public views over the landscape could affect development proposals within Rother District. We would like to highlight that if the policy is 'made' in the neighbourhood plan, RDC will need to take the policy into account in considering relevant planning applications that could affect views into and from these landscape areas. RDC request clarification on the potential implications of this policy on development proposals in the Rother district, including any need for additional consultation with Wealden District Council/ Ninfield Parish Council on relevant planning applications, and the extent of area affected by any additional consultation requirements.</p>		<p>development proposals within Rother District, including any need for additional consultation with WDC/Ninfield Parish on relevant planning applications, and the extent of the area affected...</p>	<p>site is in close proximity to the boundary.</p>
	<p>Overview</p> <p>As a neighbouring District Council, we would like to congratulate you on the production of a valid and relevant draft Plan which clearly represents the values and aspirations of the local community whilst also addressing substantial issues that extend much further than the village i.e. climate change and the biodiversity emergency. We are particularly pleased to read that all policies in the Plan are written with climate change and carbon reduction in mind and the Parish Council should be commended for taking this forward-thinking approach. The Plan is well-produced, user-friendly and the use of parish photos and maps throughout gives context to the supporting text</p>			

	<p>and policies. Generally, the encouragement and enhancement of natural capital in the parish will have a positive impact on the neighbouring parishes including the Rother settlements of Ashburnham, Catsfield and Bexhill. Clearly, the contrary also applies, therefore we support your positive environmental policies and the benefits they will also bring to Rother District. We appreciate the acknowledgement that a Neighbourhood Plan exists to complement and enhance policies in the Local Plan when appropriate, which reflects Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) on a neighbourhood plan, paragraph 041: 'It should be distinct to reflect and respond to the unique characteristics and planning context of the specific neighbourhood area for which it has been prepared.' The Ninfield NP reflects this approach and ensures the Plan remains relevant for decision makers. We support the Community Aspirations section as a non-statutory action plan of community wishes for the parish and appreciate the variety of projects included here including community and transport infrastructure and priorities for CIL. We have commented below on policies that may impact on the neighbouring Rother settlements of Ashburnham, Catsfield and Bexhill. We recognise that successful local employment and sustainable rural enterprise policies may increase the flow of traffic across the Rother/Wealden boundary but in the absence of previous figures we have not explicitly commented on these.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	Neighbourhood Plan Policies In addition to our comments above, we have the following comments on specific Neighbourhood Plan policies: N1 Sustainable Location of Development – We support the inclusion of this policy as the eastern side of development boundary is located at the Rother/Wealden district boundary. Some of the text is a little confusing '(including any enlarged development boundary forming part of any adopted replacement Wealden Local Plan)', however we are confident that advice on wording will be given by Wealden District Council.	N1		This wording was included to take account of possible revision/expansion of the development boundary (the current applicable one is 2013). Currently, there is no Local Plan in place but we are aware that WDC are working towards the Reg 18 stage at time of writing.
	N3- Flood Risk and Drainage – We support the inclusion of this policy as flooding and run-off created by new development in Ninfield may impact on Rother District and on the Pevensey Levels designated habitat. We agree with the approach of taking into account flood risk at all stages in the development process, as we aim to in Rother District, right from the initial design and construction stages despite Ninfield being a low flood-risk area in Flood Zone 1.	N3		Noted
23 Southern Water	Dear Sir/Madam – thank you for consulting us on the Submission Draft of the Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16 Consultation). We have no further comments to make at this time and look forward to hearing of progress with the Plan.			Noted
24 Surrey CC	Thank you for consulting Surrey County Council as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority. Please note that we have no comments to raise.			Noted
25 Heatons/Tarmac	See separate document			

26 WDC	See separate document			
27 West Sussex CC	Thank you for consulting WSCC on the Reg 16 Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan. To confirm we have no comments to make on the plan. Please continue to contact us with any other Neighbourhood Plan consultations.			Noted
28 Strutt Parker/Ashburnham – late response	I write as the Land Agent for, and on behalf of, the Ashburnham Estate. The Estate was surprised that, according to your website, when preparing the neighbourhood plan for Ninfield ‘the Working Group notified landowners of the possibility of using the neighbourhood plan to designate their sites of local green spaces’, which for Ashburnham Estate directly effects Coombe Wood. For the avoidance of doubt we did not receive such notification from the Working Group, nor were any consultations undertaken with the Estate about designation or use of Coombe Wood by members of the community. Coombe Wood is not an ‘open’ green space, nor has it any designated public rights of way through or around the woodland. There has been an inference that access appears to be ‘tolerated’ in Coombe Wood and we would like to remind you that this is not, nor has it ever been, correct. Anyone accessing the woodland without permission from the estate is trespassing. The woodland is under our Forestry Commission approved Woodland Management Plan: we regularly carry out forestry operations to remove trees affected by ash die back and generate wood products that are sold. The Ashburnham Estate also has a shoot let to a			<p>Landowners were notified of possible designation following the shortlisting process. It was not considered necessary to correspond with all owners of land before the list was decided upon. Coombe Wood was excluded as an LGS early on and prior to the final list coming forward.</p> <p>Coombe Wood has been used for recreation by residents for many decades (80 years at least). We note recent steps taken by the estate to exclude residents. This stance is disappointing given the peaceful environment it provided (before the recent mass tree felling). Also of note, on the site are the World War 2 ‘dragon’s teeth’ what a pity</p>

	<p>local farmer with rights over Coombe Wood. Therefore, public access is disadvantageous for the Estate, potentially dangerous for residents, and we have not sought to encourage this in any way (as the many signs, sadly regularly defaced by residents, will demonstrate). We do acknowledge that various people have trespassed over Coombe Wood but this is not something willingly tolerated by the Estate. We would like to put on record that we do not believe the Ashburnham Estate has been consulted about the possibility of designating Coombe Wood as a local green space, and we do not acknowledge your position that access is 'tolerated' through the woodland. We would like the local community to be reminded that the wood is privately owned and that residents should not be trespassing on private land.</p>			<p>that the current generation of children cannot see them.</p> <p>The PC take the view that it is the role of the estate to 'remind the local community' of their desire to exclude them.</p>