

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

This document contains all the responses made during the six-week consultation period on the submission version of the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan. The responses replicated here are verbatim and have not been corrected or altered in any way. NB: notes in *red italics* have been entered by the Borough Council as an explanatory aid.

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name or Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
<a href="#">HANDP_1</a>	Lucy Howells	I support this NDP for Hawkhurst.
TWBC Response		Comments and support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_2</a>	Karen Latham	I have reviewed the modified plan which in my opinion forms a sound framework for future developments in the village.
TWBC Response		Comments and support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_3</a>	Forestry Commission	<p><b>Neighbourhood Plans and ancient woodland – Forestry Commission approach</b></p> <p>The Forestry Commission is not in a position to input into the consultation process for Neighbourhood Plans. However, the information below is provided to assist you in assessing the appropriateness of sites for future development, and to highlight opportunities for achieving your renewable energy obligations.</p> <p><b>A summary of Government policy on ancient woodland</b></p> <p><a href="#">Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006</a> (published October 2006).</p> <p><b>Section 40</b> – “Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity”.</p> <p><a href="#">National Planning Policy Framework</a> (published March 2012).</p> <p><b>Paragraph 118</b> – “planning permission should be refused for development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats, including ancient woodland and the loss of aged or veteran trees found outside ancient woodland, unless the need for, and benefits of, the development in that location clearly outweigh the loss”.</p> <p><a href="#">National Planning Practice Guidance</a> – Natural Environment Guidance. (Published March 2014)</p> <p>This Guidance supports the implementation and interpretation of the National Planning Policy Framework. This section outlines the Forestry Commission’s role as a <b>non-statutory consultee</b> on “development proposals that contain or are likely to affect Ancient Semi-Natural woodlands or Plantations on Ancient Woodlands Sites (PAWS) (as defined and recorded in <a href="#">Natural England’s Ancient Woodland inventory</a>),</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p><i>including proposals where any part of the development site is within 500 metres of an ancient semi-natural woodland or ancient replanted woodland, and where the development would involve erecting new buildings, or extending the footprint of existing buildings”</i></p> <p>It notes that <b>ancient woodland is an irreplaceable habitat</b>, and that, in planning decisions, <b>Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS) should be treated equally in terms of the protection afforded to ancient woodland in the National Planning Policy Framework</b>. It highlights the Ancient Woodland Inventory as a way to find out if a woodland is ancient.</p> <p><a href="#">Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland and Veteran Trees</a>. (Published April 2014)</p> <p>The Forestry Commission has prepared joint <a href="#">standing advice</a> with Natural England on ancient woodland and veteran trees which we refer you to in the first instance. This advice is a material consideration for planning decisions across England. It explains the definition of ancient woodland, its importance, ways to identify it and the policies that relevant to it. It also provides advice on how to protect ancient woodland when dealing with planning applications that may affect ancient woodland. It also considers ancient wood-pasture and veteran trees.</p> <p>The Standing Advice website will provide you with links to <a href="#">Natural England’s Ancient Woodland Inventory</a>, <b>assessment guides</b> and other tools to assist you in assessing potential impacts. The assessment guides sets out a series of questions to help planners assess the impact of the proposed development on the ancient woodland. <b>Case Decisions</b> demonstrates how certain previous planning decisions have taken planning policy into account when considering the impact of proposed developments on ancient woodland. These documents can be found on our <a href="#">website</a>.</p> <p><a href="#">The UK Forestry Standard</a> (3rd edition published November 2011).</p> <p><b>Page 24</b> “Areas of woodland are material considerations in the planning process and may be protected in local authority Area Plans. These plans pay particular attention to woods listed on the Ancient Woodland Inventory and areas identified as Sites of Local Nature Conservation Importance SLNCIs).</p> <p><a href="#">Keepers of Time</a> – A Statement of Policy for England’s Ancient and Native Woodland (published June 2005).</p> <p><b>Page 10</b> “The existing area of ancient woodland should be maintained and there should be a net increase in the area of native woodland”.</p> <p><a href="#">Natural Environment White Paper “The Natural Choice”</a> (published June 2011)</p> <p><b>Paragraph 2.53</b> - This has a “renewed commitment to conserving and restoring ancient woodlands”.</p> <p><b>Paragraph 2.56</b> – “The Government is committed to providing appropriate protection to ancient woodlands and to more restoration of</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>plantations on ancient woodland sites”.</p> <p><a href="#">Biodiversity 2020: a strategy for England’s wildlife and ecosystem services</a> (published August 2011).</p> <p><b>Paragraph 2.16</b> - Further commitments to protect ancient woodland and to continue restoration of Plantations on Ancient Woodland Sites (PAWS).</p> <p>Renewable &amp; low carbon energy</p> <p>The resilience of existing and new woodland is a key theme of the Forestry Commission’s work to Protect, Improve and Expand woodland in England we will continue to work with Forestry / Woodland owners, agents, contractors and other Stakeholders to highlight and identify, pests and diseases and to work in partnership to enable Woodlands and Forests are resilient to the impacts of Climate Change.</p> <p>Woodfuel and timber supplies continues to be an opportunity for local market growth whilst also enabling woodlands to be brought back into active management.</p> <p>Flood risk</p> <p>The planting of new riparian and floodplain woodland, can help to reduce diffuse pollution, protect river morphology, moderate stream temperature and aid flood risk management, as well as meet Biodiversity Action Plan targets for the restoration and expansion of wet woodland.</p> <p>The Forestry Commission is keen to work in partnership with Woodland / Forest Stakeholders to develop opportunities for woodland creation to deliver these objectives highlighted above.</p> <p>In the wider planning context the Forestry Commission encourages neighbourhood planning groups to consider <a href="#">the role of trees in delivering planning objectives</a> as part of a wider integrated landscape approach. For instance through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the inclusion of <a href="#">green infrastructure</a> (including <a href="#">trees and woodland</a>) in and around new development; and</li> <li>• the use of locally sourced wood in construction and as a sustainable, <a href="#">carbon lean fuel</a>.</li> </ul>
TWBC Response		Comments noted. Relevant at implementation stage and in consideration of planning applications.
<a href="#">HANDP_4</a>	Alison Ede	As a resident of Hawkhurst I have reviewed the plan and while I support the need for further housing I object to large scale developments of 10 plus houses as the infrastructure cannot cope

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name or Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_5</a>	Southern Water	<p>Thank you for your email below inviting Southern Water to comment on the modified Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan. We are pleased to note that our representations have been addressed with regard to Policy LP3 Designated Green Spaces. Additionally, whilst we would prefer to see support made explicit for the provision of utility infrastructure across all levels of plan making, we concede to the Examiner's comments in paragraph 4.101 of her report dated January 2017 in relation to our request for a new policy in this regard.</p> <p>I confirm Southern Water therefore have no comments to make with respect to this consultation, and look forward to receiving notification of the Plan's adoption in due course.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_6</a>	Robin Crowther	I approve of the NDP, but do not believe a circulatory system at the Highgate crossroads would improve congestion. HGV's would not be able to circulate - cutting straight across from Highgate Hill to Cranbrook Rd causing worse conditions than now. I wish I had a simple solution but fear the only answer is to provide a by-pass from the A21 to Cranbrook.
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_7</a>	ANNE MCNAUGHTON	<p>I have reviewed the NDP for Hawkhurst. I fully support this very comprehensive NDP. Housing developments of more than 10 houses should be avoided as this would lead to additional congestion. The emphasis on smaller developments will allow the village to meet its housing development goals without changing its character.</p> <p>AM1 - the replacement of traffic lights with a dual roundabout circulatory system is an interesting idea, but I believe it would be essential to incorporate restricted and safe crossing areas for the elderly and children.</p> <p>CM2/3 - All Saints Church has been left abandoned for nearly 30 years. A specific plan should be urgently developed to use this site as suggested as a community hub/hall or it is ideally located for the proposed new medical centre, which needs to be in the heart of the village with easy access for all.</p> <p>General - Parking. This issue was not specifically addressed and should be included as part of the future plans. It is a major issue for the village as many of the older houses do not have space for off road parking.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_8</a>	Keith Lagden	<p>Having read through the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) in detail there is much within it that we agree to wholeheartedly.</p> <p>There are however one or two points we would like to make and especially as they relate to future large scale developments.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Hawkhurst is already seen as a very pleasant place to live and it is vital that this feeling is preserved at all costs moving forward. We completely agree that any developments should be small and in keeping with the local surroundings. The idea however of large scale developments being allowed in exceptional circumstances puts the whole ethos of the village at risk.</p> <p>Indeed Sect 2.9 states the following:-</p> <p>“Hawkhurst has evolved with single or small groups of houses in mixed yet complimentary styles. More recent additions of larger groups of properties are not considered to blend effectively with the existing built area.”</p> <p>We already have a large development in Circus Field which will bring another 60+ households into the discussion. There was considerable resistance from local residents, however the developers continued to push and eventually the development was approved, against the wishes of residents. It is interesting to note that subsequent to obtaining approval the developers have applied for various changes to try to reduce costs and avoid following the original plans.</p> <p>This type of underhand action must be avoided. The best way to ensure such things do not reoccur is to strenuously refuse plans for large scale development. The only way we will maintain the village feel is to ensure no more large scale developments are approved.</p> <p>Turning now to Section 10. Spaces that contribute to local landscape character. It is sad to note that no reference has been made in this section of the largest green space within the village – Hawkhurst Golf Club. Whilst we accept that this is in private ownership it should surely be noted that this is a major benefit to the local community providing recreational facilities as well as wonderful areas of woodland for the local birds and mammals.</p> <p>Indeed section 3.22 states the following: - “The green spaces listed below and shown on the map on page 27 have been identified as making a contribution to local landscape character. The characteristics of each space are described as being a combination of beauty, acting as a green edge to a particular development, having historic qualities, used for recreational purposes, offering a tranquil environment and/or acting as a wildlife habitat.”</p> <p>Whilst not listed on the map the Golf Course land would fit this description exactly. It is obviously used for recreation but importantly it offers an ideal habitat for many different forms of wildlife. The diversity of birdlife in the area is huge ranging from small finches and tits through wrens, robins, dunnocks, blackbirds, thrush’s moving up to sparrow hawks, Greater Spotted and Green Woodpeckers. The list goes on. We also have seen evidence of hedgehogs and dormice – all in all many and varied species who live and thrive within this oasis of green space.</p> <p>The NP Vision Statement states the following:- “This plan aims to encourage change within manageable limits to retain and strengthen Hawkhurst’s distinct history and character.”</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Large scale developments will in <u>no way</u> do this.</p> <p>Turning now to another comment we would just like to correct an inaccuracy. Section 7.3 refers to Springfield Industrial Estate. It mentions an application for 9 properties, however currently there is an application in for 24 properties and this is only for phase 1. We accept that this is as a result of the first application having been withdrawn and now being replaced by the second application but felt we should bring this to your attention.</p> <p>In conclusion whilst we support the NP in general we would like to see stronger protection from sprawling urban development of sites in excess of 9 properties for the reasons detailed above.</p>
TWBC Response		Support for Plan noted. Comments noted. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. It does not provide for an embargo on major development but reflects the policy tests and considerations set out in national planning policy.
<a href="#">HANDP_9</a>	Highways England	<p>Thank you for consulting Highways England regarding the above seeking a response no later than 5pm 04 September.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and as such Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity.</p> <p>Highways England will be concerned with plans or proposals that have the potential to impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN), in this case particularly the A21.</p> <p>Having assessed the modified document and taken in to account any other material considerations we have no comments on the plan.</p> <p>However, it should be noted that we will still wish to be consulted on any applications that could impact on the safety or operation of the SRN.</p> <p>Should you have any queries regarding our response please contact us.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_10</a>	David Burgess	<p>There is no need for any more large scale private housing in Hawkhurst.</p> <p>There is a need for a small council estate.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		Unfortunately a completely unnecessary Tesco store was built where the housing should have been.
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_11</a>	Rydon Homes Ltd	<p><b>Policy HD1(a).</b></p> <p>The Examiner, at para 4.10 of her Report, identifies that "Hawkhurst is one of three small rural towns in Tunbridge Wells Borough that have a good range of services. The Core Strategy and Site Allocations Local Plan demonstrate that the village is capable of accommodating a modest level of development averaging a little over 20 dwellings per annum with allocations on a small number of sites between 12 and 40 dwellings". The Submission Plan recognises that the housing requirement to 2033 will be determined by TWBC through the emerging Local Plan taking account of the policies of the NP. It is quite clear that Policy HD1(a) is designed to restrict the scope for Hawkhurst to contribute to any significant future housing need identified through the emerging Local Plan, despite its position in the settlement hierarchy.</p> <p>The prescriptive nature of this policy is contrary to the NPPF para 50 which establishes the requirement "To deliver a wide choice of high quality homes, widen opportunities for home ownership and create sustainable, inclusive and mixed communities". In addition it is contrary to NPPF para 111 which establishes the requirement for the effective use of land within built up areas. The limitation to infill development within the LDB of only 5 units is not evidenced based and entirely arbitrary. Para 4.14 of the Examiner's Report states "that blanket policies restricting housing developments should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence." The justification for the policy does not provide any evidence at all for the limitations proposed in the modified policy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Delete Policy HD1 (a).</b></p> <p><b>Policy HD (b).</b></p> <p>Similarly, this policy is completely geared to restricting future large scale development around Hawkhurst. The policy itself is not positively worded. The wording of the heading "Exceptions..." and the wording that "...houses will ONLY (my emphasis) be supported..." illustrate this point. As such the policy is not consistent with the NPPF which requires all plans to be positively prepared.</p> <p>The policy is really unnecessary given para 116 of the NPPF. However, if it is felt necessary then the policy should be reworded to reflect the NPPF wording.</p> <p><b>Recommendation: Delete policy HD1(b); or</b></p> <p><b>Delete ' Exceptions for' from the heading to the policy and delete 'ONLY' from the wording of the policy.</b></p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted. It is not agreed that Policy HD1(a) has the effect suggested. It expresses a preference for brownfield and small sites and in that way reflects national planning policy particularly with regard to development in AONB. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. It does not provide for an embargo on major development

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name or Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
		but reflects the policy tests and considerations set out in national planning policy. No further changes are considered necessary.
<a href="#">HANDP_12</a>	Jan Woodworth	<p>Section AM2 of the plan does not consider road safety for pedestrians crossing the A268 to access facilities on either side of this busy road.</p> <p>The current pedestrian crossing at the Highgate crossroads is the only safe means of crossing this busy road at the present time.</p> <p>A further crossing at an appropriate location taking consideration of the facilities on offer (doctors, church, post office, shops, schools etc) and users (in particular schoolchildren and the elderly) would enable safer access to facilities.</p> <p>This could be addressed as a part of the suggested junction and footpaths changes and upgrades.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_13</a>	Paula Kirk	I would like to add my support for the Hawkhurst NDP. I believe it will help enhance and preserve Hawkhurst and the surrounding area with particular emphasis on the need for small sustainable developments and protection of the environment.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_14</a>	Natural England	<p>Thank you for your consultation on the above dated 21st July 2017.</p> <p>Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development.</p> <p>Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning and must be consulted on draft neighbourhood development plans by the Parish/Town Councils or Neighbourhood Forums where they consider our interests would be affected by the proposals made.</p> <p>Natural England does not have any specific comments on this neighbourhood plan.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_15</a>	Ruth & Norman McChesney	We completely support this excellent NDP (revised). In particular, we totally agree with Policies HD1(a) and HD1(b) in Section 7 - Housing & Design. We support development in our wonderful village, but in a way this is planned to take account of our local situation and needs and provides sufficient infrastructure to support extra people.
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_16</a>	Norma V Cox (Mrs)	<i>[This comment was blank. Name and contact details were entered and the box stating that respondent wished to be kept informed of future stages was ticked]</i>



**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name or Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
<a href="#">HANDP_17</a>	Morar Ballenden	My main concern is the major tailback of traffic, already blighting progress, through Hawkhurst. This will be much worse after new builds, though, the proposed roundels will probably help.* Also there is no parking, apart from the 1 1/2 hours, for the two supermarkets.  * I hope!
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_18</a>	Mrs Sue Firth	I agree with Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2033.  Submission Plan July 2017.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_19</a>	Sheri Bowditch	I agree with the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan as issued in July '17 by Hawkhurst Parish Council.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_20</a>	Michael Alder	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Page 42: Will the Limits of Built Development be extended?</li> <li>2. Page 52: Will the plan of views be protected?</li> <li>3. Page 65: New medical centre. Can the Council seek support from the NHS for new medical centre.</li> </ol>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_21</a>	Maggie Alcock	We are in total support of the Hawkhurst neighbourhood plan July 2017. Whereby the village grows in response to the villages wishes, and previous plans, exceeded previous new house numbers by 29%.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_22</a>	Anne Wheelhouse	Overall a very good plan with appropriate re-actions.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_23</a>	B Kilgallon	I agree with the preference for small scale developments but question if this could be worded more forcefully.  Larger scale development by exception could also be strengthened by being more specific in respect of the criteria 2(1) to 2(iv).

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Both should be subject to the overriding concerns of the village in respect of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic volume</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion around the traffic lights at Highgate</li> <li>3. Lack of car parking in the centre of the village</li> </ol> <p>Any further development will only make these even worse and the situation is already intolerable.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. Future applications for development will be considered on individual merit having regard to the criteria set out in the policy.
<a href="#">HANDP_24</a>	Jane & Bryan Hurt	<p>Both HD1(a) and HD1(b) should state what the exceptional circumstances are that Hawkhurst would consider. Specific and robust.</p> <p>i.e. there should be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• no high rise</li> <li>• no additional pollution due to traffic caused by development</li> <li>• no development beyond current existing limits of built development</li> </ul> <p>* Development should not have a right to be consulted.</p> <p>* All materials used should be in keeping in design of Wealden traditional properties i.e. white weatherboarding.</p> <p>*Planning conditions (relating to infrastructure) to be enforced prior to development commencing</p> <p>* Any developers are to fund and maintain traffic calming measures</p> <p>* We must state we are a village &amp; not accept T. Wells terminology that Hawkhurst is a town. Our NDP should make it clear we are a village.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_25</a>	Ivor Metcalf	I hope the need of our village & villagers are at the front of all future planning in Hawkhurst.
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_26</a>	Keith John Brown JP	Some of the changes the Inspector proposed are not beneficial to the community.

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Certainly the roundabouts to replace the traffic lights I consider essential.</p> <p>Considerable concern that the medical services will disappear from the community without a new provision.</p> <p>The local plan and the neighbourhood plan must take into consideration the provision of main services.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_27</a>	Jackie Collins	<p>I am encouraged to see the Neighbourhood Plan 2016-2033. It represents how I would prefer to see the community develop over time. I am particularly pleased to see the importance of a rural community, with footpaths &amp; views of the countryside, highlighted. The development of Circus Field was an awful shock, to almost everyone I know, and this kind of developer-led growth is completely unacceptable particularly in a rural community, so the plan is a breath of fresh air.</p> <p>Small developments led by the needs of the community are the only acceptable developments to maintain the character of the village. I love the idea of re-instating the village square and the double roundabout.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_28</a>	Dido Robson	<p>I find the needs of the Neighbourhood Plan reflect my needs.</p> <p>I'd like the roundabout to replace the traffic lights.</p> <p>I'm very against these blanket developments of large estates which will just add to the problems of traffic and over stress the infrastructure - we need organic houses to keep the ambience of the village.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_29</a>	Julia Newman	<p>I am delighted to see policy HD1 is retained - it is so important to maintain the rate of growth already proven to be successful in Hawkhurst. Groups of 5-10ish dwellings is, on an annual basis, just what the village can sustain. This has been proven across history and during the period of the previous Local Plan.</p> <p>The style and character of village housing is also important to maintain and the Design guidance on p46-49 reflects this well.</p> <p>Overall, a great development plan for Hawkhurst but no nasty "clumps" of 'production line' housing please.</p> <p>A beautiful village, full of character and history, that needs to be protected and enabled to grow organically.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
<a href="#">HANDP_30</a>	John Davis	<p>7.1 The statement that Hawkhurst NHP 'expresses clear preference for smaller-scale development' is vitally important.</p> <p>The large scale development on Circus Field Highgate Hill of 62 properties shows every sign of urbanisation in a village that does not have sufficient infrastructure nor satisfactory main roads.</p> <p>Housing allocations of 10 or 15 is the level of growth the village should be able to grow with satisfactorily.</p> <p>But already Highgate shopping centre has insufficient parking, driving customers elsewhere.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted
<a href="#">HANDP_31</a>	Cassandra Hissey	<p>I have lived in the village for 10 years and would like to see the existing limits for built development stay in place.</p> <p>Retaining agricultural land is particularly important to me and many of my neighbours and is the reason why we moved from Tunbridge Wells to Hawkhurst in the first place.</p> <p>I fully support the building of bungalow properties and affordable housing in the centre of the village.</p> <p>I would hate to see over-development because the village centre cannot sustain it.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_32</a>	Joy Austen	<p>I support the changes in the modified document and feel that it is looking at helping Hawkhurst to grow more organically allowing it to remain a <u>village</u>.</p> <p>I agree that development should be restricted to 5-10 dwellings for each site which may encourage local builders rather than large developers and should help the village to gradually grown. Brownfield sites should always be used in favour of greenfield sites.</p> <p>I hope that this document will go to examination and be accepted at referendum.</p>
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_33</a>	Muriel Wilson	<p>I support the modified document as present 23rd August 2017.</p> <p>The document has evolved with huge import from the local community and is as democratic and far-reaching to the varied needs of residents as possible.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Infrastructure will not allow for continuous development of any scale of development unless the Borough Council invests in the villages.</p> <p>It would be better for the community if greenfield development was totally avoided. This is a rural village where countryside values are espoused. The land around Hawkhurst is agriculturally among the best.</p>
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_34</a>	Penelope Goodare	<p>I agree with preserving the AONB and SSSI. Anything to keep the rural and beautiful character of the village and local walks.</p> <p>7.3 Evidently the houses already built in the village have fulfilled the requirements for new housing.</p> <p>The point 'HD1(a)' 'Any greenfield housing site ...' - I'd prefer it if there were no greenfield housing sites but keeping them small is better than nothing. '<u>All</u> development proposals should comply ...'. Yes.</p> <p>Policy AM4 Walking and Cycling ... as a cyclist and pedestrian I would love to see any improvement or ANYTHING to encourage more cycling, which would help people to keep fit as well as reducing the number of cars.</p> <p>Appendix O2 Crossroads: would support the roundabout plan if it does not disrupt the local business too much while the change is made - as long as it is carried out quickly.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_35</a>	Chris Austen	I fully support the NDP document as displayed today. I feel it is appropriate for a village the size of Hawkhurst, and hope that it can be an influence on the scale and type of development that occurs in the future.
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_36</a>	JULIA NEWMAN	<p>Paragraph 184 of the NPPF states that “Neighbourhood planning provides a powerful set of tools for local people to ensure that they get the right types of development for their community.” Hawkhurst’s NDP is doing precisely that and I fully support it having been involved in the long and thorough local consultation process.</p> <p>The village of Hawkhurst has evolved in “clumps” of similar buildings through history. A large number of “production line houses” such as produced by some house builders, looks out of place and a sense of place is important to us, that is why most people live here. “Large” is defined by Tunbridge Wells planners as “more than 10” for the village of Hawkhurst.</p> <p>The NDP comments that local builders are an important part of the local economy and we need to support them as stated by the government</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>white paper "Fixing our broken housing market". They understand the local style, feel and character. I fully support this in the NDP.</p> <p>Hawkhurst is acknowledged to be a village and not a town in the TWBC Site Allocations document 2016. An error the 2017 "Settlement Role and Function Study" is misleading regarding the position of Hawkhurst and it is to be hoped that TWBC will correct this error in their evidence document; it has been pointed out to them.</p> <p>The NDP makes it clear that Hawkhurst has demonstrated over the last many years that the village residents are not against growth and it is further demonstrated that we can sustainably accommodate steady, incremental growth without detriment to the inherent character of the village. The evidence is on the ground and embedded in our history. The village seeks not to stop but to influence development to ensure the objectives of sustainable development are met as set out in the NPPF. The NDP is our "tool" to exert this influence.</p> <p>Traffic growth, especially HGVs, has now "broken" our road structure and the central crossroads are clogged up most of the day. People have started avoiding the village which will damage the economy. Both the KCC and TWBC need to publically acknowledge that further development is unsustainable until this issue is resolved.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP 37</a>	Mr Barry Lees	<p>Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Development Plan</p> <p>Hawkhurst Village has evolved slowly over centuries, has always moved along with the times and continues to contribute to increasing housing requirements.</p> <p>The numbers speak for themselves in that compared to the 2006 to 2026 requirement of 240 homes we already surpass this number by over 37% or 90 homes.</p> <p>It is imperative that future housing development is sustainable and supported by a workable infrastructure. Hawkhurst is clearly stretched at present in terms of medical facilities, banking, schools and car parking. The village crossroads are already constantly gridlocked resulting in wasted time, wasted fuel and more importantly excessive pollution.</p> <p>Hawkhurst Parish Council have done a good job on the Plan which is consistent with wishes of most of local residents. We wholeheartedly agree with it's main thrust which would allow only small developments to be built and these should be located close to the Village centre. This would also comply with the requirement to meet the 800metre walking distance guideline as set out in Policy HD1(a) and would curtail traffic movements in the case of such developments.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Name or Organisation</b>	<b>Response</b>
<a href="#">HANDP_38</a>	G J & G M Tomlinson	We are in full agreement with all aspects of the Modified Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan - in particular with the restriction on building more than 10 dwellings on any potential development site around the village.
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_39</a>	L P Mansell	<p>Page 42 I strongly endorse the view that the existing limits to built development should be adhered to.</p> <p>7.17 I strongly endorse the view that new housing should be within 800 meters of Village facilities and that green field sites should only be used where there is no other alternative and should be limited to 5 to 10 houses only.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_40</a>	Derek Mansell	<p>I am strongly opposed to any change to the existing Limits to Built Development. Where building is permitted outside the LBD, then the provisions of Policy HD1(a)(3) should be applied rigorously - contiguous to the existing LBD and maximum 5-10 houses.</p> <p>I strongly support paragraph 7.17 - all new housing should be within 800m of facilities, taking into account the topography of the walking route.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_41</a>	David Brown	<p>There is much in the Hawkhurst Dev.Plan that I approve but I have some areas of concern.</p> <p>The identity of Hawkhurst as a village should be preserved and any attempt to redefine Hawkhurst as a town resisted.</p> <p>Development should be in scale with surrounding buildings. The plan properly speaks of houses. Such buildings are in scale with current properties. I would like to see reference to "only houses." I am concerned that a developer will attempt to introduce higher rise buildings (Apartments). Such would be out of scale with current properties and inappropriate in a village.</p> <p>Parking is currently difficult, especially around Highgate. All new developments should include specific space for at least two off street parking spaces per house to provide for the likely minimum needs of occupants and prevent overspill into surrounding areas.</p> <p>New homes should be built to a high standard (whatever the size of the property) with a design that takes into account historic designs in the Weald (i.e. weatherboarding) and enhances the beauty of Hawkhurst.</p> <p>"Starter homes" should be for the use of the local community wherever possible.</p> <p>I note reference to greenways and paths, especially those that link the different parts of Hawkhurst but the photo shows a stile - stiles can be</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		difficult for elderly residents and there should be a desire to change stiles to gates to make them user friendly for everyone.
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_42</a>	M Jefferies	<p>I have reviewed the document and generally support the content</p> <p>Provision of a new medical centre for the village is essential as the current excellent facilities are vulnerable.</p> <p>Continue to protect the village and rural areas from invasive housing developments</p> <p>Monitor traffic congestion and restrict roadside parking</p>
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_43</a>	T W Rutherford	<p>Executive Summary:</p> <p>I do not believe the HPC Neighbourhood Plan - Submission Plan Jul 17 truly represents the feelings and reservations of the populus of Hawkhurst. It is written in language too dependent on legalise and planning jargon, which on closer scrutiny does not spell out the specific reservations or safeguards to further development. The submission needs to be more robust, written in plainer language and should specifically highlight criteria that should be met before the village accepts further development. The document needs to foremost represent the villagers' wishes and concerns as its driver, not serve as a document to curry favour with TWBC.</p> <p>Definitions &amp; Planning Assumptions:</p> <p>CP13 - Development in Hawkhurst. TWBC still refers to Hawkhurst as a small rural town. IT IS NOT. It is a village. But the HPC submission Jul 17 does not robustly refute this assumption. It asks for a change in vernacular - it does not stipulate that TWBC are incorrect in their classification of Hawkhurst. It must state so.</p> <p>Policy HD1(b) - The HPC Submission states that it wants to favour small scale developments and only in exceptional circumstances would it support projects of &gt;10 houses.</p> <p>a. The current housing increase to approx 240 additional homes is reached by a collection of developments far in excess of 10+ homes. There seems to be little appetite for smaller scale projects. I believe the HPC submission under subsections 7.18 &amp; 7.19 do not robustly or clearly state what criteria must be met which would satisfy an exception to be met.</p>



**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>b. I propose the criteria: Parking, traffic, school places, water and sewerage. medical and dental vacancies for the existing medical facilities all need to be addressed before any exceptions are granted for large scale developments (&gt; 10 houses).</p> <p>c. HPC concedes that each new home factors an extra 2.5 cars. They seem to draw no link between more homes and increased traffic - the HPC's Chairwoman's No.1 concern for the village.</p> <p>d. While Hawkhurst has 2 supermarkets, by Oct 17 it will have no banks, a sub-post office within a supermarket only, offering limited Post Office facilities, one primary school and soon to be only one doctors medical centre. By any definition of infrastructure, the existing facilities are already under strain. This needs to be clearly written into the submission. This is the villagers' document. I propose this clear language is incorporated and not camouflaged by legalistic &amp; planning jargon. It should be written for the villagers to reflect their views and not in language to ease conformity with TWBC's planners and policy makers.</p> <p>In its current form, I shall ask and campaign for a rejection when put to referendum.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. Future applications for development will be considered on individual merit having regard to the criteria set out in the policy.
<a href="#">HANDP_44</a>	Jeff Newman	<p>1. General: There is no point encouraging local people to shape and influence development if central government are going to over-ride in favour of large developers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• central government over-rode both the parish and the borough in the case of Circus Field</li> <li>• the examiner's report on the Neighbourhood Plan seeks to water down the Plan until it is just a fig-leaf to enable large developers to claim that whatever they choose to do has the support of the local population.</li> </ul> <p>Central government need to demonstrate clearly that they support local people, support local democracy and are not in the pocket of large developers.</p> <p>2. Housing and Design: Hawkhurst has existed since at least the Middle Bronze Age (i.e. in excess of 3,500 years) and yet within the last 10.5 years it has grown by over 10%, as can be seen from the figures provided in the Plan. This is not sustainable by any common-sense definition and the village is suffering stress accordingly. The rate of development should be aligned to the village's ability to absorb change, including the capacity of utilities, medical, education and transport services. In particular, Large Scale Development should be supported only where building is at a rate of no more than one third of the average annual outstanding net additional dwellings as required by the Tunbridge Wells Core Strategy.</p> <p>3. Housing and Design: Hawkhurst is not suitable as a dormitory village; adequate transport links are not available. The rail connection is</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>long gone and the nearest stations are several villages away (Staplehurst and Etchingham). The bus station has gone and the few remaining routes to major employment centres (e.g. Tunbridge Wells, Tonbridge, Maidstone and Hastings/St Leonards) are slow and inadequate. The crossroads at Highgate is a bottleneck at many times of the day, both in the week and at weekends. Building of new dwellings should be supported only where it does not exceed the growth in full-time, permanent jobs in the village.</p> <p>4. Housing and Design: Future housing demand projections for Kent assumed significant immigration. Following Brexit, this will reduce markedly. Conversely, Brexit and also global warming will mean that food security will increase in importance. For the duration of the Plan, development should only be supported where no agricultural land of any classification may be lost.</p> <p>5. Landscape and Environmental Protection: Where changes in agricultural use may have a significant impact on the landscape (e.g. solar farms, greenhouses), efforts should be made to minimise the impact e.g. contour-sensitive locations, screening with copses and hedging.</p> <p>6. Access and Movement: No development supporting the use of private motor vehicles (e.g. garaging, parking) will be supported until it can be demonstrated that there has been no traffic queue in Hawkhurst of more than 50 metres, for a period of more than three months.</p> <p>7. CM4: Employment is to be encouraged throughout the parish, provided that it meets all of the policies of the Plan. In the last 30 years, the southern, Moor part of the village has lost two schools, a dairy, a petrol station, a pub, all of the shops surrounding The Moor itself (at least four) and it looks as though it will be losing its surgery too (see CM3).</p> <p>8. Community Infrastructure: The digital economy continues to be increasingly important. Business of all sizes are encouraging mobile working and working from home. In our personal lives, we are increasingly using high-bandwidth services such as iPlayer and Netflix, and mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets are becoming increasingly powerful and pervasive. Throughout the Limits of Built Development, internet and mobile phone access should be to best current practice for village centres (e.g. in terms of service, service quality, bandwidth, coverage etc.), and at any other location in the parish it should be no more than three years behind best current practice.</p> <p>9. The examiner's report continues the falsehood that Hawkhurst is a town. This is not acceptable to Hawkhurst, as is well-known to, and documented and agreed by, TWBC. The examiner has clearly been provided with obsolete documents. This report is not valid until such times as all appropriate corrections have been made.</p> <p>10. Following any re-examination, should a watered down Plan fail referendum because it does not meet the requirements of the parish, we expect that the next release of the Local Plan will document the fact that a Neighbourhood Plan could not be agreed and why.</p> <p>11. The sections of the examiners report on HD1 and HD2 (paras 4.8 to 4.25) are so error-strewn and biased as to be offensive. They must be withdrawn and a written apology provided.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Errors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hawkhurst is not a town</li> <li>• the range of services is <u>not</u> considered good by villagers, particularly infrastructure</li> <li>• The Core Strategy calls for an additional 240 dwellings over a period of 20 years, that is an average of 12 per year and not 20</li> <li>• given that the village has already exceeded the requirements of the Core Strategy, there is no need to extend the Limits to Built Development</li> <li>• there <u>is</u> evidence of future housing need: the Housing Needs Analysis (updated in 2017) and the Core Strategy</li> <li>• the development size ranges are <u>not</u> arbitrary.</li> </ul> <p>Bias:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• criticising the need for careful phasing of new developments</li> <li>• favouring the representations of developers over the wishes of the parish, however ridiculous those representations are: HD1 is <u>not</u> highly restrictive; HD1 does <u>not</u> prohibit the delivery of affordable housing; favouring the use of local architects and building firms is <u>not</u> anti-competitive but good economic sense; there is no need to extend the Limits to Built Development</li> <li>• selectively criticising points that mitigate against uncontrolled or inappropriate development whilst not doing so for points where correction could reduce development</li> <li>• the purpose of HD2 is to provide Hawkhurst with the mix of housing that it needs, as opposed to whatever large developers think will make them the most money</li> <li>• these are not “blanket” restrictions, they are to assure that development is sustainable and in accordance with the vision and objectives</li> <li>• the report repeatedly calls for “robust evidence” (and yet the examiner didn’t ask for it at the time of the review) and yet repeatedly ignores basic numerical facts, and gives no evidence to justify opinions such as “that Policy HD1 would place restrictions on the delivery of sites that would otherwise be acceptable under CS Policy 1”</li> <li>• the examiner queries the percentage of one and two bedroom dwellings needed on the basis that the figures date back to 2009 (and it is well known that large developers prefer to build large properties), and yet does not challenge the volume of housing required by the Core Strategy even though this is earlier.</li> </ul> <p>12. Examiner’s report section 4.63 seeks to remove designation from verges and small green spaces. This is wrong; their loss due to e.g. road widening will change the character of the environment from rural to urban. Should any development damage or destroy any such green space then it must be replaced by by an area of at least the same size, supporting the same flora and fauna, and performing the same function as the original.</p> <p>Where a green space is protected elsewhere then for the benefit of the villagers it shall be listed in the Plan, along with the source of its</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>protection (as protections can change).</p> <p>Any area of ancient woodland not protected elsewhere must be designated as a green space; ancient woodland is irreplaceable. Any other area of woodland damaged or destroyed by development must be replaced by an area of at least the same size, with the same quantities, ratios etc of flora and fauna.</p> <p>13. For the avoidance of doubt, this Plan is not a Chinese menu; any development must comply with the Plan in its totality.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council has considered the Examiner's report and has decided to accept a majority of the recommendations and modifications as explained in the report to Cabinet and confirmed in the published Decision Statement. Some further revisions have been made and formed the basis of the Regulation 17A consultation. No further changes are considered necessary.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_45</a>	Jill Mackay	<p>I fully support the Parish Council in their responses to the modified document and in particular their refusal to accept the Inspector's suggestions as regards planning decisions affecting the village.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Support noted.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_46</a>	Mr R Phillips	<p>House building in TWBC area ..has proposed increase in number taken account of unoccupied dwellings or those in need of major refurbishment.</p> <p>Infrastructure - Hawkhurst (roads) junction of A229 and A268. Urgent need for traffic light phasing.</p> <p>Alteration of westbound A268 ... at very least a green filter light at Colonnade to enable more traffic from A268 to join northbound A229 (very often only two short vehicles can access northbound A229 &amp; A268 when normal traffic volume exists on eastbound A268) ... in many cases this is made worse when southbound A229 traffic wishes to joint A268 eastbound - further made worse by inconsiderate parking on Colonnade in close proximity to junction ... only a physical barrier from traffic lights to at least Park Farm butchers will prevent this. Deliveries should be forbidden during peak traffic flow times. Cameras and parking enforcement officers would be needed to enforce this.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_47</a>	Gladman Developments Ltd	<p>This letter provides Gladman Developments Ltd (Gladman) representations in response to the submission version of the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan (HNP) under Regulation 16 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012. Gladman requests to be added to the Council's consultation database and to be kept informed on the progress of the emerging neighbourhood plan. This letter seeks to highlight the issues with the plan as currently presented and its relationship with national and local planning policy.</p> <p><b>Legal Requirements</b></p> <p>Before a neighbourhood plan can proceed to referendum it must be tested against a set of basic conditions set out in paragraph 8(2) of</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Schedule 4b of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). The basic conditions that the HNP must meet are as follows:</p> <p><i>(a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the order.</i></p> <p><i>(d) The making of the order contributes to the achievement of sustainable development.</i></p> <p><i>(e) The making of the order is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area).</i></p> <p><i>(f) The making of the order does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with, EU obligations.</i></p> <p><b>National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) sets out the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. In doing so it sets out the requirements for the preparation of neighbourhood plans to be in conformity with the strategic priorities for the wider area and the role in which they play in delivering sustainable development to meet development needs.</p> <p>At the heart of the Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread through both plan-making and decision-taking. For plan-making this means that plan makers should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and Local Plans should meet objectively assessed needs, with sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change. This requirement is applicable to neighbourhood plans.</p> <p>The recent Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) updates make clear that neighbourhood plans should conform to national policy requirements and take account the latest and most up-to-date evidence of housing needs in order to assist the Council in delivering sustainable development, a neighbourhood plan basic condition.</p> <p>The application of the presumption in favour of sustainable development will have implications for how communities engage with neighbourhood planning. Paragraph 16 of the Framework makes clear that Qualifying Bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should develop plans that support strategic development needs set out in Local Plans, including policies for housing development and plan positively to support local development.</p> <p>Paragraph 17 further makes clear that neighbourhood plans should set out a clear and positive vision for the future of the area and policies contained in those plans should provide a practical framework within which decisions on planning applications can be made with a high degree of predictability and efficiency. Neighbourhood plans should seek to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>to deliver the homes, jobs and thriving local places that the country needs, whilst responding positively to the wider opportunities for growth.</p> <p>Paragraph 184 of the Framework makes clear that local planning authorities will need to clearly set out their strategic policies to ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. The Neighbourhood Plan should ensure that it is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider area and plan positively to support the delivery of sustainable growth opportunities.</p> <p><b>Planning Practice Guidance</b></p> <p>It is clear from the requirements of the Framework that neighbourhood plans should be prepared in conformity with the strategic requirements for the wider area as confirmed in an adopted development plan. The requirements of the Framework have now been supplemented by the publication of Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).</p> <p>On 11th February 2016, the Secretary of State (SoS) published a series of updates to the neighbourhood planning chapter of the PPG. In summary, these update a number of component parts of the evidence base that are required to support an emerging neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>On 19th May 2016, the Secretary of State published a further set of updates to the neighbourhood planning PPG. These updates provide further clarity on what measures a qualifying body should take to review the contents of a neighbourhood plan where the evidence base for the plan policy becomes less robust. As such it is considered that where a qualifying body intends to undertake a review of the neighbourhood plan, it should include a policy relating to this intention which includes a detailed explanation outlining the qualifying bodies anticipated timescales in this regard.</p> <p>Further, the PPG makes clear that neighbourhood plans should not contain policies restricting housing development in settlements or preventing other settlements from being expanded. It is with that in mind that Gladman has reservations regarding the HNP's ability to meet basic condition (a) and this will be discussed in greater detail throughout this response.</p> <p><b>Relationship to Local Plan</b></p> <p>Adopted Development Plan</p> <p>The current Development Plan relevant to the preparation of the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan consists of the Saved Policies of the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan 2006, the Core Strategy and associated Development Plan Documents.</p> <p><u>Emerging Local Plan</u></p> <p>The Council are currently working on a new Local Plan that will guide future development in the borough up to 2033. This plan is very much in its infancy, with Issues and Options consultation ending in June 2017, and so it is important that the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan is</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>flexible on housing site allocations and the plans stance on development outside of settlement boundaries. Failure to provide sufficient flexibility could lead to conflict with the emerging Local Plan, should any changes to settlement boundaries be proposed, as s38(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act states:</p> <p><i>'If to any extent a policy contained in a development plan for an area conflicts with another policy in the development plan the conflict must be resolved in favour of the policy which is contained in the last document to be adopted, approved or published (as the case may be).'</i></p> <p><b>Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the HNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination.</p> <p><b>Policy HD1(a) – Preference for Small-Scale Developments</b></p> <p>Policy HD1(a) states that small-scale infill developments will be supported and further states that any greenfield development proposals should be for a maximum of 10 dwellings.</p> <p>Gladman submit that Policy HD1(a) unnecessarily restricts the scale of development proposals coming forward to meet identified housing needs. Whilst accepting that smaller proposals may be appropriate in certain areas of Hawkhurst, given the sensitive location within the High Weald AONB, Gladman contend that some areas within and adjacent to the settlement could deliver housing and any restriction in terms of maximum development and housing size, should be removed.</p> <p>The PPG1 <a href="#">[1]</a> states that;</p> <p><i>“all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.”</i></p> <p>In line with this, there is no evidence to suggest why it is considered appropriate to limit development size within the NPA to no more than 10 dwellings on Greenfield sites. In restricting development to this maximum level the HNP is not conforming to the positive approach of the Framework and as such Gladman suggests this element of the policy is deleted.</p> <p><b>Policy HD4 – Design Quality</b></p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>This policy sets out the design principles that will be applied to residential development proposals in the Neighbourhood Plan Area.</p> <p>The Parish Council should ensure that the design principle adhered to are not overly onerous to render development unviable. The Framework is clear 'design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription or detail and should concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.' Plans should not contain such policies that would add financial burdens to a scheme which would render a scheme unviable. The objectives of the Framework are for good design whilst still enabling sustainable development to come forward viably.</p> <p><b>Policy LP1 – Views Between Village &amp; Countryside</b></p> <p>New development can often be located on the edge of built areas without resulting in the loss of openness, character or views considered to be important by the local community. Quite often the delivery of new sustainable development proposals can enhance existing landscape settings and provide new vistas and views to the surrounding area.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, Gladman raise concerns with this policy. The Plan as currently proposed provides no clarity on what would amount to a significant effect on the landscape and views of the area, we therefore have reservations over how this policy will be applied in a consistent manner through the development management process. Opinions on landscape and views are highly subjective, therefore, without further clarity, this policy will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process.</p> <p><b>Policy LP3 – Designated Green Spaces</b></p> <p>Policy LP3 seeks to allocate and protect land as Designated Green Spaces. The designation of land as Local Green Space (LGS) is a significant policy designation and effectively means that once designated, they provide protection that is comparable to that for Green Belt land. As such, the Parish Council should ensure that the proposed designations are capable of meeting the requirements of national policy.</p> <p>The Framework is explicit in stating at paragraph 77 that 'Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space'. With this in mind, it is imperative that the plan-makers can clearly demonstrate that the requirements for LGS designation are met. The designation of LGS should only be used:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the community it serves;</u></li> <li>• <u>Where the green area is 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</u></li> <li>• <u>Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.</u></li> </ul> <p>It appears that no evidence has been provided to support the proposed designations identified in this policy. As such, this brings into question whether all of the proposed designations are capable of meeting all three tests required by National Planning Policy. Gladman</p>



**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>recommend that the Parish Council take the time to investigate this matter and undertake the necessary evidence to support each designation.</p> <p><b>Conclusions</b></p> <p>Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. However, it is clear from national guidance that these must be consistent with national planning policy and the strategic requirements for the wider authority area. Through this consultation response, Gladman has sought to clarify the relation of the HNP as currently proposed with the requirements of national planning policy and the wider strategic policies for the wider area.</p> <p>Gladman is concerned that the plan in its current form does not comply with basic conditions (a) and (d). The plan does not conform with national policy and guidance and in its current form does not contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. Gladman formally request to participate at the hearing session(s) should the Examiner decide it necessary to discuss these issues in a public forum.</p> <p>Gladman hopes you have found these representations helpful and constructive. If you have any questions do not hesitate to contact me or one of the Gladman team.</p> <hr/> <p><a href="#">ii</a> PPG 001 Reference ID: 50-001-20160519</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Gladman was not a responder to the original consultation on the submitted Neighbourhood Plan and the comments now submitted seem to have overlooked that the Plan has been subject to Examination already with recommendations made and that subsequent revisions to the Plan were the subject of the most recent consultation in accord with Regulation 17A. It is the case therefore that certain content and policies have already been subject to examination and found to be acceptable.</p> <p>As regards revised Policy HD1 this is not a blanket policy in the way suggested. It expresses a preference for brownfield and small sites and in that way reflects national planning policy particularly with regard to development in AONB. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. It does not provide for an embargo on major development but reflects the policy tests and considerations set out in national planning policy. Individual development proposals and planning applications will continue to be assessed and determined on individual merit having regard to the status of development plan policies but also having regard to all material considerations which may include the justifications and circumstances advanced in a specific case.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to regular review providing the opportunity for updates and revision, subject to due process, to reflect preparation and progress of the borough Local Plan. No further changes are considered necessary.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>As regards Policy LP1 it is not considered this will likely lead to inconsistencies in the decision-making process as suggested. The policy is similar to many development management policies and has been revised to reflect the Examiner's comments and recommendations. Individual development proposals and planning applications will continue to be assessed and determined on individual merit having regard to all material considerations which may include the justifications and circumstances advanced in a specific case.</p> <p>As regards Policy LP3 the three identified areas are those that have been agreed by the Examiner. The approach to the other areas originally identified has been revised and these are now dealt with by other means, namely section 10 of the Plan.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP 48</a>	Mrs Frances Ann Vaughan	<p>I support Hawkhurst Parish Council's NDP document as put forward as a means to control future development in line with Hawkhurst residents' views.</p> <p>Hawkhurst is now so heavily affected by considerable traffic congestion that it would be foolish to add to this. There should be no further development until it is sorted out. The Borough Council has responsibility for solving our infrastructure problems, i.e. traffic, doctors and school places availability.</p>
TWBC Response		Support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP 49</a>	Sport England	<p>Thank you for consulting Sport England on the above named document. Please find herein our formal comments for your consideration.</p> <p>Sport England has an established role within the planning system which includes providing advice and guidance on all relevant areas of national, regional and local policy as well as supporting local authorities in developing the evidence base for sport.</p> <p>Sport England aims to ensure positive planning for sport, enabling the right facilities to be provided in the right places, based on robust and up-to-date assessments of need for all levels of sport and all sectors of the community. To achieve this our planning objectives are to seek to PROTECT sports facilities from loss as a result of redevelopment; to ENHANCE existing facilities through improving their quality, accessibility and management; and to PROVIDE new facilities that are fit for purpose to meet demands for participation now and in the future.</p> <p>We work with the planning system to achieve these aims and objectives, seeking to ensure that they are reflected in local planning policies, and applied in development management. Please see our website for more advice: <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/</a></p> <p>Our detailed comments are below:</p> <p><b>Policy CM1 – Sports provision</b></p> <p>Sport England is supportive of the aim to maintain and enhance existing sports facilities at the Moor. It would suggest that any new or</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>facilities should be built with Sport England guidance in mind <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/">http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/design-and-cost-guidance/</a> Sport England would also note that in order to comply with its policy any extension of the pavilion should be built to minimise loss of playing field and with consideration for existing playing pitches and the ability to rotate them.</p> <p><b>Policy AM4 – Walking and Cycling strategies</b></p> <p>Sport England is supportive of creating streets that encourage healthy active lifestyles for all ages. Sport England would encourage reference to its Active Design guidance, which goes far beyond sport and recreation and aims to build physical activity into everyday life.</p> <p>Sport England and Public Health England have recently refreshed our ‘Active Design’ guide which provides some really useful advice and case studies with clear reference to the NPPF to maximise the opportunities for design in physical activity. Sport England would commend this to you and suggest the concept of ‘Active Design’ be incorporated into policy – please see website extract and link below:</p> <p>We believe that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone’s daily life – and the design of where we live and work plays a vital role in keeping us active.</p> <p>Good design should contribute positively to making places better for people and create environments that make the active choice the easy choice for people and communities.</p> <p>That's why Sport England, in partnership with Public Health England, has produced the Active Design Guidance. This guidance builds on the original Active Design (2007) objectives of improving accessibility, enhancing amenity and increasing awareness, and sets out the Ten Principles of Active Design.</p> <p>The ten principles have been developed to inspire and inform the layout of cities, towns, villages, neighbourhoods, buildings, streets and open spaces, to promote sport and active lifestyles.</p> <p>The guide features an innovative set of guidelines to get more people moving through suitable design and layout. It includes a series of case studies setting out practical real-life examples of the principles in action to encourage planners, urban designers, developers and health professionals to create the right environment to help people get more active, more often.</p> <p>The Active Design Principles are aimed at contributing towards the Government’s desire for the planning system to promote healthy communities through good urban design.</p> <p>Active Design has been produced in partnership with David Lock Associates, specialists in town planning and urban design.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response																																																									
		<p><a href="https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/">https://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/active-design/</a></p> <p>Or watch our short video here <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mDaVBh1Bs7Y">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mDaVBh1Bs7Y</a></p> <p>Thank you once again for consulting Sport England.</p>																																																									
TWBC Response		Support and comments noted.																																																									
<a href="#">HANDP_50</a>	Cranbrook & Sissinghurst Parish Council	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="441 533 672 571">Policy</th> <th data-bbox="678 533 1205 571">Description</th> <th data-bbox="1211 533 2085 571">Commentary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="441 571 2085 609">Housing &amp; Design</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 609 672 667">HD1(a)</td> <td data-bbox="678 609 1205 667">Preference for Small scale developments</td> <td data-bbox="1211 609 2085 667">Supported. With the need for collaboration on sites that may adjoin CSPC, so as to maintain a distinct green gap between the settlements</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 667 672 762">HD1(b)</td> <td data-bbox="678 667 1205 762">Exceptions for Larger-Scale Developments</td> <td data-bbox="1211 667 2085 762">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 762 672 801">HD2</td> <td data-bbox="678 762 1205 801">Future Housing Mix</td> <td data-bbox="1211 762 2085 801">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 801 672 839">HD3</td> <td data-bbox="678 801 1205 839">Modern Living</td> <td data-bbox="1211 801 2085 839">Strongly supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 839 672 877">HD4</td> <td data-bbox="678 839 1205 877">Design Quality + Design Notes</td> <td data-bbox="1211 839 2085 877">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="441 877 2085 916">Landscape &amp; Environmental Protection</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 916 672 1011">LP1</td> <td data-bbox="678 916 1205 1011">Views Between Village &amp; Countryside</td> <td data-bbox="1211 916 2085 1011">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1011 672 1107">LP2</td> <td data-bbox="678 1011 1205 1107">Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1011 2085 1107">Strongly supported. With the need for collaboration on shared SSSI site Robin's Wood</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1107 672 1145">LP3</td> <td data-bbox="678 1107 1205 1145">Designated Green Spaces</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1107 2085 1145">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="441 1145 2085 1184">Access &amp; Movement</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1184 672 1222">AM1</td> <td data-bbox="678 1184 1205 1222">Highgate Hill Junction</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1184 2085 1222">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1222 672 1260">AM2</td> <td data-bbox="678 1222 1205 1260">Improve the Pedestrian Environment</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1222 2085 1260">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1260 672 1299">AM3</td> <td data-bbox="678 1260 1205 1299">Countryside Access</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1260 2085 1299">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1299 672 1353">AM4</td> <td data-bbox="678 1299 1205 1353">Walking &amp; Cycling Strategies</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1299 2085 1353">Supported. With need to collaborate on the extension of sustainable routes between the Parishes</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="3" data-bbox="441 1353 2085 1391">Community Infrastructure</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1391 672 1430">CM1</td> <td data-bbox="678 1391 1205 1430">Sports Provision</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1391 2085 1430">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="441 1430 672 1444">CM2</td> <td data-bbox="678 1430 1205 1444">New Community Hall</td> <td data-bbox="1211 1430 2085 1444">Supported</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Policy	Description	Commentary	Housing & Design			HD1(a)	Preference for Small scale developments	Supported. With the need for collaboration on sites that may adjoin CSPC, so as to maintain a distinct green gap between the settlements	HD1(b)	Exceptions for Larger-Scale Developments	Supported	HD2	Future Housing Mix	Supported	HD3	Modern Living	Strongly supported	HD4	Design Quality + Design Notes	Supported	Landscape & Environmental Protection			LP1	Views Between Village & Countryside	Supported	LP2	Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Strongly supported. With the need for collaboration on shared SSSI site Robin's Wood	LP3	Designated Green Spaces	Supported	Access & Movement			AM1	Highgate Hill Junction	Supported	AM2	Improve the Pedestrian Environment	Supported	AM3	Countryside Access	Supported	AM4	Walking & Cycling Strategies	Supported. With need to collaborate on the extension of sustainable routes between the Parishes	Community Infrastructure			CM1	Sports Provision	Supported	CM2	New Community Hall	Supported
Policy	Description	Commentary																																																									
Housing & Design																																																											
HD1(a)	Preference for Small scale developments	Supported. With the need for collaboration on sites that may adjoin CSPC, so as to maintain a distinct green gap between the settlements																																																									
HD1(b)	Exceptions for Larger-Scale Developments	Supported																																																									
HD2	Future Housing Mix	Supported																																																									
HD3	Modern Living	Strongly supported																																																									
HD4	Design Quality + Design Notes	Supported																																																									
Landscape & Environmental Protection																																																											
LP1	Views Between Village & Countryside	Supported																																																									
LP2	Area Of Outstanding Natural Beauty	Strongly supported. With the need for collaboration on shared SSSI site Robin's Wood																																																									
LP3	Designated Green Spaces	Supported																																																									
Access & Movement																																																											
AM1	Highgate Hill Junction	Supported																																																									
AM2	Improve the Pedestrian Environment	Supported																																																									
AM3	Countryside Access	Supported																																																									
AM4	Walking & Cycling Strategies	Supported. With need to collaborate on the extension of sustainable routes between the Parishes																																																									
Community Infrastructure																																																											
CM1	Sports Provision	Supported																																																									
CM2	New Community Hall	Supported																																																									

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response						
		<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 15%;">CM3</td> <td style="width: 40%;">New Medical Centre</td> <td style="width: 45%;">Supported</td> </tr> <tr> <td>CM4</td> <td>Protection of Community Services &amp; Employment Land</td> <td>Supported</td> </tr> </table>	CM3	New Medical Centre	Supported	CM4	Protection of Community Services & Employment Land	Supported
CM3	New Medical Centre	Supported						
CM4	Protection of Community Services & Employment Land	Supported						
TWBC Response	Support and comments noted.							
<a href="#">HANDP_51</a>	Nigel Kennison-Cook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Whilst the NDP appears to be quite comprehensive, there are a number of areas that may need to be updated or amended to reflect the current status of housing in the village and the current housing needs.</li> <li>○ The Amended NDP covers 2016-2033, however the planning policy only refers to the Local Plan and old housing allocation 2006-2026. It appears to me that the NDP needs to be updated to reflect the current planning framework and local plan.</li> <li>○ The plan refers to the Core strategy requiring 240 dwellings to be provisioned in Hawkhurst, my understanding is that this number has significantly increased since the original NDP was drafted and this document has not been kept in line with the revised figures.</li> <li>○ The site allocation of Springfields is supporting the housing allocation figures and also states that this will be developed in phases due to multiple ownership of the site. If this approach is being supported by Hawkhurst Parish Council, then the policy needs to reflect the support for larger sites being developed in phases.</li> <li>○ The limits of build in the NDP does not appear to reflect the current position with the development of Circus Field not included in the LBD, I am not sure if it also represents the other developments that the HPC are proposing support the housing allocation. This section may need to be updated to reflect the current position.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Planning Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The policy of supporting development of brown field sites is too restrictive as there are very limited sites within the current settlement, therefore development of the housing need should be focussed on the requirement for dwellings accessible to the commercial centre of the village.</li> <li>○ There was a housing need survey and I believe the results were a mix of housing, being required such as small 2 and 3-bedroom housing, properties for the elderly, young and becoming more affordable in terms of smaller dwellings and affordable homes. The restriction on developments to 10 units or less will preclude the inclusion of social and elderly housing (as seen by applications by the school and White House which were larger 4 and 5 bedroom properties)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Site Allocation Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The site allocation plan refers to Hawkhurst Castle which has not provided residential housing but is in fact a Care Home.</li> <li>○ The Allocation plan includes Springfield Garden Centre which is in multiple ownership and has no defined plan for development of the 40 dwellings referred to in the plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Other matters: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The plan doesn't appear to address some of the main concerns of residents (Parking and Traffic). My view is that rather than</li> </ul> </li> </ul>						

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p style="text-align: center;">focussing on the size of development, the policy should focus on the proximity of the development to the centre of the village to ensure that developments are within easy walking distance of the commercial centre and bus routes.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council has considered the Examiner's report and has decided to accept a majority of the recommendations and modifications as explained in the report to Cabinet and confirmed in the published Decision Statement. Some further revisions have been made and formed the basis of the Regulation 17A consultation. No further changes are considered necessary.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_52</a>	DHA Planning on behalf of Cedardrive Ltd	<p>I write on behalf of our clients Cedardrive Ltd in respect of the emerging Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan. Please accept this letter as a formal representation to the current public consultation.</p> <p><b>Policy HD1(a): Preference for Small-Scale Developments</b></p> <p>Whilst my client welcomes the broad thrust of the proposed changes to the policy HD1, in that there now appears to be recognition that the Plan needs to allow for developments which are larger than 10 dwellings, we remain unclear about how policy HD1(a) will work in practice. The policy expresses the Parish's wish for priority to be given to the redevelopment of previously-developed sites but does not go on to set out how this would be tested. For example, it does not list or otherwise identify potentially suitable brownfield sites (other than referring to existing allocations and permissions), or require a sequential test approach to be undertaken. Greater clarity should be provided.</p> <p>We remain concerned, however, that small-scale developments are much less likely to be able to help deliver much-needed community benefits such as affordable housing, and expanded education and medical provision, etc. For that reason, we believe a mix of development sizes is necessary.</p> <p><b>Policy HD1(b): Exceptions for Larger-Scale Developments</b></p> <p>We welcome the principle of amending this policy to allow for larger developments in certain circumstances. The supporting text could and should go further by recognising that larger-scale developments also provide greater community benefits as set out above.</p> <p>We question whether the word "considerable" is really necessary in the 13<sup>th</sup> line of the policy. Whilst we fully recognise that there are environmental constraints, not least due to the location of the village within an AONB, whether or not these constraints are "considerable" will vary between sites. It should also be noted that in many cases, it will be possible to mitigate the effects of development, as previous planning decisions have recognised. Where this is possible, the constraints will not be insurmountable.</p> <p>Whilst we do not object to it, we consider that criterion 3 of the policy provides unnecessary repetition. If the Neighbourhood Plan is made in due course and becomes part of the development plan, then all proposals will need to comply with its policies unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is not necessary to restate this at the end of each policy.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p><b>Policy HD4: Design Quality</b></p> <p>Whilst we have no objection to the aims and objectives of this policy, as currently worded there is some conflict between the concept of “design guidance notes” and criterion 3 of the policy which requires all developments to comply with the notes. This suggests that these notes do not provide design “guidance” but instead are firm <u>requirements</u>.</p> <p>We recommend that the following wording for criterion 3 would be more appropriate:</p> <p><i>3) All proposals for development should demonstrate how the design guidance notes on pages 46-49 have been taken into account.</i></p> <p>If it is intended that these “design guidance notes” are to be followed as firm requirements, then we would object to that for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Whilst the NPPF strongly encourages high quality design, NPPF paragraph 60 is very clear that <i>“planning policies and decisions should not attempt to impose architectural styles or particular tastes and they should not stifle innovation, originality or initiative through unsubstantiated requirements to conform to certain development forms or styles.”</i></li> <li>2. The policy may be over-prescriptive in places. For example, paragraph 7.34 requires the use of local construction materials from local sustainable sources. The encouragement of such materials is perfectly acceptable as a Neighbourhood Plan policy, but to make it an absolute requirement is over-prescriptive. There may be circumstances where it simply isn’t possible to source such materials from local sources, even where the choice of material itself is locally appropriate, for example where locally appropriate materials are either no longer produced in the local area, or cannot be produced at an economically reasonable cost. Developers need to be given reasonable options to deliver the high quality of development sought.</li> <li>3. Similarly, the statement that “modern style extensions to traditional houses will be resisted” is another example of the policies being over-prescriptive. Each case should be judged on its merits.</li> <li>4. Whilst we recognise the wish not to experience “rapid large-scale development”, it would be wrong for the Neighbourhood Plan to artificially slow down development for which an urgent need has been demonstrated. Moreover, upfront investment for example in new roads and other community benefits needs to be taken into account, since this can only be delivered where the scale of development is sufficient to allow this to be economically viable.</li> </ol> <p><b>Policy AM1: Highgate Hill Junction</b></p> <p>We fully support the objective of improving the Highgate Hill junction. Whilst we recognise that the proposed layout set out in the Plan is provided only as illustrative material, we are concerned that it may not be a practical or viable scheme and we believe there may be alternative solutions to this junction which would be more feasible and provide greater community benefits. We welcome the non-prescriptive wording of the proposed policy, but this could be supplemented by stating that alternatives to the concept design layout put forward will also be considered positively if it can be demonstrated that they would achieve positive benefits for the character and environment of the village</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>centre.</p> <p>I would be grateful if the above points could be taken into account.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council has considered the Examiner's report and has decided to accept a majority of the recommendations and modifications as explained in the report to Cabinet and confirmed in the published Decision Statement. Some further revisions have been made and formed the basis of the Regulation 17A consultation. No further changes are considered necessary. Individual development proposals and planning applications will continue to be assessed and determined on individual merit having regard to the status of development plan policies but also having regard to all material considerations which may include the justifications and circumstances advanced in a specific case.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_53</a>	Mr Andrew Hill	<p>I have no comments apart from the fact that I consider it to be an excellent, comprehensive document and with the modifications can see no reason for it not to be adopted.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_54</a>	Alan Herbert	<p>I am writing with reference to the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan – draft version. I am a Hawkhurst resident and live within the Plan area at xxxx [TWBC: respondent's personal details removed]. I have set out my comments below:</p> <p>In general I support the draft NDP but with the exception of the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Page 36 – 7.2 “there needs to be a degree of flexibility over this as the replacement Tunbridge Wells Local Plan is prepared”. It is noted that the new Local Plan is being considered and I have submitted comments on the Issues and Options document separately. In my comments on the Issues and Options document I made the point that I do not think Hawkhurst is a suitable location for larger scale housing development. In addition the words “degree of flexibility” lack clarity and definition.</li> <li>2) Page 38 – Policy HD1 (b) – Hawkhurst is not a suitable location for developments of more than 10 houses. Larger developments are in direct conflict with the AONB status of the area and the way Hawkhurst has evolved. It is appreciated that there is a national need for houses but in exceptional circumstances there should also be an upper limit on the size of any development. In my view there are much better locations for housing in the Borough (ie the A21 corridor) and even in exceptional circumstances there should be a presumption in the NDP against any individual development of more than an absolute maximum of say 20 houses in the village.</li> <li>3) Page 40 – 7.18 – see comments above.</li> <li>4) Page 41 – 7.21 – The NDP clearly sets out that the strong preference is for smaller development of less than ten houses. It is not agreed that Hawkhurst is a suitable location for development of more than ten houses. I think the words “does not actively promote” are misleading and out of keeping with the rest of the plan. I think the plan should really be setting out a presumption against larger developments. As above the words “a degree of flexibility” are ambiguous and lack clarity. In the event of exceptional circumstances and in a</li> </ol>



**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>village/AONB environment an upper limit in the size of development should be considered. This could for example be 20 houses..</p> <p>5) Larger scale developments would of course have a knock on effect on many other aspects of the draft NDP - for example – access, services, environment and transport. There is a general comment about “mitigation” in the event of large scale development but I don’t think this is potentially sufficient to capture the full impact of larger scale development on the village.</p> <p>6) It is appreciated that the New Local Plan is emerging but would it be possible to build in the ability for this NDP to be reviewed when the New Local Plan policy is clear. In particular policies HD1 a and b should – I strongly hope – reflect the point that there should be very limited and small development in a village without strong public transport links and sitting within an AONB.</p> <p>I hope the above comments are helpful and please let me know if you require any further information in support of the above.</p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted. The Borough Council has considered the Examiner’s report and has decided to accept a majority of the recommendations and modifications as explained in the report to Cabinet and confirmed in the published Decision Statement. Some further revisions have been made and formed the basis of the Regulation 17A consultation. No further changes are considered necessary. The Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to regular review providing the opportunity for updates to reflect preparation and progress of the borough Local Plan.</p>
<a href="#">HANDP_55</a>	Broadlands for Hawkhurst Station Business Park	<p>I write to confirm that my client, the Kent Woodware Company Ltd, wishes to support the view set out in Policy CM4 of this Plan, to support and enhance local employment provision, and in particular the terms of Written statement para 10.19 that;</p> <p><i>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council has identified Gills Green as an employment hub and there is support in the village for reasonable expansion. Therefore, the development of an employment hub at Gills Green, building on the strength and success of existing businesses in that part of the parish, will be encouraged.</i></p> <p>In this regard, we would also draw your attention to the following terms of your Council’s Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells Economic Needs Study, Final Report for Tunbridge Wells Borough, August 2016;</p> <p><b>Land at the former Hawkhurst Railway Station, Gills Green Key Employment Area</b></p> <p><i>9.35 The Gill Green KEA is characterised by a mix of B2 and B8 uses. Existing occupiers include Howdens, Nortrade Seafood Specialist and Raven Roofing Supplies. The buildings on site are of steel frame construction and good quality. There is also evidence of new single storey buildings being constructed to provide additional accommodation.</i></p> <p><i>9.36 The KEA is accessed from the A229 and is highly visible. There are bus stops at c.60m and 150m to the south of the site. However, the area is around 18 miles from the M25 therefore connections to the strategic motorway network are somewhat limited.</i></p> <p><i>Notwithstanding this, the site is well occupied and there is also evidence of recent take, with the construction of a new unit to the west of the</i></p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p><i>site being pre let.</i></p> <p><b>9.37 Colliers' view</b> is that this is a good rural employment site. It is considered there is potential to extend the site to the south west to accommodate further B2 and B8 uses. Although not currently allocated, it is understood a further c.3 acres of land is potentially available to facilitate this expansion and there is potential demand from existing occupiers.</p> <p>9.38 It should be noted, however, that any future development would need to be sensitive to the landscape character of the area and compatible with the residential properties which would border the potential expansion site; for example a buffer zone would most likely be required to screen any potential development. This area, and possible allocation, would also need to be tested through the Local Plan process.</p> <p>You will be aware of our representation to the Borough Council's Local Plan Call for Sites in respect of the need and potential to expand the Hawkhurst Station Business Park, a schematic scheme for which is attached.</p> <p>I trust this is in order.</p> <p><i>[A web link for the "Sevenoaks and Tunbridge Wells Economic Needs Study 2016" and the "schematic scheme" can be found in the accompanying document bundle: file name "HANDP_55_Broadlands for Hawkhurst Station Business Park"]</i></p>
TWBC Response		Comments and support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_56</a>	Broadlands for P Dunlop & family	<p>Chittenden Fields, adjacent to High Street and Slip Mill Road, Hawkhurst</p> <p>I confirm that on behalf of my clients, Mr Peter Dunlop, and his wife, Joanna, and sons Nicholas and Thomas, support the Parish Council in respect of the Neighbourhood plan proposal to support the development of a combined GP Practice and Health Centre for Hawkhurst, as set out in Policy CM3 and its supporting text.</p> <p>In this regard, I refer you to the submissions made to the Council's Local Plan Call for sites, schematic plan as attached, which shows the potential for the development of land for residential purposes at Chittenden Fields, which will support the provision of such a new much needed facility.</p> <p><i>[The submission made to the Council's Local Plan Call for Sites and the schematic plan can be found in the accompanying document bundle: file name "HANDP_56_Broadlands for P Dunlop &amp; family"]</i></p>
TWBC Response		Comments and support noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_57</a>	Paul Wigram	I have read this document and accept its recommendations.

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
TWBC Response		Comments noted.
<a href="#">HANDP_58</a>	Barton Willmore for Leander Homes	<p>These representations have been prepared on behalf of Leander Homes who are promoting a site for residential development, located at Westfield and land east of Highgate Hill, Hawkhurst ('the Site').</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out that neighbourhood planning gives communities the opportunity to develop a shared vision for their neighbourhood and deliver the sustainable development they require. In this context, Leander Homes supports the development of a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) for Hawkhurst, provided that the ambition of the NP is aligned with the strategic needs and priorities of the wider Borough area and is in compliance with National planning policy.</p> <p>These representations comprise the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section 1 – Planning Policy Context;</li> <li>• Section 2 – Representations to Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan;</li> <li>• Section 3 – Development Opportunity at Westfield; and</li> <li>• Section 4 – Conclusion.</li> </ul> <p><b>1.0 Planning Policy Context</b></p> <p>The National Planning Policy Guidance (para 065 reference ID: 41-065-20140306) requires that for a NP to be considered sound, it must be in conformity with the Basic Conditions. These are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;</li> <li>ii) The making of the NP contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;</li> <li>iii) The making of the NP is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority;</li> <li>iv) The making of the NP does not breach, and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations; and</li> <li>v) Prescribed conditions are met in relation to the NP and prescribed matters have been complied with in connection with the proposal for the NP.</li> </ol>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response										
		<p>The Development Plan for the area comprises:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Saved” policies of the Tunbridge Wells Local Plan (2006);</li> <li>• Tunbridge Wells Core Strategy (2010); and</li> <li>• Tunbridge Wells Site Allocations Local Plan (2016).</li> </ul> <p>The 2010 Core Strategy seeks for the delivery of 6,000 dwellings (300 per annum) in the Borough during the period 2006 – 2026. The figure stems from the revoked South East Plan and is thus considered out-of-date.</p> <p>Hawkhurst is identified in the Core Strategy Settlement Hierarchy as one of three “Small Rural Towns” and Core Policy 13 (Development in Hawkhurst) states that approximately 240 net dwellings will be delivered on sites to be allocated and released in accordance with Core Policy 1. This sets out that priority will be given to the allocation and release of previously developed land within the ‘Limits to Built Development’ (LBD) of settlements. Selected greenfield sites within and/or adjacent to the LBDs in the main urban area (Tunbridge Wells/Southborough) and small rural towns (Hawkhurst, Cranbrook and Paddock Wood) will also be allocated and released as appropriate to maintain a sufficient phased supply of deliverable and developable land.</p> <p>The subsequent 2016 SALP includes a number of allocations for residential and which include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• AL/HA 1: Former Springfield Garden Centre (40 dwellings);</li> <li>• AL/HA 2: Land at Woodham Hall (12 – 15 dwellings);</li> <li>• AL/HA 3: Hawkhurst Castle (30 dwellings, C2 and/or C3); and</li> <li>• AL/HA 4: Birchfield, Rye Road (26 dwellings).</li> </ul> <p>The High Weald Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) designation washes over the entire settlement of Hawkhurst (including the above allocated sites) and covers over 70% of the Tunbridge Wells Borough area.</p> <p><u>Emerging Local Plan</u></p> <p>Tunbridge Wells Borough Council is in the process of producing a new Local Plan and the table below sets out the current timetable for this:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="443 1281 1762 1455"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="443 1281 1305 1318">Stage</th> <th data-bbox="1312 1281 1762 1318">Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1323 1305 1353">Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 18 consultation)</td> <td data-bbox="1312 1323 1762 1353">02 May – 12 June 2017</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1358 1305 1388">Submission Consultation (Regulation 19)</td> <td data-bbox="1312 1358 1762 1388">2018 (No months specified)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1393 1305 1423">Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)</td> <td data-bbox="1312 1393 1762 1423">2018</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="443 1428 1305 1458">Examination (Regulation 24)</td> <td data-bbox="1312 1428 1762 1458">2018</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Stage	Date	Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 18 consultation)	02 May – 12 June 2017	Submission Consultation (Regulation 19)	2018 (No months specified)	Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)	2018	Examination (Regulation 24)	2018
Stage	Date											
Local Plan Issues and Options Consultation (Regulation 18 consultation)	02 May – 12 June 2017											
Submission Consultation (Regulation 19)	2018 (No months specified)											
Submission to Secretary of State (Regulation 22)	2018											
Examination (Regulation 24)	2018											

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response												
		<p>Adoption (Regulation 26) <span style="float: right;">2019</span></p> <p>The Site has been submitted to TWBC as part of the “call for sites” process in June 2017. Extensive representations were also made on behalf of Leander Homes to the Local Plan Issues and Options (LPIO) document which confirms the objectively assessed need (OAN) for market and affordable housing as being 648 dpa in the Borough over the period 2013 – 2033 (total 12,960). This is over double the housing target as addressed in the 2010 Core Strategy (300 dpa), as derived from the South-East Plan.</p> <p>The LPIO contains five options for growth as follows:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: center;">OPTION</th> <th style="text-align: center;">STRATEGY</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Option 1 – Focused Growth</td> <td>Majority of development directed towards Tunbridge Wells/Southborough and smaller proportion to the other three main settlements of Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option 2 – Semi-dispersed Growth</td> <td>Option 1 + additional development directed to larger villages (Pembury, Rusthall, Goudhurst, Five Oak Green and Lamberhurst).</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option 3 – Dispersed Growth</td> <td>Development distribution proportional across all of the Borough’s settlements including smaller villages.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option 4 – Growth Corridor-led Approach</td> <td>A new ‘growth corridor’ around the A21 at Tunbridge Wells/Pembury.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Option 5 – New Settlement Growth</td> <td>The principle of a new settlement within the Borough – no location specified for this.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>As one of four “main settlements” (incl. Tunbridge Wells/Southborough, Paddock Wood and Cranbrook), it is anticipated that proportionate growth will be earmarked to Hawkhurst (along with other settlements) in the emerging Local Plan, having regard to constraints in the Borough including Green Belt to the north and areas of Flood Risk around Paddock Wood.</p> <p><b>2.0 Representations to Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan</b></p> <p>The “Submission Plan” NP (para 7.3) makes reference to the extent of development identified in the Core Strategy, as recommended in the Examiner’s Report to the NP (30 January 2017). This includes provision for 240 net additional dwellings being developed in Hawkhurst during the period 2006 – 2026. It is however noted that this strategy of growth was based upon the South East Plan housing requirement for the Borough which has since been revoked and is accordingly out-of-date.</p>	OPTION	STRATEGY	Option 1 – Focused Growth	Majority of development directed towards Tunbridge Wells/Southborough and smaller proportion to the other three main settlements of Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst.	Option 2 – Semi-dispersed Growth	Option 1 + additional development directed to larger villages (Pembury, Rusthall, Goudhurst, Five Oak Green and Lamberhurst).	Option 3 – Dispersed Growth	Development distribution proportional across all of the Borough’s settlements including smaller villages.	Option 4 – Growth Corridor-led Approach	A new ‘growth corridor’ around the A21 at Tunbridge Wells/Pembury.	Option 5 – New Settlement Growth	The principle of a new settlement within the Borough – no location specified for this.
OPTION	STRATEGY													
Option 1 – Focused Growth	Majority of development directed towards Tunbridge Wells/Southborough and smaller proportion to the other three main settlements of Paddock Wood, Cranbrook and Hawkhurst.													
Option 2 – Semi-dispersed Growth	Option 1 + additional development directed to larger villages (Pembury, Rusthall, Goudhurst, Five Oak Green and Lamberhurst).													
Option 3 – Dispersed Growth	Development distribution proportional across all of the Borough’s settlements including smaller villages.													
Option 4 – Growth Corridor-led Approach	A new ‘growth corridor’ around the A21 at Tunbridge Wells/Pembury.													
Option 5 – New Settlement Growth	The principle of a new settlement within the Borough – no location specified for this.													

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>In order to meet the Basic Conditions, in particular no. (iii) above, it is therefore recommended that the NP affords flexibility and aligns with the strategy for Hawkhurst to be pursued in the emerging Local Plan, as well as the extent of overall housing need. This appears to be referred to at para 7.4, albeit this does not refer to the objectively assessed need for the Borough (648dpa over the period 2013 – 2033).</p> <p>Proposed Policies HD1(a) and HD1(b) generally seek to prevent development proposals above 10No. dwellings (unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated). The policies are quoted as follows:</p> <p><b>Policy HD1(a) – Preference for Small-Scale Developments:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Priority will be given to the redevelopment of previously developed sites over greenfield sites;</b></li> <li>2. <b>The development of small-scale infill sites suitable for 1 – 5 dwellings both within the existing limits of built development and within walking distance of shops and amenities will be supported;</b></li> <li>3. <b>Any greenfield housing sites should be contiguous with existing limits of built development and provide for sites of approx. 5 – 10 dwellings, subject to the demonstration of effective physical integration with the existing settlement patterns found in and around Hawkhurst; and</b></li> <li>4. <b>All development proposals should comply with the other policies in the Hawkhurst Neighbourhood Plan.</b></li> </ol> <p><b>Policy HD1(b) – Exceptions for Larger-Scale Developments:</b></p> <p>1) <b>Larger development of 10 or more houses will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that there are exceptional circumstances as prescribed by the NPPF and if it can be demonstrated that their impact on the sensitive AONB landscape setting and the considerable environmental constraints of Hawkhurst can be effectively mitigated.</b></p> <p>The Examiner to the NP recommended that such criteria be deleted as National policy seeks to avoid such blanket restrictions unless their use can be supported by robust evidence. We would support the Examiner’s concerns in this regard and do not consider that the NP meets Basic Condition no. (i) on this basis.</p> <p>Moreover, such policies could conflict with the emerging Local Plan which may include development options of a larger scale, particularly in view of the uplift in housing needs and the likelihood of growth occurring within the small rural towns of the Borough (including Hawkhurst). As an example, the Site being promoted by Leander to the Local Plan could deliver c. 30No. dwellings as well as much needed affordable provision and other benefits and the NP should not seek to prejudice such opportunities from occurring. Accordingly, the NP as currently drafted is considered to place unnecessary restrictions to development and is thus considered premature to the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>The Examiner to the “made” East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (November 2016) dealt with a similar issue whereby the housing provision and built-up area boundary within the Plan were based on the out-of-date 2004 Mid Sussex Local Plan (and where an up-to-date Local Plan was not yet in place)<a href="#">[1]</a>. Rather than find the Plan “unsound”, the Examiner recommended a criteria based policy (Policy EG5) to assess</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>future residential proposals that came forward outside of the existing built-up area boundary. The “made” Policy EG5 is quoted as follows:</p> <p><b>The East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan area is subject to significant environmental and infrastructure constraints and as a result new housing development on land defined as ‘previously developed’, where the site is predominantly previously developed or is green infrastructure that can be demonstrated to be surplus to requirements will be supported subject to the criteria below and in compliance with other policies within the plan.</b></p> <p><b>Other proposals for new housing development will only be supported if:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>a) The proposed development contributes to sustainable development;</b></li> <li><b>b) An application is supported by robust assessment of the environmental and visual impact of the proposal and includes as necessary appropriate mitigation measures;</b></li> <li><b>c) An application is supported by a robust assessment of the impact of the proposal upon the local highway network and it can be demonstrated that the proposal will not cause a severe cumulative impact in terms of road safety and increased congestion after proposed mitigation is taken into account;</b></li> <li><b>d) The proposal complies with design guidance contained in policy EG3 or a relevant Development Brief;</b></li> <li><b>e) The proposal provides a mix of tenure types including private, social rented and shared equity (intermediate);</b></li> <li><b>f) Contributions are made towards SANG and Strategic Access Management Measures; and</b></li> <li><b>g) The proposal meets its own infrastructure needs.</b></li> </ul> <p><b>Where proposals comply with Policy EG5, relevant site-specific policies and mitigate their highway and other infrastructure impacts, the following sites (EG6A and EG6B) will be encouraged to come forward for residential development.</b></p> <p>Instead of seeking to place restrictions upon scale/quantum of development, the above policy is a good example where future development proposals could be positively addressed as against a number of development control criteria. Such an approach is recommended for the Hawkhurst NP.</p> <p>As currently prescribed, it is considered that policies HD1(a) and HD1(b) place unnecessary restrictions that seek to restrict housing delivery in the emerging Local Plan. The policy is also likely to prohibit the provision of affordable housing coming forward which is mostly reliant</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>upon viable and larger development sites being delivered.</p> <p>It is considered that both policies fail to adhere to National planning policy and Ministerial guidance which recognises the need to boost housing delivery. However, the option of securing a “facilitating policy” as per Policy EG5 of the East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan, affords the opportunity of progressing a “sound” NP without being premature to or conflicting with the emerging Local Plan.</p> <p>These suggested changes would enable the NP to comply with Government guidance, namely Basic Conditions Nos. (i), (ii) and (iii), as set out in the NPPG.</p> <p><b>3.0 Development Opportunity at Westfield</b></p> <p>As part of these representations, please find enclosed the following documents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Site Location Plan; and</li> <li>2. Illustrative Masterplan.</li> </ol> <p>a) <u>Planning</u></p> <p>The Site extends to 1.26 ha and is located on the south-eastern edge of Hawkhurst, to the east of Highgate Hill and is set back from the road beyond a hedgerow and belt of cypress trees. It comprises the existing property; Westfield and its residential curtilage which extends eastwards beyond the dwelling. Additional areas of land are included within the Site area and which are situated south of properties along Copthall Avenue, namely; Orleigh, Cotley, St. Marys, Sunhaven and Suncourt.</p> <p>Fixtures on the Site include a single storey garage to the north of the dwelling and a brick store and greenhouse within the garden area to the rear (east) of the property.</p> <p>To the east of the curtilage comprises undeveloped grassland, adjacent which is a woodland belt which dissects the undeveloped scrub. The Site is generally flat across the northern boundary, with a gentle slope extending towards the southern boundary.</p> <p>As referred to above, the Site adjoins residential development to the north and east at Copthall Avenue and the curtilages of Rose Cottage and Cockshot Farmhouse (off Highgate Hill) to the west. The surrounding townscape comprises a mix of urban vernacular including single and two storey dwellings.</p> <p>The land to the south consists of gently undulating farmland with storage and woodland areas and paddocks. A large concrete framed hay barn is evident at Cockshot Barn beyond the south-west boundary of the Site. Further residential development is evident to the south-west of the Site, including the dwellings at Cockshot Barn and Leafwood.</p>



**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>Beyond the fields to the south, the land forms a wooded stream valley, which to a degree separates Hawkhurst from the neighbourhood of The Moor, to the south-west. The nearest Public Right of Way (PRoW) traverses through the wooded valley approximately 170m south of the Site.</p> <p>A portion of the Site is located within the LBD as identified in the 2016 SALP. This includes the dwelling and a small part of the residential curtilage. The remainder of the Site is located adjacent to this designated boundary.</p> <p>The Site is considered to represent a good opportunity in terms of seeking to meet local and Borough-wide housing needs, in view of its location within the confines of Hawkhurst and as addressed against the three elements (social, economic and environmental) of sustainable development, as set out in the NPPF.</p> <p>b) <u>Illustrative Masterplan</u></p> <p>The Illustrative Masterplan for the Site seeks to demonstrate the scope and quantum of development that could be achieved. The Masterplan adopts a landscape-led approach to development including the retention of the wooded tree belt running through the Site and boundary hedgerows throughout much of the Site. Additional planting could also be introduced along the more open boundaries in parts of the north and south of the Site.</p> <p>The Masterplan provides for the following scope of development:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C. 30No. dwellings (Illustrated as 28 on the Plan);</li> <li>• Existing dwelling (Westfield) divided into two properties;</li> <li>• Affordable provision (10No. dwellings/35%);</li> <li>• Access from Highgate Hill;</li> <li>• Areas of open space;</li> <li>• Retention of woodland area and secured as part of a Management Plan in perpetuity;</li> <li>• Areas for car parking;</li> <li>• Hard and soft landscaping; and</li> <li>• Planning obligations towards local transport infrastructure and community hall benefits could also be secured.</li> </ul> <p>c) <u>Access</u></p> <p>An appraisal concerning the potential for access at the Site has been undertaken on behalf of Leander Homes. This has had regard to a vehicular speed survey carried out at Highgate Hill and visibility requirements north and south are between 53 - 59m which is readily achievable on to the road.</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>The centre of Hawkhurst is located approximately 370m to the north and comprises a number of facilities including retail and employment. Additionally, the Site benefits from convenient access to bus services with bus stops on Highgate Hill and the High Street. Such stops provide services to, <i>inter-alia</i>, Hastings, Tunbridge Wells, Battle and Robertsbridge. As referred to above, development of the Site can deliver significant contributions towards identified improvements to local transport infrastructure including at the Highgate Hill junction (and other potential improvements – i.e. community hall).</p> <p>d) <u>Landscape</u></p> <p>The Site is located within the High Weald AONB, which should be considered in the context of the designation washing over the entire settlement. The SALP contains four allocations including for development ranging from 12 – 40 dwellings (all within AONB).</p> <p>The Site is located within “Local Character Area 11: Hawkhurst” (Tunbridge Wells Borough Landscape Character Assessment – Feb 2017) and the wider “Bodium: Lower Rother Valley” (The Landscape Assessment of Kent – Oct 2004). A landscape appraisal undertaken on behalf of Leander notes that it is evident from site observations that the agriculture land and wooded valley south of the Site is representative of the Bodium: Lower Rother Valley LCA, however the Site itself does not contain any notable features and is strongly influenced by the adjoining settlement edge. This is important to consider for future potential development. The characteristic “green infrastructure” of hedgerows, woodland and field boundaries could be incorporated into the development of the Site, in accordance with LCA objectives.</p> <p>In visual terms, the Site is largely contained by built form on three of its boundaries, to the north, east and west. Moreover, the wooded valley to the south of the Site provides screening beyond the fields to the south. Longer distance views towards the Site are restricted by intervening residential development and topography. Views from close proximity are intermittent owing to boundary vegetation and existing development.</p> <p>The proposal for the Site comprises a landscape-led approach towards development, as well as securing development that compliments the existing settlement edge in terms of building heights, detailing and materials so that development is seen as a continuum of the townscape edge. In landscape terms, development of the Site could be secured which is sympathetic to the AONB landscape it would sit within.</p> <p><b>4.0 Conclusion</b></p> <p>Leander Homes supports the development of the NP for Hawkhurst, however, as currently drafted, the proposed NP is not considered to meet the Basic Conditions (of the NPPG) in-so-far-as, it seeks to place unnecessary and unjustified restrictions on the scale of future development. The provision of a “facilitating” policy as recommended above, enables suitable development proposals to come forward and to be positively addressed against development control criteria. This would ensure that the NP complies with National planning policy and guidance and does not conflict with the strategy proposed in the Local Plan.</p> <p>As demonstrated above, the Site is capable of delivering development akin to the allocated sites in the SALP in terms of quantum and scale,</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		<p>and it would secure benefits in the form of much needed affordable housing, areas of open space, landscape and woodland management, infrastructure obligations, etc.</p> <p>As set out in the extensive representations made to the “call for sites” and the LPIO Consultation, the Site is considered “suitable”, “available” and “achievable” and thus “deliverable” in the context of para 47 of the NPPF. It is therefore proposed to form a housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan and for which the NP should not seek to prejudice.</p> <p>I trust these representations are of use to you and we would welcome the opportunity of meeting with you to discuss the above.</p> <p>Please let me know should you have any queries and I look forward to hearing from you.</p> <p><i>[Illustrative master plan and location plan can be found in the accompanying document bundle: file name “HANDP_58”]</i></p> <hr/> <p><a href="http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/77607/egnp_independent_examiners_report_of_the_east_grinstead_neighbourhood_plan.pdf">[1]</a> See Examiner’s Report of East Grinstead Neighbourhood Plan (17 August 2016) - <a href="http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/77607/egnp_independent_examiners_report_of_the_east_grinstead_neighbourhood_plan.pdf">http://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/77607/egnp_independent_examiners_report_of_the_east_grinstead_neighbourhood_plan.pdf</a></p>
TWBC Response		<p>Comments noted. Those comments relating to the specifically mentioned promoted site are not considered relevant to the Neighbourhood Plan but rather relate to the separate borough Local Plan process. All comments made in that respect will be considered as part of the assessment of sites submitted under the Local Plan call for sites resulting in a published Strategic Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment in due course.</p> <p>With regard to the specific comments relevant to consideration of the Neighbourhood Plan; the Borough Council has considered the Examiner’s report and has decided to accept a majority of the recommendations and modifications as explained in the report to Cabinet and confirmed in the published Decision Statement. Some further revisions have been made and formed the basis of the Regulation 17A consultation.</p> <p>It is not agreed that Policy HD1 has the effect suggested. It expresses a preference for brownfield and small sites and in that way reflects national planning policy particularly with regard to development in AONB. The revised Housing Policy HD1 has been drafted to accord with national policy regarding major development in the AONB. It does not provide for an embargo on major development but reflects the policy tests and considerations set out in national planning policy. Individual development proposals and planning applications will continue to be assessed and determined on individual merit having regard to the status of development plan policies but also having regard to all material considerations which may include the justifications and circumstances advanced in a specific case.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan will be subject to regular review providing the opportunity for updates and revision, subject to due process, to</p>

**HAWKHURST NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN  
REGULATION 17A: MODIFIED CONSULTATION DRAFT  
21 JULY TO 4 SEPTEMBER 2017**

Comment Number	Name or Organisation	Response
		reflect preparation and progress of the borough Local Plan. No further changes are considered necessary.
HANDP_59	Alec Travers	<p>I appreciate that a great deal of time and care has gone into the preparation and presentation of the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) and I congratulate all those who have been involved in this task.</p> <p>I should like to stress a number of points which I feel need to be emphasised, as follows:</p> <p><b>Housing</b> – The factors governing the provision of future housing in Hawkhurst and which are referred to several times in the NDP, cannot be over-emphasised. The principal ones are the character, prioritisation and quality of new homes, be they new developments or infilling, together with proper integration into the existing community. What we do not need is large scale development estates on the edges of the village, where integration is either limited or nil, and where housing designs are cheap, standardised and out of keeping with the surrounding area or the village as a whole. It may be argued that this is an attempt to preserve the village in aspic or to perpetuate a “chocolate box” appearance to the village. To counter this one needs only look at the points raised under the heading and description of the AONB. Regarding prioritisation, I would argue that we have sufficient large and luxury homes in the parish and that any large-scale development should be encouraged to concentrate on the smaller and lower-cost aspect of the housing market. It is yet to be known what Government incentives there will be passing down to councils wishing to build social housing, but this may yet prove sufficient inducement for future developments to include a significantly greater proportion of this type of housing in the future. On a minor topic I noticed there was little reference to the disposal of grey water from housing: given the current projections that the country is likely to be suffering from water shortages in the future, any means of returning water into the underground aquifers should be encouraged. Incidentally this should apply equally to storm-water falling on both houses and roads, rather than passing it directly into the sewers.</p> <p><b>AONB</b> – There should be strict observance of the necessity to adhere to the guide-lines set out for the preservation and maintenance of the AONB, and no lip-service, such as was seen recently in the proposal for a mobile phone mast on the south-eastern side of the parish.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> – Heavy traffic in Hawkhurst is a given, the intersection of two A class roads in the centre of the village guarantees that, but the key to diminishing (not resolving) this is to create a ban on the passage of HGVs through the village. There may be a longer-term solution to the traffic problem in Hawkhurst, but in my view the Crossroads Concept Scheme in Appendix 02 ain't it. One only has to imagine the problems arising from the manoeuvring of the HGV's over and around the two mini roundabouts , the doubts as to who has priority on not one but two of such these, the involvement of bicycle and pedestrian traffic, etc. to find it difficult to understand how this is supposed to resolve the situation. The Hawkhurst traffic is bad but remove the HGVs and it could be at least bearable.</p>
TWBC Response		Comments noted.