



## **ANNEX 2: SITE ASSESSMENT DOCUMENT**

**TO THE SALEHURST AND ROBERTSBRIDGE NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**2016-2028**

**PLAN SUBMISSION : Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012**

December 2016

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>1.0</b>	Introduction	<b>[2]</b>
<b>2.0</b>	Call for sites process	<b>[3]</b>
<b>3.0</b>	Public consultation on housing sites	<b>[6]</b>
<b>4.0</b>	Site scoring analysis	<b>[8]</b>
<b>5.0</b>	Housing policies	<b>[11]</b>
<b>6.0</b>	Conclusion	<b>[12]</b>
	Schedule 1	<b>[13]</b>
	Schedule 2	<b>[19]</b>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.0.1 Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like and what infrastructure should be provided, and grant planning permission for the new buildings they want to see go ahead. Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community where the ambition of the neighbourhood is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider local area. (Planning Practice Guidance).
- 1.0.2 A Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) should support the strategic development needs set out in the relevant Local Plan/ Core Strategy and plan positively to support local development (as outlined in paragraph 16 of the National Planning Policy Framework).
- 1.0.3 An NDP must address the development and use of land. This is because if successful at examination and referendum the Plan will become part of the statutory Development Plan once it has been made (brought into legal force) by the local planning authority. Applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the Development Plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise (see section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004).
- 1.0.4 Rother District Council requires the parish of Salehurst and Robertsbridge to allocate housing for a minimum of 155 units throughout the Plan period. The Steering Group started the process with a review of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA), followed by a local call for sites, and then presentations from all those interested in proposing sites. A public exhibition was subsequently held so that the community could view all the sites which came forward, speak to land owners/developers, as well as have the opportunity to make their own comments. This was later followed up by a full questionnaire distributed to every household in the parish, concerning amongst other matters a comprehensive series of questions on housing site choices. The sites were objectively assessed by the Steering Group using a selection of site criteria which then informed a selection of preferred sites or site options for a public consultation which was held on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2016.
- 1.0.5 The site assessment scoring has been carried out using standard planning criteria to identify the sites with potential for housing. This is not to be confused with the SEA process. The SEA report is a high level document that looks at the environmental impact of the NDP, so the site assessment work is used to inform the extent of the SEA report. The SEA should be viewed separately but concludes that the sites allocated are largely neutral with some positive impact.
- 1.0.6 The section on site assessment analysis seeks to explain why the sites have been given their respective scoring. It also rationalises all the information known for the various sites which influenced the final sites for inclusion in the Plan.

## 2.0 CALL FOR SITES

2.0.1 Housing allocation is a key component of the plan and the group started this process with a local call for sites.

2.0.2 The 'Call for Sites' is an early opportunity for individuals and organisations to suggest sites within Salehurst and Robertsbridge for development. The site suggestions received were used to inform the preparation of the allocations for public consultation. The call for sites exercise did not in itself determine whether a site should be allocated for development.

2.0.3 The group published a call for sites in March 2015 and those interested (potential owner or developer) were invited to present their proposals to the group and this was done over a series of evenings and facilitated by Moles Consultancy as an independent moderator. The summary of this exercise is included in this chapter.

### 2.0.4 OUTCOME

The findings of the presentation events and those representations emailed to us, are summarised in the table below. The proforma used to record the information is included in Schedule 2 and the individual reports on presentations made by developers can be seen on the website under **Reports on presentations made by developers** <http://www.robertsbridgeneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/resources.asp>

This work has been independently and impartially facilitated by Moles Consultancy. The aim was to engage with owners and developers to understand their aspirations for particular sites. This exercise is a key part of assessing land availability which is suitable, available and achievable for housing and economic development uses over the plan period. It is important to note that these discussions are not binding and any commercial sensitivity will be treated as agreed with the parties.

This does not represent the final outcome of consultation with developers/land owners and there were further opportunities to ratify inconsistent information gathered through this exercise and ensure all potential sites that could come forward have been identified.


Site ID	Summary of site	Analysis overview
Country craft / market site	Detailed planning application was sought in 2008 for 9 flats and ground floor office plus 17 parking spaces and 3 shared ownership dwellings. They had been given a grant by Rother to make it viable but never got to the point of being able to develop the scheme. After various delays they repaid the grant plus interest in March last year. The new proposal looks to provide 7 units.	The developer is probably not intending to wait for the SRNDP due to the proposals being further advanced. Site capacity and parking standards are key issues.
Pound Platt (track that leads to but not the house- Part of SHLAA RB14)	½ an acre of land being promoted to produce 6 starter home.	Right of way discussions with adjoining owner who is also interested in developing their site, needs to be undertaken. Flood risk mitigation is key for delivery. The site has access constraints which will need to be resolved as part of its viability assessment.
Mill Site (SHLAA RB9a)	The SHLAA focuses attention towards commercial uses, but allows limited residential development. The site has been vacant for many years. AONB location.	The developer has not spoken to neighbouring property owners regarding the proposal. Further discussion required regarding a footpath linking the development to the village. Little references made to the heritage assets. The indicative layout seems to seriously compromise the setting of the assets, especially the main mill building. Further thought required with regards to the layout and siting of the properties, the design/appearance of the properties and the way that they interact. The layout appears to pay

		<p>little attention to the listed buildings, which should be the stars of the show. At the moment, the properties are located too close to the listed buildings.</p> <p>Further detail should be provided as to the materials proposed.</p> <p>Areas of flood zone 2 and 3 along southern and western sections of the site pose a constraint on the development. Environmental enhancement and mitigation measures to be investigated.</p>
Grove Farm – Land adjacent to Grove Farm and South East of Salehurst C E Primary School (SHLAA RB2, RB5, RB4, RB7a, RB7r and RB3).	<p>Large site which benefits from close proximity to the built up area.</p> <p>Phase 1: 35 units (site in the 2006 LP application this year)</p> <p>Phase 2: 67 units (through SRNDP)</p>	<p>There was uncertainty regarding the potential to accommodate a medical facility.</p> <p>Much more work is required regarding the listed barn. The only real reference was to the cost required to restore it (£500,000). Little or no interest has been taken in what could be a valuable asset for the development.</p> <p>The design of the properties presented has the potential to appear rather ‘generic’ so a design more fitting with the village will need to be developed.</p> <p>Heritage requires further thought. Not only in respect of how the barn will be developed and used, but also the impact of the development on the setting of the asset.</p> <p>Greater certainty is also required with regard to the potential GP surgery as well as the parking and design of the properties.</p> <p>Green space buffer to A21 is necessary to mitigate landscape impact. Landscaping is therefore a key element. Traffic management and surface water flooding and drainage needs to be mitigated.</p>
Robertsbridge Working Man’s Club	<p>The club building is a 100 year old wooden structure and is home of the local football team and other clubs for the village.</p> <p>The site is larger than needed to continue its functions. These could continue in a new building at this site, or on an alternative site, close to the village centre.</p>	<p>The club is very early in the process of considering how to treat the site. However, the works are an attempt to improve the facilities offered to the village. It is hoped that the proposal will be part of a scheme to save the club.</p> <p>The club wants to provide a sustainable village asset.</p> <p>The short-term aim is to increase the membership of the club as well as bookings for the venue.</p> <p>The medium-term aim is to redevelop the site and/or find an alternative site from which to trade. However, a suitable alternative site would be tricky to find in such a good location.</p> <p>Access and parking issues are key to the development of such a site.</p>
Bishops Lane site (Devine Homes)	<p>3.1 ha. Two sites divided by a hedgerow. 2 acres being promoted for developing with the additional land for landscaping/buffer owned by the owner.</p> <p>Approximately 40-50 units being proposed.</p>	<p>The site has a planning history – it was rejected in 2005 plan as sufficient land was identified. Detailed information was submitted to the council.</p> <p>The SHLAA rejected the site on landscape grounds. However, the developer questions this. As a consequence, has commissioned an independent assessment.</p> <p>The site is accessible/sustainable from the centre /train station .....</p> <p>Access from Bishops Lane. The principal of access has been established following correspondence with ESCC.</p> <p>Potential increased cycle and pedestrian access.</p> <p>The footpath diversion could be problematic as it was suggested that the local people would want it to stay where it currently is. The developer argued that the gift is to provide a more picturesque approach.</p> <p>A highways consultant is probably needed as part as the deliverability assessment of this site.</p>
Slides Farm	<p>Only part of the land in their ownership is promoted for development.</p> <p>1.3 ha for consideration.</p> <p>Additional 1.5 acres for additional housing or green areas. 45 houses based on 30 houses per hectare plus an additional 15% of which 40% is affordable.</p>	<p>Farming restriction lifted on the property in 2003.</p> <p>Can be affordable, although it is not know if this would be viable.</p> <p>The landowners would consider linking with other plots of land.</p> <p>Transport: open up North Bridge Street to enable traffic to travel through it. Potential north bound access</p> <p>Existing green trees and hedges would be retained.</p> <p>The development would only be visible from a few properties.</p> <p>The landowner stated that they would look at the contours of the land to identify the most suitable part of the site and this would be a good exercise to undertake as well as considering the site boundary.</p>

		There have been no discussions with neighbouring landowners and this is needed especially to resolve potential access issues.
Mountfield(SHLAA RB13west)	2 acres are promoted for development with additional land for landscaping.	SHLAA identified site. The promoted site adjoins a neighbouring SHLAA site, which is not considered as favorably. Access issues were raised by the committee: the Heathfield Gardens access is from a cul-de-sac which is believed to be highways land. The promoter believes that access would be easier from Georges Hill via RB13 east land. However, it is considered that highways would not like this approach. The landowner of RB13 east has indicated willingness to work with this promoter. The promoter would be willing to appoint a highways consultant if the site is seen to be favourable.
Land West of Johns Cross Road <b>(response emailed)</b>	Land is situated West of John's Cross Road, from the houses to the south of Heathfield Gardens and extends south to Browns Farm and West to the land owned by the Mountfield Court Estate. The SHLAA has referenced 'RB13east' that sits on part of the land.	Response emailed from the land owner and quantum unknown at the moment. Possible access issues to be resolved. Landscape impact assessment will be a key issue.
Land at Northbridge Street <b>(response emailed)</b>	The site is identified in the SHLAA as part of a larger area, along with land to the north and north east, see RB14.	The access is narrow and as such additional land may need to be acquired in order to bring this up to standard. The site is not within the Flood zone, although part of the existing access is. The site is slightly sloping with the land higher than some neighboring sites. Landscaping measures could however be introduced to mitigate impact on surrounding sites. The boundaries are generally marked by mature trees and shrubs, creating a natural boundary and screening. The site is small scale and as such there would be limited impact on local facilities however S106 contributions would be discussed at a later stage. At least some of the housing would be for starter homes, or small units for independent elderly members of the population, providing a community benefit as this form of housing is currently in short supply.

3.0 PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON HOUSING SITES

- 3.0.1 A further community engagement was held, where the group invited expressions of interest from all known developers or owners to be present at an exhibition on 4<sup>th</sup> July 2015. This was an opportunity for everyone from the parish to look at the proposals and for them to fill in a preliminary comment sheet. These comments were used to form part of the evidence base along with the questionnaire referred to earlier. The template of the comment sheet used can be seen in Schedule 3.
- 3.0.2 Twelve potential sites were exhibited and visitors had the opportunity to record their personal views about the potential of each site for required future building in the Parish. 185 responses were received by the closing date, recording views as to which sites could be considered for development, giving reasons why (or why not). The graph below shows the percentage of positive replies to the question “Is this site worth further investigation?”.



**1. The Mill, Countrycrafts, Heathfield Gardens (West) and North of Northbridge Street (adjacent to the Mill Site).**

The Countrycrafts site had a previous (now lapsed) planning permission and it has long been accepted that building will go ahead here. Discounting this site, therefore, the most favoured new sites are at the north and south ends of the village. The Mill site has long been seen as a waste of a brownfield space, considered an eyesore, and 80 people specifically noted that it is their preferred site for development. Heathfield Gardens West is a newly available possibility, but also had considerable support.

**2. Heathfield Gardens (East), Grove Farm (Phase 1) and Slides Farm.**

Sites adjacent to the two preferred new sites: North of Northbridge Street adjacent to the Mill, and Heathfield Gardens East had middling support. A factor may be the plans for the primary sites were thought to be extensive enough.

Phase 1 of Grove Farm also had middling support, along with Slides Farm. These are both greenfield sites. The use of greenfield sites was a concern with many developments. This was a factor with Slides Farm, coupled with concern about how it would connect to the village for pedestrians and to the A21 for drivers.

Grove Farm (Phase 1) next to George Hill is known as likely to be accepted for development, and people seemed to assume building would proceed there, mainly identifying preferences for the range of homes and the feel of the village once the development is in place. The primary concerns were how the development would increase congestion on George Hill; access to the site; parking problems and also the potential of adding to surface water running down into the village.

**3. South of Pound Platt, Vicarage Lane, Grove Farm (Phase 2) and Bishops Lane.**

The remaining five sites were favoured by less than half of the respondents. Robertsbridge Club and Vicarage Land are both in the centre, and although thought useful for the GP and dentist's surgeries, small developments for supported living or local first time buyers, there was considerable concern about access, about parking, and about any new building needing to blend in with the ancient centre of the village. Phase 2 of George Hill is greenfield again, and although there were suggestions for mitigating potential problems by sensitive design and provision of community areas, there were still concerns about access, including to the A21, and additional pressure on George Hill.

Support for the site south of Pound Platt was partly because of it being owned by a local person and also because it would be a small development adjacent to existing houses. However, there were greenfield, access and traffic issues again, outside the development boundary, and potentially hazardous for pedestrians.

Support for the Bishops Lane site included its design and the way development would facilitate public access to the footpath and communal space. There were issues relating to the use of greenspace and the spoiled open views, but mainly recognition that access via Bishops Lane would exacerbate existing problems relating to both traffic and to pedestrians.



## 4.0 SITE SCORING ANALYSIS

- 4.0.1 Neighbourhood planning gives communities direct power to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and shape the development and growth of their local area. They are able to choose where they want new homes, shops and offices to be built, have their say on what those new buildings should look like.
- 4.0.2 Following the full questionnaire which was distributed to every household in the parish, (concerning amongst other matters a comprehensive series of questions on housing site choices) the next step was for the Steering Group to objectively assess the sites using the criteria listed below in Part 1. The assessment results was then used to inform the selection of a preferred site or sites options in Part 2 which formed the basis for further community consultation in February 2016.

### 4.0.3 Part 1: SITE ASSESSMENT SCORING PROCESS

Carrying out a site assessment will provide the evidence that the sites selected for allocation are the most appropriate, that they are in the most sustainable location, they are in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Rother Local Plan and that there is a good prospect that they will be developed.

The criteria list based upon conventional planning and local community lead criteria were considered in the site selection process. The same criteria and scoring method was used for each site to ensure consistency.

Questions 1-24 provide the information needed to support the site selection and to support the conclusions. These should be scored using the traffic light system: **green(suitable for development)**, **amber (possibly suitable)** or **red (not suitable)**. These criteria are based on good planning principles and site selection principles.

In concluding, each potential site was scored against these three key criteria (suitable, available and achievable). The scoring method in the conclusion is a YES (green) / NO (red)

NOTE: The site maps are not included in this document but can be found on the Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan web page as used in the exhibition in July 2015.

### Part 2: PREFERRED OPTIONS

All the gathered information and assessment results were collated and the preferred sites options selected. These are presented as a range of options and residents were consulted (February 2016) and asked to express a preference.

The site assessment document can be seen on the website under **Information from consultation day Saturday, February 27** <http://www.robertsbridgeneighbourhoodplan.org.uk/resources.asp>


- 4.0.4 The results were presented as a range of options so that the community were able to express a preference and that they understood why the preferred options were being proposed. The steering group then reviewed the comments and the site assessment and selected the sites to be included in the Plan.

## POST COMMUNITY CONSULTATION CONCLUSIONS

In concluding, each potential site is scored against these three key criteria (suitable, available and achievable). The scoring method in the conclusion is a **YES**(green) / **NO**(red)

Assessment conclusions	Mill site	Country Crafts	Heathfield Gardens (West)	North of Northbridge Street	Heathfield Gardens (East)	Grove Farm Phase 1	Slides Farm	South of Pound Platt	Vicarage Land	Bishops Lane	Robertsbridge Club	Grove Farm Phase 2
<b>Suitable</b> Is the site suitable for the type of development proposed? A site is considered to be suitable if there are no insurmountable physical or environmental factors which would restrict development. Whether or not a factor is insurmountable is a matter of judgement but often depends if it can be mitigated. Constraints which would rule out development include any potential negative impact on a national environmental designation such as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) or the site falling within the functional floodplain (Flood Zone 3a or 3b)	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO
<b>Available</b> Is the site available for development? A site is available if there is evidence that a landowner or developer is willing to sell or develop the site at a known point in the future, and within the plan period. Any legal or ownership issues should also be taken into account, such as multiple ownership.	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
<b>Achievable</b> Is the site economically viable? A site is considered 'achievable' when there is evidence that it is economically viable and there is a reasonable prospect that the particular type of development will be developed on the site at a particular point in time.	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES







## 5.0 HOUSING POLICIES

5.0.1 The Plan is pro-growth and supportive of the need to provide suitable housing for the village within the plan period. The housing allocation policy within the Plan is very reflective of this and extracts of this is found below as well as the housing spatial plan and requirement.

### 5.0.2 Policy HO1: Spatial Plan

The Plan designates a Development boundary as shown on the proposed new development boundary, Refer to ANNEX 1 to the Plan: Map 11.

Development proposals within the Development boundary will be permitted provided they comply with the provisions of relevant policies of the Plan and the Development Plan for RDC.

Development outside of the Development boundary will be considered to lie in the Countryside and will therefore only be permitted provided it complies with the provisions of other relevant policies in the Plan.

**This policy establishes the key spatial priority for the SRNDP. It sets the policy direction for all its other policies by steering new development into the established settlement in the parish, by continuing to exert strong control over development proposals elsewhere in the countryside areas of the parish.**

### 5.0.3 Policy HO2: Housing requirement

The housing requirement for Salehurst and Robertsbridge over the period 2011 to 2028 is 155 units as allocated by Rother District Council Core Strategy 2014.

The Neighbourhood Plan identifies the sites for housing development (policy HO3). In addition to these allocations, there is also housing that has been built ahead of the SRNDP or has obtained planning permission. Infill development will be considered acceptable within the built up area, subject to the provisions of Policy HO3 and other material planning considerations. Additional allocations will be made if the identified housing sites do not proceed and the SRNDP will be reviewed at least every 5 years to ensure deliverability of the allocations.

New housing development will be required to ensure that local infrastructure is provided and/or improved in relation to the size and scale of the development proposed. This requirement will apply to all infrastructure, and with particular attention to education provision, flood prevention (fluvial and surface water) and car parking/congestion in the village.

**The Plan seeks to provide and maintain a housing stock that supports sustainable, inclusive, communities and ensures appropriate growth for all in the parish and to work with RDC to positively plan for growth. The data given by RDC in July 2016 for housing in Robertsbridge is as follows:**

Core Strategy remaining local plan allocations	Core strategy potential new sites	Large site commitments 1/4/13 to 1/10/15	Balance of new sites to allocate in the DaSA	Anticipated capacity on preferred sites	DaSA	NPs
47	100	17	130	Neighbourhood Plan		130

### 5.0.4 Policy HO3: Site allocations

The Neighbourhood Plan expects the following sites to deliver the 130 units remaining from the 155 units as allocated in RDC Core strategy and therefore allocates the following sites for housing development:

- a) Mill Site (approximately 100 units)
- b) Heathfield Gardens (approximately 40 units)
- c) Vicarage Land (approximately 10 units)

(these are not listed in priority order and the phasing of the sites will be in agreement with the site owner and RDC)

as shown on the Proposals Map (Refer to ANNEX 1 to the Plan: Map 4) subject to the following criteria:

1. the provision of a range of house types and in accordance with Policy HO2 and Policy HO5 of this Plan;
2. the provision of an appropriate accessible green space within the site;
3. the provision of an appropriate access into the site and thereby ensuring the minimisation of additional traffic problems in the village and creating links by foot and cycle to the surrounding countryside;
4. the introduction of sympathetic landscaping **and**
5. the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which has been submitted by the applicant and approved in writing by Rother District Council.

This allocation is in addition to the housing that has already come forward in the plan period, 17 dwellings on the Culverwells site plus a further 6 completions.

The housing need was established by the housing numbers proposed for Salehurst and Robertsbridge by RDC in the Core Strategy. This was developed primarily as a result of RDC's assessment of the housing need for the parish, known as the Objectively Assessed (housing) Need (OAN). The potential sites were identified by including all sites in the RDC Strategic Housing Land Allocations Assessment 2013 (SHLAA), removing any such sites that were no longer available for development, having a local call for sites followed by developer/ landowner presentations. The choice of sites was guided by views expressed by the village in completed questionnaires (67% of households in the parish), the outcome of open days for all residents, call for sites including developer presentations, site assessment exercise, and the sustainability objectives. It is important to note that it is not compulsory for SRNDP to allocate specific housing sites but it welcomes the opportunity to work with RDC to positively plan for its housing need. It should be noted that below 5 units is below the threshold (6) to be considered as an allocation. ANNEX 2 includes the site assessment information.

## 6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.0.1 Rother District Council did a full SHLAA exercise in 2013 which identifies their selection and judgement of sites. The primary role of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is to identify sites with potential for housing development, assess their housing potential and estimate when they are likely to be developed.
- 6.0.2 The SHLAA is a useful evidence base document to use as a baseline but neighbourhood development plans will review these and also look at other sites which locally become available and build upon this prior to assessing all the reasonable alternatives as part of the site allocation.
- 6.0.3 It is important to note that the SHLAA offers a very broad assessment of the potential availability of land for housing and consequently the data was only be used as a starting point – further work was undertaken which looked at the deliverability of the sites in greater detail. After all the purpose of SHLAA is to demonstrate that housing targets contained in the Local Plan (Core Strategy) are achievable.
- 6.0.4 There are no hard and fast ways of choosing specific site allocations once you have determined that they are necessary, but the site selection process will have to be carried out in an open and transparent way, including consultation with the community and the production of a full evidence base to support and justify the conclusions reached. Inevitably, not all the shortlisted sites could be chosen so the sites had to be selected by identifying the most appropriate sites which could be taken forward to the next formal stage of the process following consultation with the community and other stakeholders.
- 6.0.5 The site assessment and selection process differs quite distinctly between that applied when producing a local plan to that employed in support of a neighbourhood plan. The main reason for this discrepancy is the additional requirement for neighbourhood plans to fully consult with and be endorsed by the community through a referendum. The purpose of this site selection process is to identify a range of sites that are available, deliverable and policy compliant and to apply a site selection process based upon conventional planning and local community lead criteria.
- 6.0.6 Based upon consultation with the residents of Salehurst and Robertsbridge, assessment of potential sites, the Strategic Environmental Assessment and other reasons set out in this document, the following sites have been allocated for homes in the SRNDP:
  - a) Mill Site (approximately 100 units)
  - b) Heathfield Gardens (approximately 40 units)
  - c) Vicarage Land (approximately 10 units)
- 6.0.7 The sites identified for development in the Plan are viable and achievable within a reasonable timescale and there has been significant work with the various landowners including certainty on suitability, availability and deliverability.

Schedule 1

YOUR HOUSING NEED

<b>Your present home is:</b> (Please mark <b>X</b>		<b>If you or a family member may need to move within the next 10 years, what type of home is needed?</b> (Please mark <b>X</b> all that apply)
	Owner occupied	
	Private rented	
	Housing association rented	
	Shared ownership	
	Conversion of/extension to existing building	
	Tied to employment	
	Flat/Maisonette	
	Residential Care	
	Smaller home for retirement	
Not yet available in the parish.	Warden assisted retirement home	

<b>Size of present home:</b> (Please mark x)		<b>Size of home you or a family member may need:</b> (Please mark x)
	1 bedroom	
	2 bedrooms	
	3 bedrooms	
	More than 3 bedrooms	

FUTURE NEEDS OF THE VILLAGE

Thinking about the future needs of the village generally, what type of homes do you think are most needed? Please tick up to five.

1 bed homes		Energy/Water efficient		Rented Housing Association (formerly Council Housing)	
2 bed homes		Flats/maisonettes		Private warden assisted retirement homes	
3 bed homes		Smaller retirement homes		Warden assisted retirement homes - Housing Association	
4+ bed homes		Residential care		Shared ownership	

Bungalows		Self-build		No opinion/don't know/moving out of the village	
-----------	--	------------	--	---	--

**SITE PREFERENCES**

The following sites have come forward for development. Please list your preferences, numbering them with number 1 for your most preferred, 2 for the next and so on. Please note, that some sites may not be acceptable after a site assessment has been done.

(List of sites with notes plus a map)

Our surgery is not fit for purpose and also the two dentists in the village need updated accommodation. We also need to provide employment facilities. Which would be your preferred site for these facilities. Only tick one site for each

	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	Site 4	Site 5	Site 6	Site 7	Site 8	Site 9	Site 10	Site 11	Site 12
doctors' surgery												
dentists' surgery												
employment												

**CAR PARKING IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

Car parking is an issue in the village. How far do you agree with the following?  
 1 Agree totally 2 Not sure 3 Disagree totally.

Any new development should provide extra unallocated parking bays within the development.	1 3	2
Each new home should have the same number of parking places as the number of bedrooms, up to three bedrooms. Garages do not count as parking spaces.	1	2 3

**DESIGN & APPEARANCE**

Good design of any new housing development is an important part of how the village will look. Which do you consider the most important?  
 1 highest importance and 3lowest importance. Please circle your choice.

Natural, locally relevant materials	1	2	3
Carefully considered contrast between the old and new.	1	2	3
Low energy use designed into homes.	1	2	3
Height fitting in with adjacent buildings and views from different directions.	1	2	3
Proportions to harmonise with existing buildings.	1	2	3
Well-considered views and access through developments.	1	2	3
Adequate soft landscaping and planting.	1	2	3
Shared green amenity spaces with developments.	1	2	3
Provision for growing food within developments.	1	2	3
Considered views of developments from the surrounding countryside.	1	2	3

Integrating developments with existing village, to prevent the add-on estate feel.	1	2	3
--	---	---	---

## LEISURE

What new or improved leisure facilities would you like to have in Robertsbridge?

1=Very important 3= Not necessary

	1	2	3
Improved & extended footpaths, bridle ways, cycle paths			
Off-road cycling track			
Skate park			
Multiuse court [tennis, basketball, football]			
Improved Recreation facilities (e.g. changing rooms, drainage, floodlights etc.)			
Venue for arts / community activities (plays, choirs, workshops etc.)			
Community woodland for use as fuel source/training in woodland industries			
Local museum			
Gym			
Swimming pool			

## INFRASTRUCTURE

Infrastructure means public and privately provided utilities and services such as roads, drainage and supply of water, gas, electricity, phone and broadband. These need to be maintained to a suitable standard to support the existing village and in some cases may need to be developed to support any additional housing. These questions are designed to find out existing residents' priorities for the neighbourhood plan.

Please note that the Parish Council has more control over some services than others, and any action by the Parish Council have cost implications. Roads and footpaths are the responsibility of East Sussex Council, flood management the responsibility of the Environment Agency, and gas, electricity, water etc. by private companies. The Parish Council has some influence, and can spend limited sums raised from the Parish precept on maintenance / improvements to certain aspects of infrastructure.

**What new or improved infrastructure would you like to see:**

**1 = High priority 3= Low Priority**

	1	2	3
Traffic & Parking (eg modified restrictions, payment scheme, extra car parks)			
Pedestrian Safety (eg new & wider pavements, speed limit, crossings)			
Flood Defences (eg surface water drainage, reed beds, river channels)			
Footpaths & Bridleways (eg improved surfacing, extra paths, cycleway)			
Communications (eg mobile coverage, broadband speed )			
Electric , Gas & Water Supply (eg electric reliability, gas availability, water quality)			

Rye Town Council employ a Town Steward who for example, clears gullies, overgrown footpaths, weed control, removal of dog mess from public places, cleaning signs, temporary repair of pot holes, etc.

**Would you be prepared to pay approximately 17 pence extra a week to pay for a village steward for our Parish?** Please circle **YES** **NO**



ESCC will not review the effectiveness of parking provision or the yellow lines in the village unless the Parish Council pays for a review. The cost of this is approximately £???.

Would you be prepared to pay approximately £?? pence a week, for one year to pay for a parking review? Please circle. YES NO

Pedestrian Safety: The following suggestions are to make the centre of the village safer. Which do you agree with?

	Agree	Disagree	Don't know
Speed limit of 20 mph Station Rd, High St, George Hill, and the Clappers with active signage throughout.			
Yellow lines at the top of Station Rd opposite Judges			
Creating new pavements, in Station Rd.			
Moving the loading bay to outside the Seven Stars.			
Widening pavements in critical areas, eg outside Belle Flowers.			
Resurface roads in the centre with natural brown anti-skid surface.			
Restore and repair the brick pavements in the High St.			
Introduce one-way up/down the High Street.			

ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT  
Do you work/are you employed?

- No
- Yes

If YES, are you:

- Full time
- Part time
- Employed
- Self employed

What type of industry?

- Tourism
- Catering
- Business Services
- Manufacturing
- Retail
- Land-based (eg. forestry; agriculture; horticulture; equine enterprise)
- Other: please identify.....

Where is your work based:

- Within Robertsbridge
- Outside Robertsbridge

What type of premises do you use:

- Home-based
- Office
- Workshop
- Studio

- Retail outlet
- Other: please identify.....

**If you plan to change premises, will it be:**

- Within five years
- 5 – 10 years
- 
- **Would the new premises be:**
- Smaller
- Bigger
- Same size -

**Would the new workplace be:**

- Within Robertsbridge
- Outside Robertsbridge

**Would you move to new premises if they were available in the village?**

- Yes
- No

**If YES what size of premises would you or your employer require? Please indicate                      space required: ..... sq metres**

**If you work outside the Parish, how far do you travel?**

- Less than 5 miles
- 5 – 10 miles
- More than 10 miles

**Do you travel to work?**

- By foot
- Cycle
- Vehicle
- Bus
- Train

**Do you plan to start up your own business?**

- Yes
- No

**If YES:**

- Within 5 years
- Within 10 years
- Within the Parish
- Outside the Parish.

**Do you use the local shops and businesses in and around the Parish?**

- Yes
- No

**If YES , on what basis?**

- Daily
- 4 – 6 times a week

- 1 – 3 times a week
- Irregularly.

**If NO is it because of:**

- Pricing
- Not enough choice of products
- Parking or getting access?

## ENVIRONMENT

**Rate the following in terms of how important each is:**

	Very important	Not important	Don't know
Use of renewable energy to generate power			
Surface & ground water management			
Community open spaces/village pond/community woodland			
Access to countryside: footpaths, bridleways			

## Schedule 2

### Proforma for developer presentations

Salehurst & Robertsbridge Neighbourhood Development Plan  
**Site Presentations to the NDP Steering Group**  
Independent moderator: Donna Moles (Moles Consultancy)  
@ The Youth Centre, George Hill, Robertsbridge  
June 2015

#### Worksheet

**Developer/Owner:**

**Land/site name:**



[molesconsultancy.co.uk](http://molesconsultancy.co.uk)

m:07764943805

t:01243820437

Possible issues	Key indicators	Notes
Are you landowner and/or developer?	Ownership	
Are there multiple ownerships?	Boundary	
Is the site identified in the SHLAA?	Evidence/location	
Is the entire site being developed as part of one proposal?	Site capacity	
How many units are being proposed?	Scale of development	
What will the housing mix entail?	Conformity with Rother CS	
What are the infrastructure requirements for the development?	Infrastructure	
What are the physical constraints? (e.g. access, contamination, steep slopes, flooding, natural features of significance, location of infrastructure / utilities, heritage/conservation)	Site constraints	

Are there any potential environmental constraints (heritage/conservation)?	Environmental constraints	
What are the energy saving measures being proposed?	Sustainability	
How is surface water run off addressed and mitigated?	Sustainability	
How is parking addressed and not impact on the rest of the village?	Impact	
What employment uses if any will this development provide?	Economic development	
What community facilities will this development provide?	Vison and objective/ Suitability	
Phasing of the sites will be desirable for periods 2018/24/27. Would timescales for this development be aligned to this phasing?	Deliverability/viability	
<b>Misc</b>		

Schedule 3  
Comment sheet used at sites consultation event



EXHIBITION OF  
SITES  
Youth Centre  
4 July 10am to 4pm

Please give your postcode:

TN32 .....

Circle your age range:

Under 30, 30-45, 46-60, 61- 70,

Our Neighbourhood Plan is required to identify sites for **155 homes** and for **employment** up to 2028. Owners and developers have nominated 12 sites. Some of these may not be suitable for a number of reasons, eg access, flooding risks. Please make your comments below.  
The Steering Group will take your comments into account, when writing a questionnaire for each household in the Parish to complete in the autumn.

Site	Comment	Worth further investigation
1 Slides Farm		YES/NO
2 Beeden’s land Note: access over third party land.		YES/NO
3 Mill Site Note: brownfield expected to provide some employment.		YES/NO

<b>3a Land to the north east of the Mill Site</b> Note: only possible access through the Mill Site		YES/NO
<b>4 Mission room and vicarage site</b> Note: part brownfield site.		YES/NO
<b>5 Grove Farm 1</b> Note: Allocated for at least 30 homes in the last Local Plan. Developers, Croudace already presented a plan for 37 homes at a public exhibition.		YES/NO
<b>6 Grove Farm 2</b>		YES/NO
<b>7 Robertsbridge Club</b> Note: brownfield site		YES/NO
<b>8 Country Crafts</b>		Not applicable

Note: Brownfield site. The developers, Westridge, have plans for 7 homes on this site. As this is within the development boundary of the village, the site is already acceptable for development.		
<b>9 Bishops Lane</b> Note: Flood plain covers half the site.		YES/NO
<b>10 Rear of Heathfield Gardens (west)</b>		YES/NO
<b>11 Rear of Heathfield Gardens (east)</b>		YES/NO
<b>Rear of Culverwells</b> Note: This already has planning permission for 17 dwellings and 1,300 sqm of employment space.		Not applicable
<b>Other Sites?</b>		

Please hand in your comments before you leave, otherwise drop them off in the Parish Council letterbox at the front of the Youth Centre.



**THANK YOU!**