Wealden District Council
Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation

The following is a summary of the comments made during the Regulation 16 consultation on the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan which ran between Monday 5 June 2023 and Monday 17 July 2023. It is a summary written by Officers at Wealden District Council and is written to assist the Examiner and anyone who wishes to see a summary of the issues raised. It does not contain every point a consultee has made. The full comments are available to view on our website https://www.wealden.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-planning/

Consultee	Summary of Contents	Would like to attend the examination in public, if it is deemed necessary	Would like to be notified of the LPA decision on the adoption of the Ninfield Neighbourhood Plan (Reg 19)
Ms R Allen	Since this plan was submitted Little Primmers has been granted listed status. The consultee then lists the parts of the plan that need to be updated as a result.		
Boakes Land Projects	Considers that the WNP does not adequately anticipate future housing development and is pre-emptively restricting or preventing housing development coming forward on sites which are logical and sensible locations for new housing given the current levels of housing need. Appropriate sites for new housing are inevitably more limited in the north of the district largely due to the extent of the High Weald AONB and the low number of substantial settlements (Crowborough, Forest Row and Wadhurst). This relative scarcity of housing is reflected in higher house prices. Higher house process are a barometer of unmet housing need. The consultee recognises the particular constraints on development in the WNP area but, it is inevitable that there is a need for substantial new housing over the course of the plan period and it is precisely because the area is so constrained that every effort must be made to identify acceptable housing sites.	X	X

	• Policy WAD1-are concerned that para B concerning development outside of development boundaries is too restrictive. DC17 was adopted as part of the 1998 Local Plan and restricts development outside of settlement boundaries but these boundaries were defined in contemplation of a far lower housing requirement and it has long been accepted by WDC that this policy is now out of date. This reference should be deleted. • Green Gaps and Local Green Spaces-nothing to add that has not already been expressed by other respondents. • Think it would be reasonable, in anticipation of future development needs (whatever they may be) to reconsider the settlement boundary, particularly to incorporate the Windmill House site but there may be other locations adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. • Policy WAD 2-The policy meets the housing need in the sense of addressing the type of housing that is required rather than expressing a willingness to meet need in terms of housing numbers. Other than this we support this policy. • Policy WAD 3- supports the aim of this policy that any new built form must protect and enhance the landscape and streetscapes and preserve the distinctive character of settlements. Would like to see WAD 3 simplified to remove reference to the HW Design Guide and overlap between the Design Code and WAD 3 eliminated in order to make this a more user friendly policy. Also raises concerns that some of the wording in this policy may lead to pastiche designs and that it does not recognise the role that modern materials can play in conjunction with traditional materials in producing innovative design wholly complimentary to the existing built environment. • Policy WAD 4- should include air source heat pumps.		

	• Policy WAD 8- defining the scale, scope and level of detail of any Transport Assessment or Statement is not an appropriate matter for a Neighbourhood Plan.		
Ms J Clough	Had comments on Section 13 (Community Aspirations Major Projects), in particular D1 and D2. States that more traffic calming measures going north in Lower High Street are essential and suggests a period of neighbourhood traffic speed monitoring and a couple of zebra crossings. The consultee asks for recognition that some householders have no road frontage or vehicular access and have no choice but to park on Lower High Street and High Street. Suggests providing resident only parking on Lower High Street.		
Coal Authority	As Wealden District Council lies outside the coalfield, the Planning Team at the coal authority has no specific comments to make.		
Kember Loudon Williams on behalf of Mr S Durnford	Has fundamental concerns that the draft Neighbourhood Plan is preventing sustainable development from coming forward, particularly in relation to: • The designation of Primmers Field as a Green Gap - under Policy WAD1. Questions the justification for a Green Gap designation on the basis of protecting the AONB. Also, the distinction between Primmers Green and Wadhurst village is therefore already eroded, with a link having already been established. The draft designation serves no role in preventing coalescence, therefore and should be removed. The consultee raises questions about the justification for the Green Gap given in Appendix A. The consultee states that the Green Gap fails to meet two of the basic conditions, 1) Compliance with national policy and advice; and 2) contribution to the achievement of sustainable development.	X	X

	• The protection and safeguarding of certain views, specifically those across Primmers Field - under Policy WAD15; The consultee questions 4 of the valued views that relate to Primmers Field and the justification behind them and states that the views have been chosen to constrain housing development. They state that the views do not meet the basic conditions test and should be removed from the Plan. • Policy WAD5: Conserving Heritage Assets which sets out that any non-listed entries on the Historic Environment Record should be considered as non-designated heritage assets. The consultee is concerned by this and states that the fact that a building holds a record on a local HER list should not be the sole determining factor for including a building onto a heritage list. any decisions providing additional protection needs to be evidence based and recorded in accordance with requirements set out by the Government. Without doing this, the Plan will fail the basic conditions test. In order to meet the basic conditions test the plan should • Remove Green Gap 5 Primmers Field designation from Policy WAD1; • Remove Views 2a, 2b, 3 and 5b from the list of views in Policy WAD15 that require extra protection; • Redraft Policy WAD5 to provide clear and up to date information on any identified non-designated heritage assets.		
East Sussex County Council	**Highways Authority** • Policy WAD 8 is inaccurate and does not meet the basic condition a) have regard to national policy and advice (as regards when Transport Assessments and Statements are required) and suggests some alternative wording.		

	• Reference to the health benefits of active travel were highlighted at the previous consultation stage (ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response paragraph 1.5) but are considered to have not been carried through to the Submission Version of the plan. In order to comply with the basic conditions, the NP should have stronger reference to the health benefits of active travel. • Paragraph 7.5. The inclusion of a map showing the walking and cycling network(s) in relation to the station was advised at the previous consultation stage (ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response paragraph 1.7) but has not been included in the submission version. • Reference to Uplands School and its large catchment area was requested at the previous consultation stage (ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response paragraph 1.14). However, there is no reference in the Submission Plan. • Section 12 and Section 13-There is limited reference to partnership working or funding in sections 12 or 13 contrary to the ESCC comment at the previous consultation stage (ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response paragraph 1.2 & 1.15). It is considered that the wording of paragraph 3 of Section 13 is ambiguous and could suggest funding solely for Wadhurst Parish rather than including delivery partners. • Policy WAD 9 A Public Car Parking-The issues raised in paragraph 1.19 of the ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response, does not appear to have been addressed and the wording remains much the same as in the pre-submission version of the NP. • Policy WAD 9 B Public Car Parking- There remains no reference to the management of parking in the High Street reflecting the ESCC comment at the previous consultation stage (ESCC Reg 14 Phase 2 response paragraph 1.20). • Since the Regulation 14 consultation a new government agency referred to as ‘Active Travel England’ has been established to		

	transform the role of walking and cycling within the Country's transport system. Active Travel also incorporates 'wheeling' (using a wheelchair or mobility aid). Therefore, please ensure that this is reflected in the updated Plan when referring to walking and cycling. • The County Council has received £41.4m of funding towards its Bus Service Improvement Plan. Some of the funded proposals within the BSIP are now being realised and these should be reflected in the NP. **Education** • There is no reference to early years provision in the NP. • In terms of school places, ESCC's primary and secondary forecasts continue to show that there should be sufficient capacity to meet the foreseeable levels of demand. **Culture and Tourism** • Policy WAD 11- The Council advises that specific recognition should be made of retail as a tourism activity. • Section 10- Community Facilities. A note on the particular need for indoor spaces for community activities to be possible throughout the year would be advisable and would support any future need to extend current indoor facilities if the community demand outgrows current availability and would ensure there is sufficient provision of community facilities in line with the NPPF and the social objective of sustainable development. **Public Health** • 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.		

Kember Loudon Williams on behalf of Elite Leisure Salmons UK Limited	Express fundamental concerns with the Neighbourhood Plan placing unjustifiable, unqualified and unnecessary restrictions on Bewl Water. The consultee states that a number of policies in the draft plan do not meet the basic conditions tests: • Policy WAD 16 Local Green Space. The consultee continues to raise an objection to the designation of large parts of the operational core of the Bewl Estate as Local Green Space (Policy WAD16). It is an overly and unnecessary restrictive policy designation that demonstrably fails two of the basic condition tests: 1) compliance with national policy; and 2) contribution to the achievement of sustainable development. In their professional and considered opinion, and having regard to evidence from other public examinations, the Local Space Designation is not close to the community it serves and is extensively large to meet the requirements of national policy to qualify for designation. The PPG states that Local Green Space designations will rarely be appropriate where the land has planning permission for Development. There is an extant permission on the site for a campsite (LPA Ref: WD/2020/0717). The consultee has reasonable concerns that this draft designation is similarly being used in an unqualified and unreasonable attempt to limit and constrain development at Bewl. The use of a Local Green Space designation to restrict suitable development from coming forward does not accord with the positive approach to growth requirement by the NPPF.	X	X

	• Policy WAD 14: Bewl Water Reservoir Area and Associated Public Activities. The Neighbourhood Plan should be supportive of the whole business by allowing sensitive expansion and diversification and other forms of sustainable development on site. Development should not be exclusively restricted to local community uses only, as suggested in draft Policy WAD14 – this is patently wrong. It is deeply concerning that the Steering Group has drafted a site-specific policy for Bewl Water when they refuse to acknowledge that the site has regional importance. There is a clear lack of understanding as to how the site operates, is funded and maintained. On this basis, and for the reasons provided above and repeated in early representations, Policy WAD14 fails the basic condition tests and should be removed in its entirety. It is not the purpose of the planning system to unilaterally designate private land for non-profit community-based activities, however laudable this may be. • Policy WAD 18: Important Community Facilities. The Rights of Way around Bewl Water rights of way are protected under other legislation. There is, therefore, absolutely no need or justification to provide further protection to these footpaths within Policy WAD18. Similarly, the reservoir is an important water resource that is also protected under its own legislation. Again, there is therefore no need to include any reference to Bewl Water in Policy WAD18 and we respectfully request that it is removed altogether • Policy WAD 11: Supporting Sustainable Rural Tourism. As drafted, this policy limits sustainable rural tourism opportunities to existing buildings only. There is no justification given for this		

	restrictive approach, which is actively supressing diversification. It is contrary to the NPPF, and the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area which encourage and support tourism more generally to adapt and change. The policy clearly fails the basic conditions test. The policy either needs to be removed in its entirety or it needs to be reworded to be more positive and supporting of all sustainable tourism initiatives. In summary the plan should: • Remove the Bewl Water Recreation Area LG13 from Policy WAD16 (Local Green Space); • Not have a site-specific policy for Bewl Water (i.e Policy WAD14) unless the Steering Group can do a volte face and support, rather than undermine, the commercial operations at the site; • Remove any reference to Bewl in Policy WAD 18; and • Reword Policy WAD11 (Supporting Sustainable Tourism) so that it is more positively worded and not so restrictive.		
DMH Stallard on behalf of Greymoor Homes	Provide comments relating to proposals to designate land north of Mayfield Lane as Local Green Space (identified in the plan as LG7 'Ex Wadhurst College Recreation'). The WNP fails to meet the tests of (a) having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State; and (d) contributing to the achievement of sustainable development. The consultee considers that: • the proposed LGS is not in sufficiently close proximity to the community it serves, being located some 1.3 km (or further) from the main population centres of Wadhurst. • It is considered more likely that residents of this development are more likely to use the adjoining woodland rather than the area identified by LG7.		

	• the lack of public accessibility provides a further indication that the site is not suitable for designation as an LGS. • the land proposed to be an LGS is not demonstrably special to the local community for the purposes of beauty or wildlife as highlighted within the WNP. • a 2.5 ha. site cannot be considered to be local in character, particularly given the number of LGS sites throughout Wadhurst and the limited population that this LGS is purported to serve • consideration should be given as to what designations already exist and whether there would be any local benefit gained by designation of the LGS. • the designation fails to comply with guidance set out by Paragraph 101 - 103 of the NPPF, as it would not be consistent with the local planning of sustainable development, nor would it allow for the investment in sufficient homes, jobs, or other local services. As the proposed LGS fails to accord with the guidance for designating such areas set out by Paragraphs 101 – 103 of the NPPF as well as the relevant sections of PPG, it is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan would fail to meet 'basic test a' of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. This is because it has failed to have sufficient regard to national guidance and policies. It is considered that the Neighbourhood Plan fails to meet 'basic test d' in that it identifies a disproportionate number of areas as LGS which would be detrimental to the long term planning of the area and achievement of sustainable development. Policy WAD16 and Appendix F should be amended to delete 'LG7' in order that the Neighbourhood Plan meets the relevant conditions prior to any referendum.		

Historic England	Does not consider it necessary to provide detailed comments at this time. Refers to previous comments submitted at the Regulation 14 stage and to their advice on successfully incorporating historic environment considerations into a neighbourhood plan, which can be found on their website.		X
Mr C Ince	Requests both as part of Objective 2 (Getting Around) and the D1 and D2 Major Projects to meet Community Aspirations that: • The top end of Washwell Lane, between Townlands Road and the B2099, be included within the areas designated as Traffic/Congestion Hotspots (pages 57 - 59, Figure 7.4 and Policy WAD8 of the WNP refer). • Mechanisms be put in place to enforce the existing 8am - 6pm parking restrictions from Monday to Saturday on Washwell Lane • The White Hart Pub be required to store its refuse bins on its premisses, rather than leave them on the pavement, on Washwell Lane, where they represent a significant Health and Safety Hazard for Wadhurst residents transiting the area on foot.		
Mr D Moore	Thinks the plan is a comprehensive assessment of Wadhurst, and has identified some key issues. Traffic and parking are important topics and detract from the appeal of the village and deters new businesses. The railway station is an important asset and a good feature that is away from the village and so spreads the parking concentration. Does not want developments close to the station as that would start to close the rural gap. Although the plan represents a snapshot of Wadhurst as it is now and extolls the virtues of maintaining it as it is, it is not clear how it could expand or develop over the next 25 years. It also does not mention Gatwick (or the expansion) but as a lot of planes pass over Wadhurst on		X

	their approach flightpaths, it should be predicted that this degrades the countryside rating of the area.		
National Highways	The Plan is generally very well written and seems to cover all aspects National Highways would wish to see in a Neighbourhood Plan. Wadhurst itself is a village located c.5 km west of the A21, being the nearest access point to the SRN. The Plan seeks to address local transport issues, including traffic and parking issues and promoting sustainable transport options by improving connectivity to facilities within and beyond the Parish by integrating and, where possible, extending the network of footpaths, cycleways and bridleways, which is welcomed. The Plan notes local residents have raised problems associated with rat-running, where Wadhurst routes are used by drivers to avoid congestion on the A21. Traffic congestion in Wadhurst may be exacerbated by traffic diverting traffic through Wadhurst when delays are identified on the A21 and also when accidents close the A21. Whilst not directly interacting with Wadhurst itself, there are currently studies and projects along the A21 to improve safety and congestions, which may result in more trips being directed to the SRN and away from Wadhurst, particularly for north-south journeys. In terms of impact on the SRN, the Plan is not considered to have a material impact on the SRN, and as such no objection would be raised by National Highways.		X
Natural England	Natural England does not have any specific comments on the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan.		

Mrs C Noel	Believes there is room to strengthen the wording in some policies e.g. • 4.1.3 could be more assertive in its commitment to the natural environment and should be reworded to ‘‘The aim is to conserve and enhance the natural environment, contributing to a resilient and strengthened rural character.’ • Suggests the following measures could be incorporated into Policy IN3: Water Supply and Quality: Require new developments to incorporate water efficiency measures, require a comprehensive assessment of the existing water infrastructure's capacity before approving any new development, make it mandatory for developers to contribute to infrastructure upgrades if the existing system is found to be inadequate to handle the additional demand from the new development. Consideration should be given to adding a specific policy related to medical services. This could involve working with local health authorities, lobbying for more resources, or exploring innovative solutions like telemedicine or community health initiatives. Housing policies should ensure that housing is available and affordable for medical professionals, the village could attract more healthcare providers. Would like to see the parish council work with stakeholders to implement new TPO's in Wadhurst. Trees are an important part of our village's character and biodiversity, and they play a vital role in reducing air pollution and improving air quality. The parish council could also work with landowners to develop a more comprehensive tree protection plan for the village. Additionally, we should develop a tree management plan for the village.		

	Suggests a policy on biodiversity net gain is added and suggests wording.		
Mr I Noel	There is an urgent need for stronger protections and enforcement of our environmental policies, to ensure the preservation of our community's natural heritage for future generations. The consultee proposes: • the implementation of a policy that mandates the planting of three new trees for every single tree removed due to development • that we also prioritize the safeguarding of hedges. Hedges are an integral part of our local ecosystem, providing essential habitats for a variety of wildlife and contributing significantly to our landscape's character. As such, any development plans should include clear measures to protect existing hedges and, where necessary, provisions for the planting of mixed native new ones. • a new policy to be added on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). This policy seeks to ensure that all development proposals within the parish identify and incorporate opportunities for net gains in biodiversity, in line with best practices and legal requirements. The plan should encourage and require all developers to seek ways to enhance biodiversity within and around their projects. • All development proposals must include a Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment. • Ecological Surveys: Developers should commission surveys to identify existing biodiversity and important habitats on the site. The results of these surveys should inform the design of the development and any necessary mitigation measures. • Mitigation Hierarchy: Developers should follow the mitigation hierarchy (avoid, minimise, restore, and offset) to prevent harm to biodiversity.		

Mr and Mrs O Dwyer	Raise a number of points: • Would like ESCC and WDC to fund additional parking at Uplands. • Asks why there is no parking sign for the Greyhound car park. • Parking in St James' Square is an extreme hazard as people park outside the designated lines. • People park wherever they like on yellow lines, at the bus stop and in St James' Square. There are 7 buses parked in the Square and at the bus stop ever afternoon during term time. This heightens these risks even more.		
Ray	The plan is very thorough, well-considered and crafted. Raises a number of points: • Are there any plans for a ring road to ease traffic congestion? • What happened to the plans for the Commemoration Hall redevelopment which had great merit? More car parking provision too. • Being awarded the best town in which to live in the UK is, or should be, a great opportunity for tourism. How many beds are available in the village? Do we have a tourism website? • If we designate areas for green areas with great views it is important for them to be visible. • Could shop workers be encouraged to park away from the High Street, thus releasing spaces for customers on the road side?		
Southern Water	Have no further comments to make at this time.		X
Surrey County Council	Have no comments to make regarding the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan Regulation 16 Consultation.		

Tunbridge Wells Borough Council	Note and support the Vision and Objectives and spatial strategy of the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan, as well as the issues impacting the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan area. TWBC has continued to focus on aspects of the Neighbourhood Plan that could raise strategic cross-boundary issues, including issues such as infrastructure and the protection of the natural and built environment, as well as general points of clarity and consistency with national and local policy. Regard has also been given to comments made previously by TWBC at both stages of the Regulation 14 consultation. As previously commented, it is noted that the provision of infrastructure to support new development is considered to be a key issue, including the aspiration of improving a variety of infrastructure facilities, including better health, leisure, and recreational facilities. These aspirations are recognised, and it is likely that this infrastructure may be used by some residents of Tunbridge Wells Borough who reside in some of the rural areas on the boundaries with East Sussex/Wealden/Wadhurst – such as rural Lamberhurst and Hawkhurst. Likewise, it is assumed that some residents of Wadhurst will utilise infrastructure within Tunbridge Wells Borough. As previously noted, it would be helpful to be kept updated with any of these projects as they progress. There are some previous comments which could still be addressed: • TWBC would suggest that the provision of recreation open space may be better placed as a policy in its own right under the Environment section as it is considered to get somewhat lost amongst lots of other policy detail where currently placed in the Design section.		

	• Policy WAD 10- the title could benefit from being re-worded and there are some inconsistencies between references within the policy (Section A and B) of which commercial uses are being referred to – Class E and also Class B2, B8 and F. This could be tidied up. • Local Economy section- there is a more recent and updated document prepared on behalf of WDC to inform their Local Plan work by Nexus Planning, and this should therefore be taken into account and referred to in the Wadhurst Neighbourhood Plan if relevant. There are also some additional comments on the submission Neighbourhood Plan; the wording of objective 1 and paragraph 2.20 and more general comments on formatting and accessibility.		
Wealden District Council	The Council has provided extensive comments. The main issues of concern that remain are around the Green Gaps, Local Green Spaces, non-designated heritage assets and Locally Valued Views. The Council has considered the environmental designations proposed within the WNP and notes that many of the proposed environmental designations (e.g. Green Gaps and Locally Valued Views) cover sites that have been submitted to Wealden District Council as part of its Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (SHELAA).The Council feel that the considerable number of designations could result in limiting the supply of potential housing sites and the number of dwellings that can be delivered on these sites to meet the housing needs of the local community in Wadhurst. The Council also highlighted issues with the wording of the Bewl Water Policy WAD 14.		

	The Council also provided extensive comments on the Design Code, namely that: • It needed to be prepared on the basis of evidence. • The Character Appraisal should form the cornerstone of the Design Code. • The document could better represent other settlements in the parish besides Wadhurst. • Breaking the parish down into Character Areas would enable the character of each settlement to be identified and the code formed from there. • Much of the Design Code does not seem to allow for contextual design or responding to local sites/areas based on historic patterns of development/use or innovative modern design. The aim of a Design Code is not to take planning judgement out of the process altogether. • Certain requirements are very prescriptive and could lead to the homogenisation of the area. • Certain requirements are more akin to policy / community aspirations, in which case,is the design code the right place for these? • It is not clear what consultation has taken place specifically on this design code prior to the Phase 2 Regulation 14 consultation document. • There is some conflict between some of the Design Code and Wealden's adopted Local Plan as outlined in our detailed comments		
West Sussex County Council	Have no comments to make on the draft plan.		

Ms L Wight	The Neighbourhood Plan addresses the primary needs and concerns of residents of Wadhurst Parish expressed by callers to Carillon Cottage, ie level and type of development, problems with infrastructure (mainly health and water), and severe traffic problems. The consultee supports the stated aims of maintaining the conservation area and also that of maintaining the distinctive and rural nature of the hamlets which form part of the wider Wadhurst Parish. Policy WAD 7 does not give enough weight to the significant issues on the B2100 rural road which runs through the hamlets of Cousley Wood, Pell Green, Primmers Green and into Sparrows Green. There is heavy domestic traffic throughout the day and especially at peak times, increasing use of the roads by large commercial vehicles and a problem of speeding vehicles particularly at night. This is threatening the rural nature of these areas. The plan implies that the use of this road is especially problematic when traffic is trying to divert from issues on the A21, but it is in fact a problem at any time. In particular many large commercial vehicles (including double-decker buses, heavy construction traffic, and excessively large delivery lorries) are choosing to use this road as their regular route to places other than Wadhurst, despite it being too narrow in places to accommodate the width of these vehicles. This has a detrimental effect not only on the rural nature of the hamlets, but especially on road safety for both pedestrians (who need to cross the road multiple times to keep to pavements) and those entering and leaving the properties along this route. Acknowledges that some of the measures needed to address this are outside of the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan but supports the recommendations in Section 7.10.		X

	The consultee suggests that the volume, speed and character of the traffic along the B2100 (and not merely at its junction with other roads in the parish) should be part of the considerations in Policy WAD8. If congestion is eased in the High Street the measures employed must not have the consequence of encouraging a higher volume of through traffic. Therefore, any steps taken to address traffic issues in the centre of the village should integrate with, and not have a consequential negative impact on, the traffic on the surrounding routes and the hamlets along them, especially the B2100 and that this should be made explicit in the Plan.		
Withyham Parish Council	The Consultation was noted with interest, however as it would have little effect on the Parish the committee did not feel the need to respond.		
Mrs B Wood	Asks to stop building houses on greenfield sites and states that no more houses are needed in the area. The consultee states that the area is already grid locked with roads, schools, doctors.		X
Mr S Wood	Policy 3 (Design Development and Character) is well intentioned but the Local Authority lacks teeth to put local character and opinion above development pressure e.g. the Waters Reach development. The Local Authority has allowed the developer to treat the local community with contempt. Please campaign for greater powers for local people in this regard.		X
Mrs J Wrobel	The consultee is currently running a petition to force scrutiny of SE Water by the regulator Ofcom and questions whether repairs are being carried out properly and investment is sufficient to upgrade and extend the infrastructure in our county in order to support the rate of new development that we have been committed to by central Government. Is		X

	there consideration of this issue in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan and if not, there certainly should be.		