

Comments

Event: Regulation 18 Draft Local Plan

Submission: DLP683

Agent Name: Chalvington With Ripe Parish Council

Consultee Organisation: Chalvington With Ripe Parish council

Consultation point: Question 3 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-16

a. Do you agree with this draft policy SS2 Provision of Homes?

Yes

b1. Should we change anything?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

Paragraph 4.36- The Parish Council agrees that those settlements with more services and facilities, public transport and accessibility are more sustainable for development, and that Chalvington and Ripe should be categorised as a Type 6 Settlement (Residential settlement) in the draft Settlement Hierarchy because of these factors.

Page 71- Distribution of housing growth- Table 5 -Chalvington with Ripe has received a disproportionate allocation of housing growth as a Type 6 (Residential Settlement), with Committed Dwellings 142, and a Windfall dwellings allowance: 12, totalling 154, In comparison with other Type 6 Residential Settlements and even Type 5 Neighborhood Settlement. Chalvington with Ripe is targeted well above its weight in terms of new dwellings, either built or permissioned. We would like to see the windfall dwellings allowance of 12 reduced.

c. Have we missed anything? If so, what have we missed and how should it be included?

Page 71- Distribution of housing growth- Table 5 -Chalvington with Ripe has received a disproportionate allocation of housing growth as a Type 6 (Residential Settlement), with Committed Dwellings 142, and a Windfall dwellings allowance: 12, totalling 154, In comparison with other Type 6 Residential Settlements and even Type 5 Neighborhood Settlement. Chalvington with Ripe is targeted well above its weight in terms of new dwellings, either built or permissioned. We would like to see the windfall dwellings allowance of 12 reduced.

Consultation point: Question 76 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-15

a. Do you agree with draft Policy EC4 Rural Economy?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council supports the draft policy, and wishes to see the encouragement of small businesses to include the provision of 'wework' type space for sole traders in the service sector or small service businesses to have office space.

Consultation point: Question 30 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-14

a. Do you agree with draft Policy NE9 Agricultural Land?

Yes

b1. Should we change anything?

No

b2. What should we change and why?

With a moderate likelihood of a large part of the parish consisting of best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV), the Parish Council agrees with the importance of protecting farmland, and supports the draft policy.

c. Have we missed anything? If so, what have we missed and how should it be included?

With a moderate likelihood of a large part of the parish consisting of best and most versatile agricultural land (BMV), the Parish Council agrees with the importance of protecting farmland, and supports the draft policy.

Consultation point: Question 37 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-13

b1. Should we change anything?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council would like the draft policy HE2 on energy efficiency changed. With the phasing out of oil boilers, and the encouragement by Government for the use of heat pumps, solar panels, and for energy efficiency, the Council wants the last sentence of paragraph 7 amended to give 'significant weight' to the importance of energy efficiency improvements when weighed against the significance of the asset and/or its setting, or any features of special architectural /heritage interest that may be impacted.

Consultation point: Question 18 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-12

b. Subject to the Council's renewable energy study, would you support the identification of areas within the district for locating solar farms?

Please explain your answer.

The Parish Council broadly supports the proposed policy, subject to the draft policy being amended so as to ensure that when considering any impact on the local environment of a proposal, significant weight is given to the cumulative adverse impact on the local environment of any other solar farms and networks that have been given planning permission or have been built out, in the locality of the proposal site. In our area, we are of the opinion that there is a saturation of solar farms, which is damaging to the character and quality of the Low Weald landscape in our area.

c2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council broadly supports the proposed policy, subject to the draft policy being amended so as to ensure that when considering any impact on the local environment of a proposal, significant weight is given to the cumulative adverse impact on the local environment of any other solar farms and networks that have been given planning permission or have been built out, in the locality of the proposal site. In our area, we are of the opinion that there is a saturation of solar farms, which is damaging to the character and quality of the Low Weald landscape in our area.

Consultation point: Question 86 Do you have any comments on the Interim Sustainability Appraisal?

Comment number: DLP683-11

Please use this box if you have any comments on the Sustainability Appraisal.

Initial Sustainability Appraisal- Appendix A11d -SHELAA Ref:345/3230 SITE: Follengers Field, Church Lane, Ripe

The Parish Council agrees that 'The site is rejected for allocation because development here would have a significant adverse effect on the established settlement character of Ripe, the surrounding listed buildings and the Ripe conservation area. Additionally, the poor public transport services for Ripe will require the use of private motor vehicles to access services and facilities due to the limited availability of these within the village.'

However, the Parish Council disagrees with the statement that ' . However, development along the frontage part of the site along Church Lane may be suitable as sufficient scope exists to mitigate any impact development would have on the wider landscape.'

In the Summary of the Appraisal, it states that 'No significant effects are also likely against SO19 as although Uckfield is classed as a sustainable settlement in the settlement hierarchy as it is a larger centre, the site is a considerable distance from the facilities town centre and the only way to travel from the site is either via private motor vehicle or public buses. Additionally, the health services and facilities within Uckfield, mean that the clinical area working at 86% of existing capacity and therefore development of the site would have no significant effect against SO15. ' This is patently incorrect Chalvington & Ripe is classed in the draft Local Plan as a Type 6 settlement (residential settlement), one with few or no

facilities and services, and where further development would be unsustainable. There are no health service facilities in Chalvington & Ripe.

The Parish Council is of the view that if there is development along the frontage of the site, then Church Lane will appear like an urban development, with houses on both sides of the road. Most importantly the open space that is so valued by the community for its amenity value will be lost, along with the long distance views across ground gently rising towards the High Weald. and the historic character of the village will be harmed. Follengers Field, where it joins Church Lane, is now in the Ripe Conservation area because it is an important open space and because of evidence of Roman agriculture - centuriation. Any development of this open green space will go against the principle of preserving and enhancing the character of the conservation area.

Consultation point: Question 2 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-10

a. Do you agree with draft policy SS1 Spatial Strategy?

Yes

b. Is there an alternative strategy that we should be considering through this Local Plan? If so, please set out what the alternative strategy should contain and why.

The Parish Council supports the need for the proposed development boundaries to ensure that development comes forward in the most sustainable locations, and to protect the character and identity of our settlements, our valued landscapes, countryside and open spaces, and agricultural services. And that land outside of the defined development boundaries be considered countryside where countryside policies will apply, and development will only be permitted in a restricted set of circumstances in accordance with the policies of the local plan and the wider development plan.

Consultation point: Question 1 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-9

a. Do you agree with our overall vision for the district?

Yes

b. Do you agree with our 'mini' visions for the district?

Yes

c. Do you agree with the objectives for the district?

Yes

d1. Should we change anything?

Yes

Consultation point: Question 38 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-8

a. Do you agree with draft policy HE3 Conservation Areas?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council agrees with the draft policy HE3 Conservation Areas.

Consultation point: Question 55 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-7

a. Do you agree with draft Policy HO14 Rural Workers Accommodation?

Yes

b. Do you agree that where a rural occupancy condition is removed, that a new planning condition/planning obligation should be in place to require the dwelling to remain as affordable housing in perpetuity? Please explain your answer.

The Parish Council agrees with the draft policy

c1. Should we change anything?

No

Consultation point: Question 34 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-6

a. Do you agree with draft Policy NE13 Water Environment and Water Infrastructure?

Yes

b1. Should we change anything?

No

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council agrees with the draft policy.

Consultation point: Question 56 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-5

a. Do you agree with draft Policy HO15 Conversion of Rural Buildings to a Residential Use?

Yes

b. Do you agree that the conversion of agricultural buildings should first consider business and tourism uses first before residential development? Please explain your answer.

The Parish Council agrees with the draft policy

Consultation point: Question 61 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-4

a. Do you agree with draft Policy INF1: Infrastructure provision, delivery, and funding?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council are broadly supportive of the draft policy but believe that there is a mismatch between the proposed housing development in the southern part of the district, and the funding of necessary improvements to infrastructure to support such development. The A27 between Lewes and Polegate, and the A22 between Hailsham and Uckfield are congested. The A22 is not part of the Strategic Road Network and therefore does not attract significant funding. There are no immediate plans to improve the highway capacity of the A27. The congestion on both roads is getting worse, this is particularly so the A22. This is leading to 'rat runs' during the ever extending peak hours, and when there is an accident through the adjoining villages, and is an increasing problem in Ripe and Chalvington.

Consultation point: Question 36 Consultation Questions

Comment number: DLP683-3

a. Do you agree with draft policy HE1: The Conservation, Protection and Enhancement of the Historic Environment?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council supports the draft policy and the importance of protecting the historic environment when this is affected by any development proposals.

Consultation point: Question 31 Consultation Questions**Comment number: DLP683-2****a. Do you agree with draft Policy NE10 Light Pollution and Dark Skies policy?**

Yes

b1. Should we change anything?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council broadly supports the policy in respect of dark skies. There are no street lights in Chalvington and Ripe. However, the draft policy should be amended so that significant weight is given to the need for natural light in a property, provided that suitable measures are put in place to minimise for any light escape at night, and reflectivity during daylight hours.

Consultation point: Question 60 Consultation Questions**Comment number: DLP683-1****a. Do you agree with draft Policy HO19 Extensions to Residential Gardens?**

Yes

b1. Should we change anything?

Yes

b2. What should we change and why?

The Parish Council would like to know the circumstances when the discretion to remove permitted development rights would be applied.